

Appendix I: Table of submission points

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
8.1	Geoscience Society of New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Add a new schedule listing scheduled Outstanding Natural Features (ONF) in the district.	Outstanding Natural Features are geological sites and landforms. Marine and terrestrial ecosystems, cultural and historic sites are all protected through other clauses in the RMA. Outstanding natural features were included in the RMA after our Society's submission where a clause was needed to protect the outstanding aspects of NZ's unique geoheritage. Outstanding natural features are outstanding geological sites and landforms recognised by other territorial and local authorities in northern NZ: e.g. Far North District Council 113 ONFs, Whangarei District Scheme schedules 56 ONFs, Auckland Unitary Plan schedules 254 ONFs, Waitomo District 75 potential ONFs to be scheduled. All of the above are geoheritage features. Identifying and scheduling outstanding natural features are the most critical actions for a District Plan.	Accept	9.1
FS1012.3	Auckland Volcanic Cones Society	Support	Reasons for my support are: 1. The existing Waikato District Scheme, part inherited from Franklin DC contains a list of scheduled ONFs. This schedule MUST be retained and expanded, so that all the work protecting these sites from the past is not lost. They include three of the most outstanding volcanoes in the South Auckland Field. 2. Auckland Volcanic Cones Society has devoted considerable time and resources to defending Pukekawa Scoria Cone from the adverse effects of proposed subdivision in a Franklin District resource hearing in the past. All these efforts, on behalf of the people of NZ, will have been in vain if Pukekawa is downgraded from its unchallengeable status as an ONF to a nebulous "Significant Amenity Landscape" with no legal status as now proposed. 3. The proposed Waikato District Scheme and Waikato Regional Policy Statement combine Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes into a term they call ONFL, which has no legal status and is not justified in the documents. The Regional Policy statement uses the definition of an outstanding landscape taken from the NZ Institute of Landscape Architects Best Practice Note 10.1 but merely invents their own definition of an	We support the Geoscience Society of NZ and request that additions to be made to the proposed District Scheme to recognise ONFs as natural geological features, landforms or physical systems just as they have been in the existing Franklin Scheme for all these years. This requires a number of additions to the proposed scheme, one of which is the schedule of ONFs.	Accept	9.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p>outstanding natural feature by saying "A feature is a discrete part of a landscape." This is a nonsensical definition with no basis in law and fails to have any understanding of the history of the RMA and why natural features were specifically included as different from natural landscapes. 4. Waikato District officers have been totally misled by their consultant's report "Appendix 9.1 Waikato District Landscape Study by Boffa Miskell" when it comes to defining and identifying ONFs. They are not "small landscapes" as claimed and they do NOT need to have natural vegetation cover as seems to have been applied by the Boffa Miskell report to be outstanding natural features. The AVCS has spent the last 2 years in and out of the Environment Court and High Court defending a volcano from the adverse effects of proposed subdivision. At no time has the ONF status of the volcano been questioned by any side nor any of the panel or judge, yet there is not a stitch of natural vegetation growing on it - it is entirely in grass and kiwi fruit vines. 5. We support the Geoscience Society's contention that an ONF is a natural geological feature, landform or physical system. The landform may be an entity within a landscape but an ONF does not need to be, nor does it need to have natural vegetation. It can indeed be an unnatural exposure (road cut or quarry face) of a natural geological feature or features. This definition has been accepted for 20 years plus by the majority of TLAs around the country and by the Franklin District Scheme which is now being combined with the old Waikato District Scheme.</p>			
FS1223.179	Mercury NZ Limited	Oppose	Mercury seeks that the submission point is disallowed.	Mercury has an interest in the submission points listed in paragraphs 11.1 and 11.2 above. Mercury supports the protection of outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes in the context of section 6(b) of the RMA, where there has been a robust expert assessment undertaken to describe the values supporting an assessment of what is outstanding. The Waikato RPS Table 12.2 sets out factors that District Councils are to consider when undertaking such an assessment. Mercury considers that such a robust assessment has not been undertaken as part of the preparation of the PWDP.	Reject	9.1
8.2	Geoscience Society of New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Add a new Schedule to Section D Appendices and Schedules, entitled "Important Geological Sites and Landforms", and include the following sites (from the Waikato District Plan - Franklin Section, Part 5, Schedule 5B) in the schedule. Daff Road Jurassic Plant Beds Kaawa Creek-Ngatutura Bay Section Kellyville Tuff Ring Moeweka	These features are currently Outstanding Natural Features in the Franklin Section of the operative Waikato District Plan. These features have been protected as Outstanding Natural Features since the 1990s. The Society has attended resource consent hearings and commented on	Reject	9.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			Quarry Jurassic Fauna Onewhero Tuff Ring Opuatia Cliff Jurassic Fauna Port Waikato to Tuakau Bridge Road Jurassic Section Pukekawa III Scoria Cone Huriwai Beach Jurassic Plant Beds Waikato River Delta	applications which have helped defend them from inappropriate subdivision, use and development as defined in RMA clause 4b. Not scheduling or showing these Outstanding Natural Features on planning maps must be an oversight, as it appears to be tantamount to removing the protection they so desperately need and have had for quarter of a century.		
FS1223.180	Mercury NZ Limited	Oppose	Mercury seeks that the submission point is disallowed.	Mercury has an interest in the submission points listed in paragraphs 11.1 and 11.2 above. Mercury supports the protection of outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes in the context of section 6(b) of the RMA, where there has been a robust expert assessment undertaken to describe the values supporting an assessment of what is outstanding. The Waikato RPS Table 12.2 sets out factors that District Councils are to consider when undertaking such an assessment. Mercury considers that such a robust assessment has not been undertaken as part of the preparation of the PWDP.	Accept	9.1
FS1012.4	Auckland Volcanic Cones Society	Support	Reasons for my support are: These sites have been recognised and protected as ONFs since the mid 1990s. They are as outstanding now as they were when first scheduled. Using the criteria listed in Northland and Auckland Plans, these features certainly qualify as Outstanding Natural Features that need to be protected under RMA clause 6b. Having a schedule of ONFs provides certainty for the Council, owners and the public. Otherwise every resource consent application will need to be assessed to decide whether it is an ONF or not, and many ONFs will be lost or damaged through lack of expertise in WDC.	We support retaining all the existing scheduled ONFs from the existing District Scheme, but from our volcanic perspective we cannot emphasise enough the importance of retaining the three young volcanoes in the list: Kellyville Tuff Ring Onewhero Tuff Ring Pukekawa III Scoria Cone	Reject	9.1
FS1342.1	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow part of submission points 8.2. Do not allow any new areas or features, identified on private land, to be added to schedules without prior landowner approval.	FFNZ considers that only new sites or features located on public land should be added to schedules in the plan using this submission process. It is inappropriate to add any sites that may be located on private land without direct landowner consultation in the first instance. There are very restrictive land use controls which apply to these sites and as such, a rigorous identification process with meaningful consultation is necessary.	Accept	9.1
FS1293.1	Department of Conservation	Support	Seek that the submission point is allowed.	The Director-General supports the addition of the proposed sites from Geoscience NZ to ensure these sites are afforded adequate protection under the plan.	Reject	9.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
8.3	Geoscience Society of New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Add the following additional Outstanding Natural Features (i.e. geological sites and landforms) as recorded in the NZ Geopreservation Inventory to a new schedule of Outstanding Natural Features as follows: 1. <u>Port Waikato sandspit</u> 2. <u>Ngapuriri natural arch and surrounding karst</u> 3. <u>Huriwai-Waikawau coastal section</u> 4. <u>Waiwiri Beach unconformity and basal Waitemata group</u> 5. <u>Pukeotahinga scoria cone</u> 6. <u>Onewhero scoria cone</u> 7. <u>Kauri Rd scoria cone</u> 8. <u>Onepoto volcanic cone</u> 9. <u>Te Kohanga tuff ring</u> 10. <u>Rasmussen Rd tuff ring</u> 11. <u>Waiuku volcanic cone</u> 12. <u>Pokeno scoria cone</u> 13. <u>Serpell Rd tuff ring</u> 14. <u>Puketoka conglomerate</u> 15. <u>Waikorea hot springs</u> 16. <u>Gibsons Beach unconformity and fossil karst</u> 17. <u>Taupiri Gorge</u> 18. <u>Dunphall Bluffs Oligocene sandstone</u> 19. <u>Waingaro hot springs</u> 20. <u>Carters Beach shore platforms</u> 21. <u>Raglan coastal karst</u> 22. <u>Te Toto Gorge lava and pyroclastic sequence</u> 23. <u>Mt Karioi</u> 24. <u>Papnui Pt volcanics</u> 25. <u>Bridal veil Falls columnar jointed basalt</u> 26. <u>Lake Disappear blind valley</u> 27. <u>Lake Disappear karst</u> 29. <u>Taranki Pt karst</u> 30. <u>Aotea dune field</u> 31. <u>Helectite Hole karst</u>	The significance and location of these outstanding features are outlined in the publicly accessible NZ Geopreservation Inventory. Outstanding natural features need to be identified, mapped and scheduled so that they can be protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development, as required by RMA clause 4B and in Policy 15 of the NZ Coastal Policy Statement which states: avoid adverse effects of activities on outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes in the coastal environment. Outstanding Natural Features are geological sites and landforms. Marine and terrestrial ecosystems, cultural and historic heritage sites are protected through other clauses in the RMA. Identifying and scheduling outstanding natural features and providing criteria for potentially identifying others are the most critical actions for the District Plan.	Accept in part	9.1
FS1012.5	Auckland Volcanic Cones Society	Support	<i>There are many outstanding natural features in Waikato District (according to the criteria listed above) that need certainty by scheduling. They should NOT be placed in a non-legal second-rate category that has been invented and called Significant Amenity Landscapes. They qualify as Outstanding Natural Features and the RMA requires them to be protected as "a matter of national importance".</i>	<i>I seek that the whole of the submission be allowed for the details below We support the full list given by the Geoscience Society of NZ but from our volcanic perspective we are insistent that the following threatened young basalt volcanoes in Waikato District MUST be on a scheduled list of ONFs in the Plan: Their mapped extent is publicly available on the web site of the NZ Geopreservation Inventory. 5. Pukeotahinga scoria cone 6. Onewhero scoria cone 7. Kauri Rd scoria cone 8. Onepoto volcanic cone 9. Te Kohanga tuff ring 10. Rasmussen Rd tuff ring 11. Waiuku volcanic cone 12. Pokeno scoria cone 13. Serpell Rd tuff ring</i>	Accept in part	9.1
FS1121.1	John Lawson	Support	<i>Reasons for WED's support are that these features are as much heritage, deserving of protection, as other heritage items. The recent Foulden Maar issue highlights the need for the District Plan to include the full inventory.</i>	<i>WED seeks that the whole of the submission be allowed, but ensure correct spelling of Papanui (not Papnui), as in the original submission.</i>	Accept in part	9.1
FS1120.1	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence	Support	<i>Support submission point 8.3.</i>	<i>Reasons for WED's support are that these features are as much heritage, deserving of protection, as other heritage items. The recent Foulden Maar issue highlights the need for the District Plan to include the full inventory. WED seeks that the whole of the submission be allowed, but ensure correct spelling of Papanui (not Papnui), as in the original submission.</i>	Accept in part	9.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FSI293.2	Department of Conservation	Support	Seek that the submission point is allowed.	The Director-General supports the addition of the proposed sites from Geoscience NZ to ensure these sites are afforded adequate protection under the plan.	Accept in part	9.1
FSI276.215	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Support	WED seeks that the whole of the submission point be allowed, but ensure correct spelling of Papanui (not Papnui), as in the original; submission.	These features are as much heritage, deserving of protection, as other heritage items. The recent Foulden Maar issue highlights the need for the District Plan to include the full inventory.	Accept in part	9.1
FSI342.2	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow part of submission point 8.3. Do not allow any new areas or features, identified on private land, to be added to schedules without prior landowner approval.	FFNZ considers that only new sites or features located on public land should be added to schedules in the plan using this submission process. It is inappropriate to add any sites that may be located on private land without direct landowner consultation in the first instance. There are very restrictive land use controls which apply to these sites and as such, a rigorous identification process with meaningful consultation is necessary.	Accept in part	9.1
8.4	Geoscience Society of New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Add more policies and rules to protect Outstanding Natural Features and provide criteria for the potential identification of others.	Outstanding Natural Features need to be protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development, as required by RMA clause 4B and Policy 15 of the NZ Coastal Policy Statement which states: "avoid adverse effects of activities on outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes in the coastal environment". Outstanding Natural Features are geological sites and landforms. Marine and terrestrial ecosystems, cultural and historic heritage sites are protected through other clauses in the RMA. The protection of Outstanding Natural Features is the most critical action for the District Plan. Council needs to consider other District Plans in the region that contain objectives, policies and criteria relating to Outstanding Natural Features.	Reject	5.1
FSI342.3	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow submission point 8.4.	FFNZ understands the intent of the submission but considers the notified policies and rules, incorporating the amendments sought by FFNZ, will provide appropriate protection for identified ONFs. The Waikato Regional Policy Statement provides direction for territorial authorities concerning identification of local sites.	Accept	5.1
FSI345.109	Genesis Energy Limited	Oppose	Accept in part.	The proposed provisions are unspecified and therefore the implications cannot be assessed (there is a lack of certainty).	Accept	5.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1223.181	Mercury NZ Limited	Oppose	Mercury seeks that the submission point is disallowed.	Mercury has an interest in the submission points listed in paragraphs 11.1 and 11.2 above. Mercury supports the protection of outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes in the context of section 6(b) of the RMA, where there has been a robust expert assessment undertaken to describe the values supporting an assessment of what is outstanding. The Waikato RPS Table 12.2 sets out factors that District Councils are to consider when undertaking such an assessment. Mercury considers that such a robust assessment has not been undertaken as part of the preparation of the PWDP.	Accept	5.1
FS1012.1	Auckland Volcanic Cones Society	Support	Outstanding Natural Features need to be protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development, as required by RMA clause 6B and Policy 15 of the NZ Coastal Policy Statement which states: 'avoid adverse effects of activities on outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes in the coastal environment'.	Other district schemes in northern New Zealand have developed policies and rules to protect their scheduled ONFs. These plans can readily be consulted and the policies and rules most applicable to WDC selected for inclusion.	Reject	5.1
FS1293.3	Department of Conservation	Support	Seek that the submission point is allowed.	The Director-General supports further protection of Outstanding Natural Features and criteria for additional identification of additional ONFs.	Reject	5.1
8.5	Geoscience Society of New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Add into Section 3.3 Outstanding Natural Features, criteria for identifying Outstanding Natural Features, similar to that in the Auckland Unitary Plan, Northland Regional Plan and other local districts: <u>Assessment criteria for identifying ONFs (a) the extent to which the landform, feature or geological site contributes to the understanding of the geology or evolution of the biota in the region, New Zealand or the earth; (b) the rarity or unusual nature of the site or feature; (c) the extent to which the feature is an outstanding representative example of the diversity of district's natural landforms and geological features; (d) the extent to which the landform, geological feature or site is part of a recognizable group of features (e.g. caves and karst group: South Auckland volcanoes group); (e) the extent to which the landform or geological feature contributes to the aesthetic value or visual legibility of the wider landscape; (f) the extent of community association with, or public appreciation of, the values of the feature or site; (g) the potential value of the feature or site for public education; (h) the potential value of the feature or site to provide additional understanding of the geological or biotic history; (i) the state of preservation of the feature or site; (j) the extent to which a feature or site is associated with</u>	Providing criteria for potential outstanding natural features are the most critical action for District Plans. Council officers and public need to have clarity as to what the criteria are for identifying outstanding natural features and how consent applications can be assessed against the values of individual outstanding natural features.	Reject	5.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			an historically important natural event, geologically related industry, or individual involved in earth science research; (k) the importance of the feature or site to Mana Whenua.			
FSI293.4	Department of Conservation	Support	Seek that the submission point is allowed.	The Director-General supports this as it provides further protection to Outstanding Natural Features.	Reject	5.1
FSI345.110	Genesis Energy Limited	Oppose	Accept in part.	The proposed provisions are unspecified and therefore the implications cannot be assessed (there is a lack of certainty).	Accept	5.1
FSI342.4	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow submission point 8.5.	FFNZ opposes the submission on the basis that the relief sought is unnecessary to meet RMA requirements. The Waikato Regional Policy Statement provides the appropriate framework and local context with regards to ONFs and ONLs.	Accept	5.1
FSI062.1	Andrew and Christine Gore	Support	Support in part submission point 8.5. Council and public need clarity as to how outstanding features are identified and how consent is assessed.	• It is important that experts identify what an important natural feature is.	Reject	5.1
FSI223.153	Mercury NZ Limited	Support	Mercury seeks that these submissions are allowed	Mercury supports the protection of outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes in the context of section 6(b) of the RMA, where there has been a robust expert assessment undertaken to describe the values supporting an assessment of what is outstanding. The Waikato RPS Table 12.2 sets out factors that District Councils are to consider when undertaking such an assessment. Mercury considers that such a robust assessment has not been undertaken as part of the preparation of the PWDP.	Reject	5.1
FSI198.18	Bathurst Resources Limited and BT Mining Limited	Oppose	The submission point be disallowed in full.	The Proposed Plan defines: Outstanding natural features Outstanding natural character areas High natural character area Outstanding natural landscapes Significant natural areas Significant amenity landscapes These definitions overlap to a large extent and it is queried why so many definitions are needed. It is also hard to follow how they are used in the Proposed Plan and to identify exactly where all of these areas actually are. The proposed definition of Outstanding Natural Features is too extensive and will unnecessarily impede development in rural areas.	Accept	5.1
FSI223.182	Mercury NZ Limited	Oppose	Mercury seeks that the submission point is disallowed.	Mercury has an interest in the submission points listed in paragraphs 11.1 and 11.2 above. Mercury supports the protection of outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes in the context of	Accept	5.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				section 6(b) of the RMA, where there has been a robust expert assessment undertaken to describe the values supporting an assessment of what is outstanding. The Waikato RPS Table 12.2 sets out factors that District Councils are to consider when undertaking such an assessment. Mercury considers that such a robust assessment has not been undertaken as part of the preparation of the PWDP.		
FS1012.2	Auckland Volcanic Cones Society	Support	Hearings and courts need guidance as to what criteria are used to identify ONFs. These have been developed and included in Auckland and Northland and proposed for Waitomo District.	We request that the criteria for identifying ONFs in the Auckland Unitary Plan be included in the Waikato District Scheme: Assessment criteria for identifying ONFs (a) the extent to which the landform, feature or geological site contributes to the understanding of the geology or evolution of the biota in the region, New Zealand or the earth; (b) the rarity or unusual nature of the site or feature; (c) the extent to which the feature is an outstanding representative example of the diversity of district's natural landforms and geological features; (d) the extent to which the landform, geological feature or site is part of a recognizable group of features (e.g. caves and karst group: South Auckland volcanoes group); (e) the extent to which the landform or geological feature contributes to the aesthetic value or visual legibility of the wider landscape; (f) the extent of community association with, or public appreciation of, the values of the feature or site; (g) the potential value of the feature or site for public education; (h) the potential value of the feature or site to provide additional understanding of the geological or biotic history; (i) the state of preservation of the feature or site; (j) the extent to which a feature or site is associated with an historically important natural event, geologically related industry, or individual involved in earth science research; (k) the importance of the feature or site to Mana Whenua.	Reject	5.1
68.2	William Smeed	Oppose	Delete the overlays placed over the island in the Waikato River, such as the Significant Amenity Landscape or the Significant Natural Area.	The Significant Amenity Landscape and the Significant Natural Area overlays affect the use of the island so that it cannot be used for any productive activities, including the use or development of the property. If the island is that significant, then Council needs to consider either paying significant compensation for the loss of use of the land or purchase the property.	Reject	15.1 16.1
104.4	Tim Newton	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.2.3.4 P1(a)(ii) Earthworks - within	The restrictions on all categories of landscape or	Reject	7.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			Landscape and Natural Character Areas, to allow 1,000m2 area and 500m2 volume for all categories of landscape or natural character areas.	natural character areas other than Hill Country are unrealistic and will unreasonably restrict ordinary farm management activities.		
FS1007.2	Phillip John Swann	Support	Null		Reject	7.1
235.1	Phyllis Luders on behalf of P.M. Luders Family Trust	Oppose	Delete the Significant Amenity Landscape on the planning maps from the property at 758 Mangapiko Valley Road, Ohinewai.	For the vast majority of the farm, Rule 22.2.3.4 is far too restrictive. As there are more than 1000m of tracks in one paddock (bush paddock), Rule 22.2.3.4 would prevent maintaining tracks to a safe standard.	Accept in part	15.1 16.1
FS1207.1	Ohinewai Area Committee	Support	Seek that the whole of the submission be allowed.	There are a number of properties that came up in searching the council submission database, using the term 'Ohinewai.' These properties are on the Ohinewai RD run. They are not technically within the OAC zone, but one is right on the border, and another very close to the border. However, upon examining this issue, it would appear that an examination of Google satellite imagery (or other similar images) has been done and it was determined that any land that has tree cover, that is not plantation or associated with gardens, is a Significant Natural Area (SNA) as there is an overwhelming correlation between the satellite imagery and these areas. It does not appear that anyone from WDC has visited the site. This is shown well illustrated in that the area between the river edge, and the stop bank through the Ohinewai area has been designated a SNA. Many residents back onto this area, and ask any one of them about what is there, and they would answer it is overrun with willow, alder and a mixture of invasive weeds. How this could be considered a SNA does not make sense. It would also appear that other farmers in surrounding district have also had SNA areas designated, where they are in fact 'waste' lands and of no significant value what so ever. It appears that the blunt tool of Google has been used, rather than a consultation with the people neighbouring/owning this land to find out what exactly occurs here and to see if there is any significant value. Thus we fully support the above submission to have SNA removed.	Accept in part	15.1 16.1
FS1145.10	Ohinewai Area Committee	Support	There are a number of properties that came up in searching the council submission database, using the term 'Ohinewai'. These properties are on the Ohinewai RD run. They are not technically within the OAC zone, but one is right on the border, and		Accept in part	15.1 16.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p>another very close to the border. However, upon examining this issue, it would appear that an examination of google satellite imagery (or other similar images) has been done and it was determined that any land that has tree cover, that is not plantation or associated with gardens, is a Significant Natural Area (SNA) as there is an overwhelming correlation between the satellite imagery and these areas. It does not appear that anyone from WDC has visited the site. This is shown well illustrated in that the area between the river edge, and the stop bank through the Ohinewai area has been designated a SNA. Many residents back onto this area, and ask any one of them about what is there, and they would answer it is overrun with willow, alder and a mixture of invasive weeds. How this could be considered a SNA does not make sense. It would also appear that other farmers in surrounding district have also had SNA areas designated, where they are in fact 'waste' lands and of no significant value what so ever. It appears that the blunt tool of Google has been used, rather than a consultation with the people neighbouring/owning this land to find out what exactly occurs here and to see if there is any significant value. Thus we fully support the above submission to have SNA removed.</p>			
257.1	Stuart Chisnall on behalf of Estate of Alwynne McDonald Chisnall	Oppose	Delete the Significant Amenity Landscape from 275 Parker Lane, Buckland.	The site is rough pasture and has no significant landscape features. The site does not meet the criteria for Significant Amenity Landscape. The proposed Significant Amenity Landscape rules are unreasonable and restrict maintenance of significant drains which are legally required to be maintained via a caveat with the Waikato Regional Council.	Accept in part	15.1 16.1
257.2	Stuart Chisnall on behalf of Estate of Alwynne McDonald Chisnall	Oppose	Delete Rule 22.2.3.4 Earthworks - within Landscape and Natural Character Areas. OR Amend Rule 22.2.3.4 PI Earthworks - within Landscape and Natural Character Areas to change the area and volume of earthworks for Significant Amenity Landscapes.	The rule will unreasonably limit ability to maintain significant drains, specifically for drains required to be maintained under a caveat to the Waikato Regional Council.	Accept in part	7.1
268.2	Warwick Cheyne	Oppose	Delete Rule 22.2.3.4 Earthworks- within Landscape and Natural Character Areas.	A limit of 1000m2 has been arbitrarily assigned for earthworks in a Hill Country Significant Amenity Landscape. This limit will be problematic for track maintenance where large areas of the farm (60%) are proposed as a Significant Amenity Landscape. Inability to maintain tracks is a health and safety issue. Rules render land	Reject	7.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				incapable of reasonable use.		
268.5	Warwick Cheyne	Oppose	Delete the Significant Amenity Landscape from property number 1003679. The submitter suggested leasing the amenity landscapes.	No wish to have this designation on the property. Leasing the amenity landscapes would stop them from changing and help protect them. The rules are naïve and ill-informed.	Accept in part	15.1 16.1
273.3	Russell Luders	Oppose	No specific decision sought, but submission opposes the limits on volume, area and cut of earthworks in Rule 22.2.3.4 PI (a) Earthworks within landscape or Natural Character Areas.	Regular maintenance of tracks is essential. Provisions must be allowed for earthworks for maintaining existing farm infrastructure.	Accept in part	7.1
278.1	Simpson Trevor for Simpsons Farms Ltd	Oppose	Delete the Outstanding Natural Features on the properties owned by Simpson Farms Ltd.	Object to the application of the Outstanding Natural Feature without direct consultation and prior knowledge of the submitter	Reject	15.1 16.1
301.3	Lizbeth Hughes	Oppose	Delete the Significant Amenity Landscape from the property at 17 Calvert Road, Raglan.	Unlike other properties that can be viewed in the Coastal Marine area, the property at 17 Calvert Road, and any activities on it, are less visible.	Reject	16.1
FS1276.4	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Oppose	WED seeks that the whole the submission be disallowed.	This area is important in the visual and natural linkage of Karioi to the sea.	Accept	16.1
328.4	Paula Dudley	Support	Retain Section 3.4 Significant Amenity Landscapes.	No reasons provided.	Accept	5.2
368.3	Ian McAlley	Neutral/Amend	Amend Section 3.3 Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes, to ensure that limitations on development only apply to Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes that are specifically identified in the District Plan.	Policy 3.3.3 refers to 'features' without a capital 'F'. If there are to be limitations with respect to Outstanding Natural Features these must only be with regard to those 'Features' specifically identified in the District Plan. Unclear referencing of Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes creates uncertainty in terms of being able to effectively assess the issues associated with a particular project. Clarity is required to ensure that relevant objectives and policies of the District Plan can be administered with both efficiency and certainty.	Reject	5.1
FS1386.558	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is	Accept	5.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
FS1345.111	Genesis Energy Limited	Support	Accept in part.	For the reasons presented in the submission and subject to the exact nature of the amendments.	Reject	5.1
368.4	Ian McAlley	Neutral/Amend	Amend Objective 3.4.1(a) Significant Amenity Landscapes, to clearly identify that the objective only relates to specifically identified Significant Amenity Landscapes.	Unclear referencing of Significant Amenity Landscapes creates uncertainty in terms of being able to effectively assess the issues associated with a particular project. Certainty is required to enable appropriate planning to occur, both for Council and for private landowners. Clarity is required to ensure that relevant objectives and policies of the District Plan can be administered with both efficiency and certainty.	Reject	5.2
FS1345.112	Genesis Energy Limited	Support	Accept in part.	For the reasons presented in the submission and subject to the exact nature of the amendments.	Accept	5.2
FS1386.559	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	5.2
368.5	Ian McAlley	Neutral/Amend	Amend Section 3.5 Natural Character, to ensure that any limitations to development are only for those areas specifically identified in the District Plan as having High and Outstanding Natural Character.	Unclear referencing of Natural Character creates uncertainty in terms of being able to effectively assess the issues associated with a particular project. Certainty is required to enable appropriate planning to occur, both for Council and for private landowners. Clarity is required to ensure that relevant objectives and policies of the District Plan can be administered with both efficiency and certainty.	Reject	5.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
395.1	Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment for New Zealand Petroleum and Minerals	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 3.3.3 (a) (iv) Protection from inappropriate subdivision, use and development as follows (or similar wording): (iv) Avoiding, <u>remedying, mitigating, offsetting or compensating</u> the adverse effects of extractive industries and earthworks. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential or similar amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in submission.	NZPM recognises that Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes are valued areas for a range of reasons and agrees that the attributes of these areas should be protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development. NZPM does not oppose a more stringent management regime however a requirement to avoid absolutely all adverse effects of extractive industries effectively equates to a prohibition of mining activities in these areas. A requirement to avoid, remedy and mitigate adverse effects is consistent with Part 2 of the RMA whilst ensuring inappropriate mining activities are avoided in Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes. Offsetting and compensation is consistent with 2017 amendments to the RMA which inserted section 104(ab). Relief sought is consistent with mitigation hierarchy promoted by the Business and Biodiversity Offsets Programme. Amendment will ensure Policy 3.3.3 is better aligned with Objective 5.4.1 and assist therefore in plan integration.	Reject	5.1
FSI 198.19	<i>Bathurst Resources Limited and BT Mining Limited</i>	Support	<i>The submission point be allowed in full.</i>	<i>Adverse effects of mining activities should be able to be addressed through avoidance, mitigation, remediation, offsetting and environmental compensation.</i>	Reject	5.1
FSI 334.33	<i>Fulton Hogan Limited</i>	Support	<i>Allow submission point.</i>	<i>Fulton Hogan supports the recognition of ONFL but seeks removal of the corresponding overlays which include their Waingarō quarry. Despite this, it is appropriate that when considering adverse effects, that this includes the potential to remedy, mitigate, offset or compensate for such effects.</i>	Reject	5.1
FSI 377.83	<i>Havelock Village Limited</i>	Support	<i>Support.</i>	<i>HVL supports amendments to provide greater flexibility in addressing the potential effects arising from earthworks. In addition, as an alternative to residential zoning, HVL seeks that land it controls be rezoned as Aggregate Extraction Zone. HVL supports amendments that provide greater flexibility for extractive industries.</i>	Reject	5.1
443.1	Graham Wallace Ray	Neutral/Amend	Amend the planning map by reducing the extent of the Significant Amenity Landscape on the property at 286D Newell Road, Tamahere so that this annotation only	The notified Significant Amenity Landscape affecting this property includes an area now cleared of gorse and replanted with other	Reject	15.1 16.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			applies to the area within the riparian setback from the river.	vegetation including flax, griselinia, red robin and cabbage trees as well as lawn and paddock areas which are kept tidy, maintained and free of weeds. These areas do not comprise a significant landscape.		
471.7	Andrew Wood for CKL	Oppose	Delete several terms such as "Outstanding Natural Character Area" and "High Natural Character Area" from Rule 22.3.3 Buildings and structures in Landscape and Natural Character Areas OR Add definitions for areas such as Outstanding Natural Character Area and High Natural Character Area to Chapter 13 Definitions. AND Any consequential amendments necessary.	There are no definitions for several of the areas in this rule.	Accept in part	10.1
481.6	Bruce and Kirstie Hill for Culverden Farm	Neutral/Amend	Delete the limits on volume, area and cuts in Rule 22.2.3.4 PI Earthworks within Landscape and Natural Character Areas, for the purposes of maintaining existing farming infrastructure. AND Amend Rule 22.2.3.4 PI Earthworks within Landscape and Natural Character Areas to permit earthworks for new infrastructure within these areas such as fencing, tracks and drains.	Regular and complete maintenance of tracks is essential to meet health and safety requirements.	Accept in part	7.1
482.1	Kirstie Hill on behalf of Hill Country Farmers Group	Neutral/Amend	Delete the limits on volume, area and cuts in Rule 22.2.3.4 PI Earthworks within Landscape and Natural Character Areas, for the purpose of maintaining existing farming infrastructure. AND Amend Rule 22.2.3.4 PI Earthworks within Landscape and Natural Character Areas to permit earthworks, for new infrastructure such as fencing, tracks and drains.	Regular and complete maintenance of tracks is essential to meet health and safety requirements.	Accept in part	7.1
493.5	Jackie Colliar	Neutral/Amend	Amend the Proposed District Plan and maps to include the Waikato River in its entirety as both an Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape.	Submission does not support the assessment of and non-inclusion of the Waikato River as an Outstanding Natural Feature and/or Landscape in its entirety. The submitter believes that the Waikato River must be viewed holistically and therefore do not believe that parts of the Waikato River can be cut into sections. The assessment of the Waikato River as Outstanding Natural Feature and Landscape is both a historic and	Accept in part	13.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				contemporary issue. Beyond the rich history of the Waikato River pre and post European settlement, a variety a legislative and policy directions have been developed; that support the identification of the Waikato River as an Outstanding Natural Feature. The Proposed Plan and maps provide for the Waikato River as an Outstanding Natural Feature, only from the river delta to inside the river mouth. Submitter considers the Waikato River is an Outstanding Natural Feature in its entirety and the reasons for it not attaining regional significance was based on interpretation and a lack of work on behalf of those researching the cultural significance of the river.		
FS1345.135	Genesis Energy Limited	Oppose	Reject submission point.	The implications of identifying the entire Waikato River as an ONF and ONL have not been fully assessed and there may be significant unintended consequences of identifying the entire river as an ONL and ONF.	Accept in part	13.1
FS1139.106	Turangawaewae Trust Board	Support	Null	Support the proposed amendment.	Accept in part	13.1
FS1108.118	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)	Support	Null	Support the proposed amendment.	Accept in part	13.1
FS1035.58	Pareoranga Te Kata	Support	Agree and support the whole submission.	• Engage with Waikato Tainui and mana whenua to ensure that the Tainui Environmental Plan Tai Tunu, Tai Pari, Tai Ao and marae environmental plans have been included in the Waikato District Plan.	Accept in part	13.1
FS1223.173	Mercury NZ Limited	Oppose	Mercury sees that the submission point is disallowed.	Mercury has an interest in the submission points listed in paragraphs 11.1 and 11.2 above. Mercury supports the protection of outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes in the context of section 6(b) of the RMA, where there has been a robust expert assessment undertaken to describe the values supporting an assessment of what is outstanding. The Waikato RPS Table 12.2 sets out factors that District Councils are to consider when undertaking such an assessment. Mercury considers that such a robust assessment has not been undertaken as part of the preparation of the PWDP.	Accept in part	13.1
493.6	Jackie Colliar	Neutral/Amend	Amend the Proposed District Plan to include a Waikato River Corridor Zone to recognise the special status and	The Waikato River must be viewed holistically and therefore parts of the Waikato River can not be	Reject	13.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			importance of the Waikato River.	cut into sections.		
FS1345.136	Genesis Energy Limited	Oppose	Reject submission point.	There is no clarity in the submission as to what the Waikato River Corridor Zone would provide for (i.e. no objective, policy or rule framework suggested).	Accept	13.1
FS1035.59	Pareoranga Te Kata	Support	Agree and support the whole submission.	• Engage with Waikato Tainui and mana whenua to ensure that the Tainui Environmental Plan Tai Tunu, Tai Pari, Tai Ao and marae environmental plans have been included in the Waikato District Plan.	Reject	13.1
494.3	Derek Tate on behalf of D & J Tate	Oppose	Delete the Significant Amenity Landscape from the property at 185B Hakarimata Road, Ngaruawahia.	This is a very small area of land that is separated from the River Bank by Hakarimata Road. This area on the submitter's property is flat, in pasture and includes a house.	Accept	15.1 16.1
494.5	Derek Tate on behalf of D & J Tate	Oppose	Delete the Outstanding Natural Feature from the property at 185B Hakarimata Road, Ngaruawahia.	The ONF has been arbitrarily placed on the property without any due diligence as to what is around it. i.e grass, pine forest. There is already policy in place to preserve/protect this area, re 60m line. The ONF also restricts access within the property for future foresting of the pine forest. The ONF is changing this property into a reserve for the public with no compensation for the landowner.	Accept in part	11.1
495.2	Norris Peart	Oppose	Amend the boundary of the Natural Character overlay at 274 Okete Road, Raglan so that the southern boundary is aligned with the existing fence put in place over 40 years ago in consultation with Council to protect these areas, including Maaori Site of Significance R14/51.	The mapped area of the Natural Character does not align with the area historically and currently protected by the existing landowners, whose family has farmed there since 1910. The existing protected area was put in place over 40 years ago in consultation with Council. The proposed area has large open spaces of grazing land.	Reject	14.1
506.1	Dean Hansen for Hansens Farms Ltd	Oppose	Clarify why an area of 83 Paulsen Road, Waerenga is identified as a Significant Amenity Landscape; AND Amend the District Plan to provide for track maintenance in the Significant Amenity Landscape.	The submitter has always wanted to build a small house in the vicinity of the Significant Amenity Landscape. Have camped up there in a tent. Need to continue maintaining the existing track as it is used for a community fundraising event every year. Too dangerous to fence, if fenced weeds and scrubs would take over and change the area for the worse. Questions the value of Significance Amenity Landscape to anyone other than the landowners and visitors.	Accept in part	15.1 16.1
510.2	Bob Carter	Oppose	Amend District Plan to detail all impacts of the Coastal Environment overlay.	It is not clear what impact the Coastal Environment overlay has on a property.	Reject	17.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1381.2	Counties Power Limited	Support	Support.	CPL seeks relief in the form of a full description of the impact of the proposed Coastal Environment overlay on land within the Waikato District.	Reject	17.1
510.3	Bob Carter	Oppose	Amend District Plan to clarify what impact Significant Amenity Landscapes has on a property.	It is not clear what impact a Significant Amenity Landscape has on a property.	Accept	15.1 16.1
510.5	Bob Carter	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.23.4 Earthworks - within landscape and natural character areas, by swapping around the area and volume figures of 50m ² and 250m ³ .	These limits would be impossible if complying with batter rules. Probably a typo. Area should always be no less than volume.	Reject	7.1
553.6	Malibu Hamilton	Neutral/Amend	Add a new clause (iv) to Policy 3.3.2 Recognising values and qualities, as follows: <u>...(iv) The Whaanga Coastline</u>	Nationally significant surf breaks form a unique set of coastal reserve area that are comprised of volcanic boulders approximately 6m in depth. The characteristics on the Whaanga coast create some of the best surf breaks in Aotearoa. The Whaanga Coast surf breaks are recognised in the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2012 as being Nationally Significant along with being world renowned. NZCPS Policy 13(2)(c) states: natural landforms such as headlands, peninsulas, cliffs, dunes, wetlands, reefs, freshwater springs and surf breaks and Policy 15 seeks protection of those features and landscapes. Those natural features form part of the Coastal Marine Area that District Council has jurisdiction of to mean high water mark.	Reject	5.1
574.6	TaTa Valley Limited	Oppose	Delete the Significant Amenity Landscape from the property at 242 Bluff Road, Pokeno. AND Any consequential amendments and other relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	The area of the Significant Amenity Landscape on the submitter's land appears to be a rollover of the previous District Plan notation with no ground truthing undertaken. An expert assessment has been prepared by Rob Pryor, Landscape Architect (LA4 Landscape Architects) which concludes that attributes onsite are not aligned to those described in the study and the Significant Amenity Landscape should be removed from the site (attached as Appendix C to the submission). The proposed Resort Zone provisions include amenity values as matters of discretion for a number of activities and proposed Objective 29.1.2 and associated policies includes consideration of amenity effects (these are detailed in Appendix A to the submission).	Accept in part	15.1 16.1
FS1303.48	Charlie Harris	Support	I also support the original submission by Ta Ta Valley Limited in its entirety.	Ta Ta Valley Limited controls land in southern Pokeno at 242 Bluff Road, Pokeno. TaTa Valley's submission	Accept in part	15.1 16.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>is to amend the plan to enable the development of its site into a major tourism destination, known as the "Ta Ta Valley Resort". I Support the improved tourism offerings that this will provide for the area, showcase New Zealand rural character and significantly enrich the region socially and economically.</i>		
FS1369.12	Ngati Tamaoho Trust	Oppose	Null	Oppose the request to delete the Significant Amenity Landscape.	Accept in part	15.1 16.1
FS1301.48	New Zealand Health Food Park Limited	Support	Support the submission in its entirety.	TaTa Valley Limited controls land in southern Pokeno at 242 Bluff Road, Pokeno. TaTa Valley's submission is to amend the plan to enable the development of its site into a major tourism destination, known as the "TaTa Valley Resort." Health Food Park supports the improved tourism offerings that this will provide for the area, This is turn brings more consumers to the area, showcase New Zealand's rural character and significantly enrich the region socially and economically.	Accept in part	15.1 16.1
FS1090.9	Jenny Forsyth	Oppose	<i>I oppose the submission to remove the significant amenity landscape designation from this area on the basis of one report commissioned by an interested party. This is an SAL within the Waikato River catchment and should be preserved and protected as intended by its designation.</i>	<i>I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed. It is widely accepted that interference with significant natural areas causes adverse ecological effects.</i>	Accept in part	15.1 16.1
FS1108.85	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)	Oppose	Null	Inappropriate amendment.	Accept in part	15.1 16.1
FS1139.76	Turangawaewae Trust Board	Oppose	Null	Inappropriate amendment.	Accept in part	15.1 16.1
FS1377.140	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	As outlined in its original submission, HVL seeks the deletion of this SAL from the planning maps.	Accept in part	15.1 16.1
575.3	Fulton Hogan Limited	Neutral/Amend	Retain Objective 3.3.1 Outstanding natural features and landscapes, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Objective 3.3.1 - Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes, as follows (or words to similar effect): (a) Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes and their attributes are recognised and protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development <u>excluding any legally established mineral or aggregate extraction activities.</u> AND	Fulton Hogan supports the objective to recognise and protect ONFAL and SAL in the district as they may make up character which Waikato District is known for. Seek amendments as the proposed district plan includes Outstanding Natural Features, Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Significant Amenity Landscapes over existing lawfully established quarries which limits the ability for expansion of these quarries, which will hinder the financial prosperity of the same. This could cause social and economic harm to the company and community. The proposed amendment is	Reject	5.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential and additional amendments as necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	to ensure that these are sufficiently safeguarded. This is also in line with the RPS, which provides specific protection to mineral extraction activities.		
FS1332.24	Winstone Aggregates	Support	Support.	The submission point reflects the matters that affect the aggregate industry as a whole.	Reject	5.1
575.4	Fulton Hogan Limited	Support	Retain Objective 3.4.1, provided that the Significant Natural Areas, Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes are removed as sought elsewhere in the submission.	Fulton Hogan supports the objective to recognise and protect SAL in the district as they make up character which Waikato District is known for. Seek amendments as the proposed district plan includes Outstanding Natural Features, Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Significant Amenity Landscapes over existing lawfully established quarries which limits the ability for expansion of these quarries, which will hinder the financial prosperity of the same. This could cause social and economic harm to the company and community.	Accept	5.2
576.9	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	Support	Retain Policy 3.5.4 Protecting the natural character of wetlands, and lakes and rivers and their margins, as notified.	The submitter supports reference within the policy to "inappropriate" as such reference is consistent with Section 6(a) of the RMA, Waikato RPS Objectives 3.12 and 3.22 and also recognises that not all development is to be avoided, rather the emphasis is on that which is inappropriate. Clause (ii) is also supported in that it requires to 'minimise, to the extent practicable', thereby recognising it is not always practicable to minimise adverse effects.	Accept in part	5.3
585.3	Lucy Roberts for Department of Conservation	Oppose	Amend Objective 3.5.1 Natural Character as follows: (a) The high and Outstanding Natural Character of the coastal environment...	Section 6(a) of the RMA and Policy 13 of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement requires consideration of all natural character in the coastal environment.	Reject	5.3
585.4	Lucy Roberts for Department of Conservation	Oppose	Amend Policy 3.5.3(a)(iv) Protecting the natural character qualities of the coastal environment, as follows: (a) Protect the qualities of outstanding and high natural character areas in the coastal environment from inappropriate subdivision, use and development by: ... (iv) avoiding activities that damage the stability of functioning identified coastal dune systems;	Part of the functioning of coastal dune systems involves a level of instability and this should be reflected in the policy. All dune systems should be covered and not just those identified, to ensure protection for any which may have been overlooked during the mapping process.	Accept	5.3
623.2	Paul Hoogeveen	Oppose	Delete the Outstanding Natural Feature from the property at 156 Paddy Road, Te Kauwhata.	The Outstanding Natural Feature is separate from the main wetland by the railway corridor and is not part of the wetland in a practical sense.	Reject	11.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
640.1	Timothy Bodle	Oppose	Amend the boundary of the Significant Amenity Landscape area on the property at 316 Hooker Road, Tamahere (Property No. 1008619) to align with the Significant Natural Area (i.e. from river to bush line, but not including the farm/pasture land); or any other relief which would address the reasons for this submission.	Do not oppose identification of Significant Natural Area. Significant Amenity Landscape is now over pasture/farmland which we do not consider an Significant Amenity Landscape. Area has been increased to include farmland, which does not seem appropriate. The submitter has not been provided sufficient information to confirm the Significant Amenity Landscape classification. New overlay will trigger requirement for resource consent in certain circumstances in an area with an 'inappropriate' Significant Amenity Landscape site. Does not achieve the purpose of RMA.	Reject	15.1 16.1
642.5	Waikato River Authority	Neutral/Amend	Amend the Proposed District Plan, including maps, to include the Waikato River in its entirety as both an Outstanding Natural Feature and an Outstanding Natural Landscape.	The Authority supports the identification of areas of high and outstanding natural character and outstanding natural features and landscapes. To achieve the objectives of the Vision and Strategy, the Waikato River must be included as an Outstanding Natural Feature in its entirety and should under no circumstance be considered in parts or sections. Recognition of the Waikato River acknowledges the significant role and contribution that the river has provided and sacrificed to the wellbeing of the nation, region and district. The Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River is the primary direction setting document for the Waikato River and all it embraces. The Waikato District Council is responsible for the largest portion of the Waikato River, by a single territorial authority in length and area. It would be remiss of the Council to not take this opportunity to further acknowledge the Waikato River as a primary feature that requires great protection and restoration. National recognition of the Waikato River, and legislative weighting justifies the rivers recognition as an Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape.	Accept in part	13.1
FS1037.5	Waikato River Authority	Support	Seeks that the whole of the submission be allowed.	Aligns to Waikato River Authority's Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River (Te Ture Waimana o Te Awa o Waikato) statutory obligations to the Vision and strategy. Recommendation to Chapter 13:1, 11 are achieved that the entirety of the submission receive full support in the restoration of the river.	Accept in part	13.1
FS1108.104	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato	Support	Null	General support for the amendment.	Accept in part	13.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
	Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)					
FS1035.49	Pareoranga Te Kata	Support	Highly support. The entirety of the submission should be allowed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aligns to Waikato River Vision and Strategy (Te Whaimana o te Awa o Waikato). Aligns to statutory Vision and Strategy. 	Accept in part	13.1
FS1139.91	Turangawaewae Trust Board	Support	Null	General support for the amendment.	Accept in part	13.1
FS1340.102	TaTa Valley Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	The submitter considers this relief to be unnecessary given the recognition of the Waikato River under the Vision and Strategy.	Accept in part	13.1
FS1223.169	Mercury NZ Limited	Oppose	Mercury seeks that the submission point is disallowed.	Mercury has an interest in the submission points listed in paragraphs 11.1 and 11.2 above. Mercury supports the protection of outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes in the context of section 6(b) of the RMA, where there has been a robust expert assessment undertaken to describe the values supporting an assessment of what is outstanding. The Waikato RPS Table 12.2 sets out factors that District Councils are to consider when undertaking such an assessment. Mercury considers that such a robust assessment has not been undertaken as part of the preparation of the PWDP.	Accept in part	13.1
FS1345.97	Genesis Energy Limited	Oppose	Reject submission point.	The implications of identifying the entire Waikato River as an ONF and ONL have not been fully assessed and there may be significant unintended consequences of identifying the entire river as an ONL and ONF.	Accept in part	13.1
642.7	Waikato River Authority	Support	Retain the identification of areas of High and Outstanding Natural Character.	The identification of High and Outstanding Natural Character areas supports the Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River.	Accept in part	14.1
FS1223.170	Mercury NZ Limited	Oppose	Mercury seeks that the submission point is disallowed.	Mercury has an interest in the submission points listed in paragraph 11.1 and 11.2 above. Mercury supports the protection of outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes in the context of section 6(b) of the RMA, where there has been a robust expert assessment undertaken to describe the values supporting an assessment of what is outstanding. The Waikato RPS Table 12.2 sets out factors that District Councils are to consider when undertaking such an assessment. Mercury considers that such a robust assessment has not been undertaken as part of the preparation of the PWDP.	Accept in part	14.1
FS1037.7	Waikato River Authority	Support	Seeks that the whole of the submission be allowed.	Aligns to Waikato River Authority's Vision and Strategy	Accept in part	14.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				for the Waikato River (Te Ture Waimana o Te Awa o Waikato) statutory obligations to the Vision and strategy. Recommendation to Chapter 13:1, 11 are achieved that the entirety of the submission receive full support in the restoration of the river.		
FS1108.106	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)	Support	Null	General support for the amendment.	Accept in part	14.1
FS1035.51	Pareoranga Te Kata	Support	Highly support. The entirety of the submission should be allowed.	• Aligns to Waikato River Vision and Strategy (Te Whaimana o te Awa o Waikato). • Aligns to statutory Vision and Strategy.	Accept in part	14.1
FS1139.93	Turangawaewae Trust Board	Support	Null	General support for the amendment.	Accept in part	14.1
642.8	Waikato River Authority	Support	Retain the identification of Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes.	The identification of Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes will assist in the achieving the objectives of the Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River.	Accept in part	11.1 12.1
FS1108.107	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)	Support	Null	General support for the amendment.	Accept in part	11.1 12.1
FS1035.52	Pareoranga Te Kata	Support	Highly support. The entirety of the submission should be allowed.	• Aligns to Waikato River Vision and Strategy (Te Whaimana o te Awa o Waikato). • Aligns to statutory Vision and Strategy.	Accept in part	11.1 12.1
FS1037.8	Waikato River Authority	Support	Seeks that the whole of the submission be allowed.	Aligns to Waikato River Authority's Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River (Te Ture Waimana o Te Awa o Waikato) statutory obligations to the Vision and strategy. Recommendation to Chapter 13:1, 11 are achieved that the entirety of the submission receive full support in the restoration of the river.	Accept in part	11.1 12.1
FS1139.94	Turangawaewae Trust Board	Support	Null	General support for the amendment.	Accept in part	11.1 12.1
FS1223.171	Mercury NZ Limited	Oppose	Mercury seek that the submission point is disallowed.	Mercury has an interest in the submission points listed in paragraphs 11.1 and 11.2 above. Mercury supports the protection of outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes in the context of section 6(b) of the RMA, where there has been a robust expert assessment undertaken to describe the values supporting an assessment of what is outstanding. The Waikato RPS Table 12.2 sets out factors that District Councils are to consider when undertaking such an assessment. Mercury considers that such a robust assessment has not been	Accept in part	11.1 12.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>undertaken as part of the preparation of the PWDP.</i>		
669.2	Bernard Brown	Oppose	No specific decision sought, but submission objects to the Amenity Landscape overlay added to property number 1013511 (16 Whaanga Road, Whale Bay, Raglan).	Infringing on individual property rights.	Reject	15.1 16.1
FS1040.2	Bernard Brown Family Trust	Support	Seek that the whole of the submission be allowed.	<i>In our opinion, a review of the Significant Amenity Landscape (SAL) values is required to fully appreciate both public and local residents perceptions of the greater Raglan Coastal Landscape as illustrated in the attached Appendix 3- Map 23 of the PDP- Raglan Coast. The importance of the visual interplay between several landscape features needs to be registered regardless of where the viewpoint may be. In this respect, local residents values deserve equity with the perceived public values.</i>	Reject	15.1 16.1
FS1276.145	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Oppose	WED seeks that the whole submission point be disallowed.	All planning can be said to infringe property rights. Property rights exist within a legal, environmental and social context as set out in the reasons for the RMA.	Accept	15.1 16.1
669.5	Bernard Brown	Oppose	Delete the Outstanding Natural Landscape from the property located at 759 Wainui Road, Raglan (Property Number 1013542).	Complex overlay designations infringe on individual property rights. Request removal.	Accept	12.1
FS1040.5	Bernard Brown Family Trust	Support	Seek that the whole submission be allowed.	<i>Support this submission point for the following reasons: The property is elevated at approximately 50m above sea level and has commanding views eastward and northward across Manu Bay toward the Te Akau Coast and the Raglan Harbour entrance. The visual interplay of several landscape features is evident extending 40km north towards the Waikato Heads. The landscape context is the Raglan Coastal Landscape which has the following landscape features outlined in the attached Appendix 3: Mount Karioi and Whaanga Coast Ngaranui Beach and the South Headland to the Raglan Harbour North Headland to the Raglan Harbour Coastal Escarpments of the Te Akau Coast In our opinion, the existing natural landscape character attributes of Mount Karioi and the Whaanga Coast have been compromised and potential Papakainga development proposed would further support this claim. In our opinion, the Outstanding Natural Landscape overlay for Mount Karioi is overrated and no way compares to other landscapes such as Fiordland which have nationally significant outstanding natural landscape</i>	Accept	12.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				classifications.		
FS1276.147	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Oppose	WED seeks that the whole submission point be disallowed.	Property rights are subject to the RMA.	Reject	12.1
669.6	Bernard Brown	Oppose	Delete the Significant Amenity Landscapes from the property located at 759 Wainui Road, Raglan (Property Number I013542).	Complex overlay designations infringe on individual property rights. Request removal.	Reject	15.1 16.1
FS1040.6	Bernard Brown Family Trust	Support	Seek that the whole of the submission be allowed.	The property has extensive views northward across the Coastal Marine Area toward the Te Akau Coastal Environment which provides a landscape continuum feature displaying headlands, rugged escarpments and hilly landforms extending to 160m above sea level. The visual interplay between the Whaanga Coast and the Te Akau Coastline is one of the most memorable impressions for both visitor and local residents alike. This view extends for approximately 40km northward toward the Waikato Heads and is commonly referred to by local residents as "Our Remarkables" and "Waikato's Hinterland Playground" (see attached PDP-Planning Map 23- Appendix 4). The landscape contained in the view from Whaanga Coast includes: Ngaranui Beach and the South Headland to the Raglan Harbour, North Headland to the Raglan Harbour, Escarpments along the Te Akau Coast.	Reject	15.1 16.1
FS1276.148	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Oppose	WED seeks that the whole submission point be disallowed.	WED supports all activities that do not comply with the District Plan being publicly notified in order to protect the character of Raglan.	Accept	15.1 16.1
701.2	Steven & Theresa Stark	Oppose	Delete all Outstanding Natural Features from 747 Rutherford Road, Ohinewai.	There were no rural representatives who had input into the production of the "Waikato District Landscape Study" report, or were engaged with, yet over 18000 property owners were affected. This policy encourages the public to regard working productive landscapes on private property as desirable for the community but at the landowner's cost. Local authorities need to realise that "scenic" parts of private land are not conservatories and that public land through the Department of Conservation (DOC) who manages about one-third of New Zealand's land area. It is inappropriate to try and freeze-frame rural farmland. These are working environments and depending on finances, cyclic nature of farming, market signals, etc. The submitter states they may wish to use this land in a different	Reject	11.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>manner in the future. Unnecessarily restricting farming activities especially without giving something in return, does not incentivise one to protect their own property for someone else's enjoyment. This is unreasonable. If permanent protection of a part of private property is deemed of value to the public, the landowner must be compensated either under the Public Works Act or incentivised in some other manner. Boffa Miskell (Waikato District Landscape Study report producer) are trying to use the term 'significant landscape' to assess other second tier landscapes or features. This is not a valid criteria against which to assess outstanding natural features and landscapes under s6(b) of the RMA. Using farmland for farming purposes is an appropriate use of land under the RMA. The policy is similar to the now defunct Ridgeline Policy that WDC had placed on many properties for approximately 20 years without valid criteria to underpin it. The 2 ONF areas on the submitter's property are merely vegetation, well represented in the district and not outstanding at all.</p>		
701.6	Steven & Theresa Stark	Oppose	Delete all objectives, policies, methods and rules relating to Natural Character.	No Significant Natural Area, Outstanding Natural Area, Outstanding Natural Feature or Outstanding Natural Landscape can be accurately placed upon a property without ground-truthing and the consent of the affected landowner. Natural character designations have no standing or requirement to be protected under section 6 (b) of the RMA.	Reject	5.3
701.7	Steven & Theresa Stark	Oppose	<p>Amend Rule 22.2.3.4 Earthworks - Within Landscape and Natural Character Areas, as follows: 22.2.3.4 Earthworks-Within landscape and Natural Character Areas P1 (a) Earthworks are for the maintenance or upgrade of existing tracks, fences or drains within an identified outstanding Natural Landscape Landscape or Natural Character Area and must meet all of the following conditions <u>are permitted.</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Delete Rule 22.2.3.4 P1 (a)(i)-(vii) Earthworks within a Landscape and Natural Character Area;</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Add a new P2 to Rule 22.2.3.4 Earthworks within a</p>	The rules are overly restrictive for larger properties. Due to finances or weather, maintenance requiring earthworks may be delayed. Larger quantities may need to be moved.	Reject	7.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			Landscape and Natural Character Area, as follows: P2 (a) Earthworks within a site must meet all of the following conditions: (i) Does not exceed a volume of more than 1000m ³ and an area of more than 2000m ³ over any single consecutive 12-month period on a property (ii) Does not exceed a volume of more than 3000m ³ and an area of more than 6000m ² over any single consecutive 12-month period on a property ≥40ha AND Delete Rule 22.2.3.4 DI Earthworks - within Landscape and Natural Character Areas.			
701.8	Steven & Theresa Stark	Oppose	Delete all objectives, policies, methods and rules relating to Significant Amenity Landscape.	No Significant Natural Area, Outstanding Natural Feature or Outstanding Natural Landscape designation should be placed on a property without it being ground truthed and without the consent of the affected landowner. Significant Amenity Landscapes are subjective designations that have no standing or requirement to be protected under section 6 (b) of the RMA.	Reject	5.2
704.2	Margaret Millard for The C. Alma Baker Trust	Support	Retain Policy 3.5.3 (a) (viii) Protecting the natural character qualities of the natural environment, recognising historic farming operations that continue today.	Limestone Downs has a history of being farmed for over 100 years and does so in an environmentally sustainable manner but does have challenging environmental issues being on the coast and having a dairy farm in a flood plain.	Accept in part	5.3
704.4	Margaret Millard for The C. Alma Baker Trust	Oppose	No specific decision sought, but the submission opposes the volume limits and time period in Rule 22.2.3.4 Earthworks - within Landscape and Natural Character Areas.	These limits are not practical on a working farm which has a considerable percentage of land identified as Coastal Environment, Natural Character, Significant Amenity Landscapes and/or Significant Natural Area. During extreme weather events or when normal repair and maintenance tasks occur, the cost of obtaining resource consents would be onerous. The requirements of this rule need to be achievable and monitored.	Accept in part	7.1
704.6	Margaret Millard for The C. Alma Baker Trust	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.3.3 Buildings and structures in Landscape and Natural Character Areas, by changing the activity status from discretionary to either restricted discretionary or controlled activity.	It is impractical to run a large farm of approximately 3000ha with a considerable percentage of land identified as Coastal Environment, Natural Character, Significant Amenity Landscape and/or Significant Natural Area.	Reject	8.1
706.4	Francis and Susan Turton	Oppose	No specific decision sought, but the submission opposes Rule 22.2.3.4 PI (a) Earthworks - within Landscape and Natural Character Areas, with respect to the volume, area	These limits will hinder maintenance of existing and new farm infrastructure such as drainage, fencing and tracks.	Accept in part	7.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			and cut limits.			
731.2	Jean Tregidga	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.2.3.4 Earthworks - within Landscape and Natural Character Areas, by permitting the earthworks for the construction of new tracks within Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes.	There is no provision for earthworks required for new track construction. This is unreasonable as the properties owned by this submitter on Lyons Road, Mangatawhiri have no practical access which renders the land useless for practical purposes. This rule does not enable sustainable management as required by the Resource Management Act.	Reject	7.1
FS1180.2	Jean Tregidga	Support	Seek that the whole of the submission be allowed.	<i>These are the only properties in NZ that I am aware of that have been planted and left to mature with Indigenous species. Conservation lands administered by DOC are protected under the Conservation Act and no harvesting is permitted Therefore it leaves a private land owner to supply interested parties with a supply of indigenous timber. My blocks were set up for the long term supply of specialised timber for use in boat building, furniture, poles, farm gates, fence posts/batteries and other small items. Nothing was ever wasted right down to even small branches. The Forest Act recognises the rights of land owners to obtain an economic return from a privately owned asset but also identifies their responsibility to maintain a healthy forest and functioning ecosystem. It aims to achieve an appropriate balance between productive use and maintenance of the forests natural values. Reasons for my support area: In my original submission I asked that if my application under 731-District Plan (Proposed) was accepted. I would not require these other submissions. I ask that they now be accepted as they are all very relevant to development of the properties.</i>	Reject	7.1
760.1	Patrick Day on behalf of P & B Day	Support	Retain Significant Amenity Landscape overlay on the property at 656 Wainui Road, Raglan as notified.	Submitter accepts Significant Amenity Landscape designation. Understand the need to protect the environment. Submitter would like to continue work exterminating pests, fencing bush areas from stock, removing invasive species such as asparagus fern from the bush and selectively felling old Manuka and kanuka from edges of bush. Would like to continue to allow access to the Karioi Project to the land.	Accept	15.1 16.1
774.1	Stuart Cummings for Surrey Chambers	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however the submission opposes the adoption of the identification of landscapes	If this were allowed, it would amount to retrospective imposition of restrictions on	Reject	14.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			and natural character if that means that existing use rights regarding height and boundary are affected.	property rights to the detriment of the previously uninformed owner. For example, if an existing height use is allowed to continue, these cannot logically be any increase in the "lost" amenity value or vision disturbance.		
FS1387.1171	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	14.1
788.1	Susan Hall	Neutral/Amend	Amend the Coastal Environment Overlay to become a conservation area (including Raglan), where all major changes and consents which infringe District Plan rules, or which exceed one storey, are publicly notified.	The Proposed District Plan is hard to understand for the average person. The Raglan Naturally Plan is the 'true voice' of Raglan, and should form the basis of the planning in this area. Section 1.6.1 of the Proposed District Plan currently says "Raglan will retain its seaside village character as it grows, while protecting the harbour." Raglan Naturally has firm regulations around this. Most of the coast is visible from Raglan, is part of its character and should therefore have the same protection, e.g. no apartment style housing and no development of buildings that repeat the same shape and design along the front of a section. Views should be protected, not just from peoples house, but also as people walk around the town. The sea and mountain views are what makes Raglan special, not with the tall buildings.	Reject	17.1
FS1329.15	Koning Family Trust and Martin Koning	Oppose	Oppose. Disallow that part of the submission that seeks to establish compulsory public notification in the Coastal Overlay Area.	The submitter seeks to introduce a compulsory public notification of all development that fails to meet any of the district plan standards or is two storied within the Coastal Overlay. This is opposed for the same reason as the above.	Accept	17.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1276.34	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Support	WED seeks that the whole of the submission point be allowed.	WED supports the Coastal Environment Overlay as a conservation area (including Raglan), where all major changes and consents infringe District Plan rules, or which exceed one storey, are publicly notified. WED also supports the Raglan Naturally Plan forming the basis of the planning in this area. Raglan Naturally is able to apply a finer detail than the DP and that is needed to conserve Raglan's seaside village character. This has been recognised by WDC's Blueprint.	Reject	17.1
FS1276.197	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Support	WED seeks that the whole of the submission point be allowed.	The submission highlights the need for the new District Plan to avoid the planning failures, which approved apartments on the corner of Stuart Street and Wainui Road, Raglan. The failures include devolution of power by council, resulting in the lack of any political or public involvement in making the decision, lack of adequate treatment of storm water from a site immediately adjacent to the coastal management area and a shellfish bed, infringement of daylight protections, parking and setback requirements, location of a road junction with poor sightlines and failure to protect views of a heritage building. It also highlights the need for the District Plan to consider the social and economic value of a development. This development for holiday apartments removes much needed permanent accommodation and will exacerbate seasonal parking, traffic and employment problems. Furthermore, WED supports the 'Raglan Naturally' ethos and notes that the Waikato Blueprint, adopted by council in June 2019, aims to "Provide a high-level 'spatial picture' of how the district could progress over the next 30 years, address the community's social, economic and environmental needs, and respond to its regional context. The Blueprint will provide the Waikato District Council with an effective and legible tool to move from vision to strategy, and from strategy to action by setting out specific, prioritised initiatives at the district and social level." And includes these statements: "WDC should work with the Community Board and Raglan Naturally and Tangata Whenua to define, strengthen and communicate Raglan's special identity." The top priority initiatives for Raglan include: -Building a strong identity for the town, -Supporting Raglan Naturally in their prioritised local initiatives such as local food production, energy self sufficiency, alternatives to weed spraying, GE free approaches and	Reject	17.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				education regarding climate change, - Partnering with Raglan Naturally in respect to planning processes.		
FS1381.6	Counties Power Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	CPL opposes the entire Coastal Environment overlay becoming a conservation area (including Raglan), where all major changes and consents which infringe District Plan rules, of which exceed one storey, are publicly notified. The submitter seeks to introduce a compulsory public notification of all development that fails to meet any of the district plan standards within the Coastal Overlay. This is inefficient and will result in costly consent costs. Not all rules relate to the built form and not all development, two storied or otherwise, will necessarily create adverse environmental effects that warrant public notification. It is considered that it is more efficient to rely on the process embedded within the RMA to determine the appropriate level of notification for any resource consent application.	Accept	17.1
81.25	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend the provisions to ensure that natural character is managed in accordance with Policy 12.2 and Implementation Method 12.2.1 of the WRPS.	The RMA (section 6a) and WRPS (12.2 and 12.2.1) seek to manage natural character in the coastal environment and wetlands, lakes and rivers and their margins. There is policy support for this in Section 3.5 of the Proposed Plan however that does not flow through to other provisions. There has been no assessment of the natural character of wetlands, lakes and rivers and their margins and as a consequence natural character has not been mapped outside of the coastal environment. The Policies in section 3.5 that relate to the wetlands, lakes and rivers and their margins will only come into play for discretionary and non-complying consent applications. As a result there may be permitted, controlled and restricted discretionary activities that are inappropriate to the level of natural character.	Accept in part	5.3
FS1258.2	Meridian Energy Limited	Oppose	Disallow	The submission point does not identify the specific manner in which the proposed District Plan fails to give effect to the RPS policy referred to and does not detail the specific wording amendments requested. In the absence of this detail, it is not possible to determine the specific implications for land in which Meridian may have an interest.	Accept in part	5.3
FS1330.10	Middlemiss Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	Reject Submission	The proposed assessment and mapping exercise has	Accept in part	5.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>the potential to delay the current Proposed Plan and could be included to Stage 2 if required.</i>		
FS1342.48	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow submission point 81.25.	<i>The notified plan includes land use controls that are designed to meet Policy 12.2 and Method 12.2.1 of the WRPS. A more specific planning response may be appropriate after the natural character assessment sought in submission 81.24 has been undertaken.</i>	Accept in part	5.3
81.26	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend provisions throughout the plan that relate to natural character to recognise that a different approach is required to high and outstanding natural character to give effect to Policy 12.2 and Implementation method 12.2.1 of the WRPS.	All the provisions for areas of High and Outstanding Natural Character are the same, no distinction has been made between the two areas in terms of the management approach. As a result the different levels of natural character have not been appropriately recognised and managed. This is inappropriate given that Policy 12.2 and Implementation Method 12.2.1 of the WRPS seek to recognise the different levels of natural character and therefore set out a different management approach for each.	Accept in part	5.3
FS1293.12	Department of Conservation	Support	Seek that the submission point is allowed.	<i>The Director-General agrees that amendments to recognise a different approach to high and outstanding natural character would give effect to Policy 12.2 and Implementation Method 12.2.1 of the WRPS.</i>	Accept in part	5.3
FS1330.11	Middlemiss Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	Reject Submission.	<i>The proposed assessment and mapping exercise has the potential to delay the current Proposed Plan and could be included to Stage 2 if required.</i>	Accept in part	5.3
FS1258.3	Meridian Energy Limited	Oppose	Disallow	<i>The submission point does not detail the specific provisions intended to address the lack of differentiation between areas of 'high' and 'outstanding' natural character. In the absence of this detail, it is not possible to determine the specific implications for land in which Meridian may have an interest.</i>	Accept in part	5.3
827.8	New Zealand Steel Holdings Ltd	Support	Retain the Significant Amenity Landscapes overlay mapping in relation to the Waikato North Head mine site.	There are no significant amenity landscapes identified on the mine site.	Reject Accept	15.1 16.1
827.9	New Zealand Steel Holdings Ltd	Support	Retain the Natural Character overlay mapping in relation to the Waikato North Head mine site.	There are no high or outstanding natural character areas identified on the Waikato North Head site.	TBA	14.1
835.2	Pam Butler on behalf of KiwiRail Holdings Limited (KiwiRail)	Oppose	Delete Outstanding Natural Features overlays from KiwiRail's designations.	The objective of identifying Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes is to ensure that these landscapes and their attributes are recognised and	Reject	11.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development. The benefits of infrastructure are provided irrespective of location. Designated land transport corridors are highly modified areas.		
FS1293.62	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	Outstanding Natural Features are identified as having specific values. This is not influenced by the existence of a designation. The Director-General opposes reviewing the ONF overlays to remove designations. KiwiRail designations can be broad and have a large impact on ONFs.	Accept	11.1
835.3	Pam Butler on behalf of KiwiRail Holdings Limited (KiwiRail)	Neutral/Amend	Delete Outstanding Natural Character overlay from KiwiRail's designations.	The objective of identifying Outstanding Natural Character is to protect the natural character of the coastal environment and waterways from inappropriate subdivision, use and development. The benefits of infrastructure are provided irrespective of location. Designated land transport corridors are generally highly modified areas.	Reject	14.1
FS1293.63	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	Outstanding Natural Character areas are identified as having specific values. This is not influenced by the existence of a designation. The Director-General opposes reviewing the ONC overlays to remove designations. KiwiRail designations can be broad and have a large impact on ONC areas.	Accept	14.1
835.4	Pam Butler on behalf of KiwiRail Holdings Limited (KiwiRail)	Neutral/Amend	Delete Outstanding Natural Landscapes overlays from KiwiRail's designations.	The objective of identifying Outstanding Natural Landscapes is to ensure that these landscapes and their attributes are recognised and protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development. The benefits of infrastructure are provided irrespective of location. Designated land transport corridors are highly modified areas.	Reject	12.1
986.9	Pam Butler on behalf of KiwiRail Holdings Limited (KiwiRail)	Neutral/Amend	Add a new clause (vii) to Policy 3.3.2(b) Recognising values and qualities (or similar amendments to achieve the requested relief): (b)Recognise the attributes of the Waikato River delta and wetlands, Whangamarino Wetland and Lake Whangape identified as Outstanding Natural Features, including: ... (vii) <u>existing infrastructure, including land transport networks</u> AND Any consequential amendments to link and/or accommodate the requested changes.	As a continuous linear network KiwiRail's railway corridor is located within some Outstanding Natural Landscape areas. The policy should include recognition that the location of significant land infrastructure in these areas is an attribute similar to the farming and recreational activities also noted.	Reject	5.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1176.287	Watercare Services Ltd	Support	Null	Watercare supports the recognition of infrastructure in this policy.	Reject	5.1
273.10	Russell Luders	Oppose	No specific decision sought, but submission opposes Significant Amenity Landscapes being identified on private land.	The submitter takes pride in the private bush area which their predecessors chose not to develop. Strongly oppose being dictated and restricted on what can and cannot be done on these areas. These areas in the future could possibly have significant value, however consultation needs to be undertaken prior. The Waikato District Council has not presented a practical plan for the direction of future management of Significant Amenity Landscapes.	Accept in part	15.1 16.1
286.13	Lorraine Dixon for Waikato-Tainui	Support	No specific decision sought but submission supports the identification of areas of high and outstanding natural character and outstanding natural features and landscapes, and the engagement of experts in this field and with mana whenua.	No reason provided.	Accept in part Accept in part Accept	11.1 12.1 14.1
FS1223.176	Mercury NZ Limited	Oppose	Mercury seeks that the submission point is disallowed.	Mercury has an interest in the submission points listed in paragraphs 11.1 and 11.2 above. Mercury supports the protection of outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes in the context of section 6(b) of the RMA, where there has been a robust expert assessment undertaken to describe the values supporting an assessment of what is outstanding. The Waikato RPS Table 12.2 sets out factors that District Councils are to consider when undertaking such an assessment. Mercury considers that such a robust assessment has not been undertaken as part of the preparation of the PWDP.	Accept in part Accept in part Reject	11.1 12.1 14.1
286.14	Lorraine Dixon for Waikato-Tainui	Not Stated	Amend the Proposed District Plan to include the Waikato River in its entirety as both an Outstanding Natural Feature and an Outstanding Natural Landscape AND Amend the Proposed District Plan maps to include the Waikato River in its entirety as both an Outstanding Natural Feature and an Outstanding Natural Landscape.	Waikato-Tainui do not support the assessment of the non-inclusion of the Waikato River as an Outstanding Natural Feature and/or Landscape. Waikato-Tainui do not believe that parts of the Waikato River can be cut into sections and not viewed holistically. The assessment of the Waikato River as an Outstanding Natural Feature and Landscape is both a historic and contemporary issue. A variety of legislative and policy directions have been developed that support the identification of the Waikato River as an Outstanding Natural Feature and Landscape. The Waikato-Tainui Raupatu Claims (Waikato River) Settlement Act 2010 talks of the	Accept in part	13.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>significance and holistic nature of the Waikato River is viewed. The submission quotes Part 2, Settlement redress through legislation (8). This acknowledgement by the Crown, that the Waikato River should be considered in its entirety and not divided, as it has been assessed in the Proposed District Plan, provides what the river settlement legislation was seeking. The Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River was required to be included without amendment in the Waikato Regional Policy Statement. The Regional Policy Statement review assessed the Waikato River as an Outstanding Natural Feature and Landscape. This was removed in the decision's version on the basis that the Waikato River had been modified too significantly, in particular the part of the river flowing through Hamilton City to be deemed an Outstanding Natural Feature or Landscape and that the necessary assessments and understanding of the cultural significance has not been undertaken to support the rivers inclusion. Fast forward to the current situation where Waikato District Council are assessing the river at a more detailed district level, that does not include Hamilton City. In addition Waikato District Council have a greater understanding of the cultural significance of the Waikato River to Waikato-Tainui through the engagement process. The Proposed Plan and maps provide for the Waikato River as an Outstanding Natural Feature, only from the river Delta to inside the river mouth. Waikato-Tainui are of the opinion the Waikato River is an Outstanding Natural Feature in its entirety and the reasons for it not attaining regional significance was based on interpretation and lack of work on behalf of those researching the cultural significance of the river. The Waikato River is recognised by statute and is the subject of a previously unique authority that funds the restoration and protection annually. Alone this legislative weight potentially justifies its status as an Outstanding Natural Feature and Landscape at a district level. Of more importance is the cultural connection that Waikato-Tainui have with the Waikato River. Whilst the landscape assessment attached to the Proposed Plan does</p>		

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				not support the entire river being included, it does as a starting point provide justification as to how the assessment was made (submission refers to the Proposed Plan Appendix 3). The cultural and heritage values do not neatly fit into the specific feature or landscape assessment criteria, however engagement with iwi and understanding the districts identity should have seen the Waikato River included as an Outstanding Natural Feature or Landscape or both. The lines that are blurred on the margins of the river by wetlands, tributaries, islands and river use in general only add to the rivers significance. Because the river does not sit neatly as an Outstanding Natural Feature or Outstanding Natural Landscape, that it should be considered both, and afforded the highest protection rather than defaulting to a partial categorisation that undermines its significance. The assessment criteria used appears to isolate features or places, rather than taking a more holistic approach. If this had been the case Waikato-Tainui assume that the Waikato River would have been deemed Outstanding; both as a landscape and a feature.		
FS1223.177	Mercury NZ Limited	Oppose	Mercury seeks that the submission point is disallowed.	Mercury has an interest in the submission points listed in paragraphs 11.2 and 11.2 above. Mercury supports the protection of outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes in the context of section 6(b) of the RMA, where there has been a robust expert assessment undertaken to describe the values supporting an assessment of what is outstanding. The Waikato RPS Table 12.2 set out factors that District Councils are to consider when undertaking such an assessment. Mercury considers that such a robust assessment has not been undertaken as part of the preparation of the PWDP.	Accept in part	13.1
FS1271.10	Riverdale Group Limited	Oppose	Reject submission.	While it is acknowledged that the river has very significant cultural value to Waikato-Tainui, it has been significantly modified and is not 'natural'. Furthermore, it is not clear as to the extent of any notation and the effects of such a planning provision on private property should the submission be accepted, particularly in the absence of any rigorous assessment supporting such a proposal.	Accept in part	13.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FSI293.18	Department of Conservation	Support	Seek that the submission point is allowed.	The Director-General supports the intent of this submission point and appropriate mapping of the Waikato River as an Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape to afford it adequate protection under the plan.	Accept in part	13.1
FSI340.37	TaTa Valley Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	The submitter considers this relief to be unnecessary given the recognition of the Waikato River under the Vision and Strategy.	Accept in part	13.1
FSI345.124	Genesis Energy Limited	Oppose	Reject submission point.	The implications of identifying the entire Waikato River as an ONF and ONL have not been fully assessed and there may be significant unintended consequences of identifying the entire river as an ONL and ONF.	Accept in part	13.1
286.15	Lorraine Dixon for Waikato-Tainui	Not Stated	Amend the Proposed District Plan after undertaking a natural character assessment for the Waikato River to determine if there are any areas of high or outstanding natural character.	Waikato-Tainui have concerns that no natural character assessment has been undertaken for the Waikato River.	Reject	14.1
FSI340.38	TaTa Valley Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	The submitter considers that delaying hearing submissions on the Proposed Plan is inefficient and will lead to poor economic, environmental and social outcomes for the District. There are pressing environmental issues that need to be managed.	Accept	14.1
FSI333.4	Fonterra Limited	Support	Allow the relief.	Fonterra support assessment of the Waikato River natural and landscape character values prior to any proposals being made to amend the District Plan.	Reject	14.1
FSI293.19	Department of Conservation	Support	Seek that the submission point is allowed.	The Director-General supports the undertaking of a natural character assessment for wetlands, lakes, rivers and their margins to give effect to Section 6(a).	Reject	14.1
FSI035.21	Pareoranga Te Kata	Support	Support the submission in full.	• Council needs to partner with Kaitiaki, mana whenua or review strategies with Waikato Tainui to ensure preservation and restoration of the Waikato River.	Reject	14.1
FSI345.126	Genesis Energy Limited	Support	Accept submission point.	For the reasons set out in the submission.	Reject	14.1
FSI345.125	Genesis Energy Limited	Oppose	Reject submission point.	The implications of identifying the entire Waikato River as an ONF and ONL have not been fully assessed and there may be significant unintended consequences of identifying the entire river as an ONL and ONF.	Accept	14.1
FSI271.11	Riverdale Group Limited	Support	Accept submission.	For the reasons stated in the submission.	Reject	14.1
FSI223.178	Mercury NZ Limited	Oppose	Mercury seeks that the submission point is disallowed.	Mercury has an interest in the submission points listed in paragraphs 11.1 and 11.2 above. Mercury supports	Accept	14.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>the protection of outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes in the context of section 6(b) of the RMA, were there has been a robust expert assessment undertaken to describe the values supporting an assessment of what is outstanding. The Waikato RPS Table 12.2 sets out factors that District Councils are to consider when undertaking such an assessment. Mercury considers that such a robust assessment has not been undertaken as part of the preparation of the PWDP.</i>		
330.84	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 22.2.3.4 Earthworks - Within Landscape and Natural Character Areas.	No reasons provided.	Reject	7.1
367.46	Liam McGrath for Mercer Residents and Ratepayers Committee	Support	Retain Section 3.3 Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	5.1
367.47	Liam McGrath for Mercer Residents and Ratepayers Committee	Support	Retain Section 3.4 Significant Amenity Landscapes.	No reasons provided.	Accept	5.2
367.48	Liam McGrath for Mercer Residents and Ratepayers Committee	Support	Retain Section 3.5 Natural Character.	No reasons provided.	Accept	5.3
405.89	Counties Power Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend the planning maps as the Outstanding Natural Character and High Natural Character do not appear in the drop-down lists on the Planning Maps, as stated in the Definitions section.	No reasons provided.	Accept	18.1
433.40	Mischa Davis for Auckland Waikato Fish and Game Council	Neutral/Amend	Retain Policy 3.3.2 Recognising values and qualities, except for the amendment sought below AND Amend Policy 3.3.2 (b) Recognising values and qualities, as follows: (b) Recognise the attributes of the Waikato River delta and wetlands, Whangamarino Wetland and Lake Whangape identified as Outstanding Natural Features, including: (i) natural geomorphology, and hydrological processes, biodiversity and ecological processes; (ii) significant habitat values; (iii) significant indigenous vegetation; (iv) cultural heritage values associated with these areas; (v) recreational use of these areas including but not limited to walking, fishing, bird watching, game bird hunting and boating; (vi) existing pastoral farming activities on the margins of these areas.	Introductory Paragraph 1.4.3.1 Rural activities refers to hunting and fishing as important rural activities. Therefore, for consistency, this policy should include reference to hunting and fishing as recreational attributes in outstanding natural features and landscapes. It should also ensure that regard is given to the intrinsic values of ecosystems by recognising the significant ecological biodiversity and habitat values in order to promote sustainable management. Pastoral farming activities are often the cause of adverse effects on these areas including through nutrient enrichment of waterways and affecting natural wetland hydrology.	Accept in part	5.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			AND/OR Any alternative relief to address the issues and concerns raised in the submission.			
FS1330.41	Middlemiss Farm Holdings Limited	Support	Accept Submission.	The amendments are appropriate.	Accept in part	5.1
433.41	Mischa Davis for Auckland Waikato Fish and Game Council	Support	Retain Objective 3.5.1 (b) - Natural Character as notified.	This objective supports Method 12.1.1 of the Waikato Regional Policy Statement which requires district plans to identify and provide for the protection of the values and characteristics of outstanding natural features and landscapes from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.	Accept	5.3
433.42	Mischa Davis for Auckland Waikato Fish and Game Council	Neutral/Amend	Retain Policy 3.5.4 Protecting the natural character of wetlands, and lakes and rivers and their margins, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Policy 3.5.4 (a) (iii) Protecting the natural character of wetlands, and lakes and rivers and their margins as follows: (iii) encouraging any new activities to consolidate within, and around, existing developments and or, where the natural character and landscape values have already been compromised, to avoid development sprawling; and AND/OR Any alternative relief to address the issues and concerns raised in the submission.	Whether values have been compromised or not is highly subjective and this proviso should be removed for the policy to be clear, effective and non-contentious.	Reject	5.3
FS1340.66	TaTa Valley Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	The submitter opposes submission point 433.42 in that deleting areas where natural character and landscape values have already been compromised is not an efficient use of the resources.	Accept	5.3
433.53	Mischa Davis for Auckland Waikato Fish and Game Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 22.2.3.4 PI (a) (vii) Earthworks - within Landscape and Natural Character Areas AND Add new note to Rule 22.2.3.4 Earthworks - within Landscape and Natural Character Areas, as follows: <u>Note: Where earthworks are specifically for ecosystem protection, restoration or enhancement (e.g. conservation covenants, works involved with wetland enhancement)</u> then PI does not apply. AND/OR Any alternative relief to address the issues and concerns raised in the submission.	The notified rule is restrictive for most of the maintenance and enhancement activities carried out by Auckland Waikato Fish and Game in wetlands which have been identified as Outstanding Natural Features or Significant Amenity Landscapes. Earthworks for ecosystem protection, restoration or enhancement should therefore be exempt. Furthermore, any change to natural water flows, water bodies or drainage paths is a consideration of Waikato Regional Council and is not a function of a district council.	Reject	7.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1340.71	TaTa Valley Limited	Support	Support.	The submitter supports submission 433.53 as this would enable landowners to carry out ecosystem enhancement, protection and restoration works without the need to obtain a resource consent which can often be a barrier to such works. The rule, as it is currently written, is too restrictive for ecosystem maintenance works within areas identified as either an ONF or a SAL.	Reject	7.1
433.58	Mischa Davis for Auckland Waikato Fish and Game Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.3.3 DI Buildings and structures in Landscape and Natural Character Areas, as follows: (a) Building or structure <u>that is not a maimai</u> located within any: ... AND/OR Any alternative relief to address the issues and concerns raised in the submission.	Supports building restrictions in areas of high natural character. Maimai are controlled by the Building Act 2004 and should be exempt from this rule. Consistency is required with the Waikato Regional Plan which permits maimai subject to them not exceeding an area of 10m ² and a height of 2.5 metres measured from floor level.	Reject	8.1
471.32	Andrew Wood for CKL	Oppose	Add "Outstanding Natural Character Areas" and "High Natural Character Areas" to the planning maps. AND Any consequential amendments necessary.	These terms are used in the Proposed District Plan but they are not identified on the planning maps.	Accept	18.1
FS1198.52	Bathurst Resources Limited and BT Mining Limited	Oppose	The submission point be disallowed in full.	Consideration should be given to rationalising the number of different definitions for areas of significance. Any inclusion on the planning maps should only be after an objective assessment of the land in question and with the consent of the landowner.	Reject	18.1
FS1388.456	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	18.1
493.22	Jackie Colliar	Not Stated	Undertake a Natural Character Assessment of the	It is also a concern that no natural character	Reject	14.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			Waikato River to determine if there are any areas of High or Outstanding Natural Character.	assessment has been undertaken for the Waikato River. The submitter believes that the Waikato River must be viewed holistically and therefore do not believe that parts of the Waikato River can be cut into sections.		
FS1223.174	Mercury NZ Limited	Oppose	Mercury seeks that the submission point is disallowed.	Mercury has an interest in the submission points listed in paragraphs 11.1 and 11.2 above. Mercury supports the protection of outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes in the context of section 6(b) of the RMA, where there has been a robust expert assessment undertaken to describe the values supporting an assessment of what is outstanding. The Waikato RPS Table 12.2 sets out factors that District Councils are to consider when undertaking such an assessment. Mercury considers that such a robust assessment has not been undertaken as part of the preparation of the PWDP.	Accept	14.1
FS1035.75	Pareoranga Te Kata	Support	Agree and support the whole submission.	• Engage with Waikato Tainui and mana whenua to ensure that the Tainui Environmental Plan Tai Tunu, Tai Pari, Tai Ao and marae environmental plans have been included in the Waikato District Plan.	Reject	14.1
493.28	Jackie Colliar	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, but submission supports efforts to identify areas of high and outstanding natural character and outstanding natural features and landscapes, the engagement of experts and with mana whenua.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part Accept in part Accept	11.1 12.1 14.1
FS1139.113	Turangawaewae Trust Board	Not Stated	Null	No reasons provided.	Reject Reject Reject	11.1 12.1 14.1
FS1108.125	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)	Support	Null		Accept in part Accept in part Accept	11.1 12.1 14.1
FS1035.81	Pareoranga Te Kata	Support	Agree and support the whole submission.	• Engage with Waikato Tainui and mana whenua to ensure that the Tainui Environmental Plan Tai Tunu, Tai Pari, Tai Ao and marae environmental plans have been included in the Waikato District Plan.	Accept in part Accept in part Accept	11.1 12.1 14.1
FS1223.175	Mercury NZ Limited	Oppose	Mercury seeks that submission point is disallowed.	Mercury has an interest in the submission points listed in paragraphs 11.1 and 11.2 above. Mercury supports the protection of outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes in the context of	Accept in part Accept in part Reject	11.1 12.1 14.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>section 6(b) of the RMA, where there has been a robust expert assessment undertaken to describe the values supporting an assessment of what is outstanding. The Waikato RPS Table 12.2 sets out factors that District Councils are to consider when undertaking such an assessment. Mercury considers that such a robust assessment has not been undertaken as part of the preparation of the PWDP.</i>		
543.15	Fellrock Developments Limited and TTT Products Limited	Support	Retain Rule 20.3.2 Building height in an Outstanding Natural Feature, Outstanding Natural Landscape or Significant Amenity Landscape.	More onerous controls over building height are required to preserve these identified areas within the Waikato District.	Accept	8.1
559.40	Sherry Reynolds on behalf of Heritage New Zealand Lower Northern Office	Support	Retain Policy 3.3.2 (a)(iv), (b)(iv) and (c)(iv) Recognising values and qualities.	The submitter supports Policy 3.3.2 (a)(iv), (b)(iv) and (c)(iv) as these policies give effect to s6(e) of the Resource Management Act.	Accept	5.1
559.42	Sherry Reynolds on behalf of Heritage New Zealand Lower Northern Office	Support	Retain Policy 3.4.4 (a), (b) and (c) - The relationships of Maaori with natural resources and land.	The submitter supports Policy 3.4.4 (a), (b) and (c) as these policies give effect to s6(e) of the Resource Management Act.	Accept	5.2
567.32	Ngati Tamaoho Trust	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, but submission supports the landscape inclusions.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part Accept in part	15.1 16.1
574.11	TaTa Valley Limited	Oppose	Amend the Proposed District Plan to include a schedule that reflects the outcomes of the Waikato District Landscape Study, which notes the attributes and features that lend itself to the Significant Amenity Landscape status. OR Delete all Significant Amenity Landscapes from the Proposed District Plan including associated objectives, policies in Section 3.4 and rules that reference Significant Amenity Landscapes. AND Any consequential amendments and other relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	Objectives and policies in 3.4 reference 'attributes' and 'features'. The significant amenity landscapes and these attributes should be included in a schedule to allow for resource consents to be assessed against the relevant objectives and policies in Section 3.4. Waikato District Landscape Study was prepared to support the mapping of the	Accept in part Accept in part	15.1 16.1
<i>FS1223.168</i>	<i>Mercury NZ Limited</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Mercury seeks that the submission point is disallowed.</i>	<i>Mercury has an interest in the submission points listed in paragraphs 11.1 and 11.2 above. Mercury supports the protection of outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes in the context of section 6(b) of the RMA, where there has been robust expert assessment undertaken to describe the values supporting an assessment of what is outstanding. The Waikato RPS Table 12.2 sets out factors that District Councils are to consider when undertaking such an assessment. Mercury considers that such a robust</i>	<i>Accept in part Accept in part</i>	<i>15.1 16.1</i>

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				assessment has not been undertaken as part of the preparation of the PWDP.		
FSI301.53	New Zealand Health Food Park Limited	Support	Support the submission in its entirety.	TaTa Valley Limited controls land in southern Pokeno at 242 Bluff Road, Pokeno. TaTa Valley's submission is to amend the plan to enable the development of its site into a major tourism destination, known as the "TaTa Valley Resort." Health Food Park supports the improved tourism offerings that this will provide for the area, This is turn brings more consumers to the area, showcase New Zealand's rural character and significantly enrich the region socially and economically.	Accept in part Accept in part	15.1 16.1
FSI303.53	Charlie Harris	Support	I also support the original submission by Ta Ta Valley Limited in its entirety.	Ta Ta Valley Limited controls land in southern Pokeno at 242 Bluff Road, Pokeno. TaTa Valley's submission is to amend the plan to enable the development of its site into a major tourism destination, known as the "Ta Ta Valley Resort". I Support the improved tourism offerings that this will provide for the area, showcase New Zealand rural character and significantly enrich the region socially and economically.	Accept in part Accept in part	15.1 16.1
FSI108.89	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)	Oppose	Null	Inappropriate amendment.	Accept in part Accept in part	15.1 16.1
FSI139.80	Turangawaewae Trust Board	Oppose	Null	Inappropriate amendment.	Accept in part Accept in part	15.1 16.1
574.12	TaTa Valley Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 3.4.4 (a) The relationships of Maaori with their resources and land, if Significant Amenity Landscapes are retained in the Proposed District Plan, by elaborating on ways in which the relationship of Maaori with Significant Amenity Landscapes can be provided for. AND Any consequential amendments and other relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	Policy 3.4.4(a) does not state how the relationship can be provided for and this creates uncertainty for applicants and processing planners when assessing a consent against this policy.	Reject	5.2
FSI108.90	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)	Oppose	Null	Inappropriate amendment.	Accept	5.2
FSI139.81	Turangawaewae Trust Board	Oppose	Null	Inappropriate amendment.	Accept	5.2
FSI369.14	Ngati Tamaoho Trust	Oppose	Null	Only Maori can "elaborate on ways their relationship with Significant Amenity Landscape can be provided for."	Accept	5.2
FSI303.54	Charlie Harris	Support	I also support the original submission by Ta Ta Valley Limited in	Ta Ta Valley Limited controls land in southern Pokeno at 242 Bluff Road, Pokeno. TaTa Valley's submission	Reject	5.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<i>its entirety.</i>	<i>is to amend the plan to enable the development of its site into a major tourism destination, known as the "Ta Ta Valley Resort". I Support the improved tourism offerings that this will provide for the area, showcase New Zealand rural character and significantly enrich the region socially and economically.</i>		
FS1301.54	New Zealand Health Food Park Limited	Support	Support the submission in its entirety.	TaTa Valley Limited controls land in southern Pokeno at 242 Bluff Road, Pokeno. TaTa Valley's submission is to amend the plan to enable the development of its site into a major tourism destination, known as the "TaTa Valley Resort." Health Food Park supports the improved tourism offerings that this will provide for the area, This is turn brings more consumers to the area, showcase New Zealand's rural character and significantly enrich the region socially and economically.	Reject	5.2
575.10	Fulton Hogan Limited	Support	Retain Policy 3.3.2 - Recognising values and qualities, provided that the Significant Natural Areas, Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes are removed as sought elsewhere in the submission.	Supports the recognition of values and qualities of the Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes but seeks to remove the overlays from the Waingaro quarry. Proposed overlays will unreasonably restrict the ability to operate commercial aggregate extraction activities at this site. It further risks that the existing resource is sterilised, as it will become very difficult to expand the quarry's footprint, which is detrimental not only to Fulton Hogan but to the district as a whole, which relies on the extractive industry for economic development and growth.	Accept	5.1
FS1019.1	Peter Ayson on behalf of Ngaruawahia Action Group	Oppose	Ngaruawahia Action Group Incorporated has been in existence for 21 years, and has the following objectives: a) to work for the protection of Ngaruawahia, the Hakarimata ranges and surrounding areas from mining or extraction of mineral resources in inappropriate places and of inappropriate scale b) to support and promote careful planning for the economic, social and spiritual well-being of the lands, water and communities of Ngaruawahia and the Hakarimata ranges and surrounding areas. As such, Ngaruawahia Action Group (NAG) has a special interest in this submission, because Fulton Hogan site is a quarry in Ngaruawahia and on the Hakarimata ranges. NAG opposes this submission because the submission seeks to remove outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes and significant natural area overlays in an area for which these values are of national and regional importance. With regards to this submission, the extractive industry should be treated no differently here as other land-users are treated.	We seek to disallow the whole of this submission including other submissions which seek to remove natural heritage and landscape overlays, as if those values didn't exist.	Reject	5.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
575.11	Fulton Hogan Limited	Support	Retain Policy 3.3.3 Protection from inappropriate subdivision, use and development, provided that the Significant Natural Areas, Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes are removed as sought elsewhere in the submission.	Supports the recognition of values and qualities of the Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes but seeks to remove the overlays from the Waingaro quarry. Proposed overlays will unreasonably restrict the ability to operate commercial aggregate extraction activities at this site. It further risks that the existing resource is sterilised, as it will become very difficult to expand the quarry's footprint, which is detrimental not only to Fulton Hogan but to the district as a whole, which relies on the extractive industry for economic development and growth.	Accept	5.1
FS1027.4	Peter Ayson on behalf of Ngaruawahia Action Group Incorporated	Oppose	<i>Ngaruawahia Action Group Incorporated has been in existence for 21 years, and has the following objectives: a) to work for the protection of Ngaruawahia, the Hakarimata ranges and surrounding areas from mining or extraction of mineral resources in inappropriate places and of inappropriate scale b) to support and promote careful planning for the economic, social and spiritual well-being of the lands, water and communities of Ngaruawahia and the Hakarimata ranges and surrounding areas. As such, Ngaruawahia Action Group (NAG) has a special interest in this submission, because Fulton Hogan site is a quarry in Ngaruawahia and on the Hakarimata ranges. NAG opposes this submission because the submission seeks to remove outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes and significant natural area overlays in an area for which these values are of national and regional importance. With regards to this submission, the extractive industry should be treated no differently here as other land-users are treated.</i>	<i>We seek to disallow the whole of this submission including other submissions which seek to remove natural heritage and landscape overlays, as if those values didn't exist.</i>	Reject	5.1
FS1027.3	Peter Ayson on behalf of Ngaruawahia Action Group Incorporated	Oppose	<i>Ngaruawahia Action Group Incorporated has been in existence for 21 years, and has the following objectives: a) to work for the protection of Ngaruawahia, the Hakarimata ranges and surrounding areas from mining or extraction of mineral resources in inappropriate places and of inappropriate scale b) to support and promote careful planning for the economic, social and spiritual well-being of the lands, water and communities of Ngaruawahia and the Hakarimata ranges and surrounding areas. As such, Ngaruawahia Action Group (NAG) has a special interest in this submission, because Fulton Hogan site is a quarry in Ngaruawahia and on the Hakarimata ranges. NAG opposes this submission because the submission seeks to remove outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes and significant natural area overlays in an area for which these values are of national and regional importance. With regards to this submission, the extractive industry should</i>	<i>We seek to disallow the whole of this submission including other submissions which seek to remove natural heritage and landscape overlays, as if those values didn't exist.</i>	Reject	5.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<i>be treated no differently here as other land-users are treated.</i>			
575.12	Fulton Hogan Limited	Support	Retain 3.3.4 Policy The relationships of Maaori with natural resources and land, provided that the Significant Natural Areas, Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes are removed as sought elsewhere in the submission.	Supports the recognition of values and qualities of the Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes but seeks to remove the overlays from the Waingaro quarry. Proposed overlays will unreasonably restrict the ability to operate commercial aggregate extraction activities at this site. It further risks that the existing resource is sterilised, as it will become very difficult to expand the quarry's footprint, which is detrimental not only to Fulton Hogan but to the district as a whole, which relies on the extractive industry for economic development and growth.	Accept	5.1
575.13	Fulton Hogan Limited	Support	Retain Policy 3.4.3 Maintaining and enhancing Significant Amenity Landscapes, provided that the Significant Amenity Landscape overlay is removed, as sought elsewhere in the submission.	Supports intent to protect Significant Amenity Landscapes across the district but, seeks removal of the overlay from the Tuakau Quarry (subject to a separate submission point).	Accept in part	5.2
575.20	Fulton Hogan Limited	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 22.2.3.4 Earthworks within Landscape and Natural Character Areas OR Amend Rule 22.2.3.4 Earthworks if the Significant Natural Areas, Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes are not removed from Fulton Hogan lawfully existing quarries as sought elsewhere in the submission. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential and additional amendments as necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	Has no opposition to the rule in principal but seeks removal of the overlays from existing quarries.	Accept in part	7.1
FS1332.34	Winstone Aggregates	Support	Support.	The submission point reflects the matters that affect the aggregate industry as a whole.	Accept in part	7.1
575.25	Fulton Hogan Limited	Oppose	Delete the Outstanding Natural Feature from the Waingaro quarry land (Waignaro Road, Ngaruawahia - properties 2006029, 1012692, 1012697 and 1012732. (A map of the respective area sought for deletion is attached to the original submission as Appendix B). AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential and additional amendments as necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	The land identified is directly adjacent to current operations, meaning that any future expansion (or continued extraction) could involve land subject to this overlay. This overlay overlaps with the 'Aggregate Extraction Areas' overlay, which is intended to protect lawfully established quarry activities. The overlapping overlays creates unnecessary confusion as to what takes priority and will make any future expansion of the quarry unnecessarily complex and costly.	Reject	11.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1027.8	Peter Ayson on behalf of Ngaruawahia Action Group Incorporated	Oppose	Ngaruawahia Action Group Incorporated has been in existence for 21 years, and has the following objectives: a) to work for the protection of Ngaruawahia, the Hakarimata ranges and surrounding areas from mining or extraction of mineral resources in inappropriate places and of inappropriate scale b) to support and promote careful planning for the economic, social and spiritual well-being of the lands, water and communities of Ngaruawahia and the Hakarimata ranges and surrounding areas. As such, Ngaruawahia Action Group (NAG) has a special interest in this submission, because Fulton Hogan site is a quarry in Ngaruawahia and on the Hakarimata ranges. NAG opposes this submission because the submission seeks to remove outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes and significant natural area overlays in an area for which these values are of national and regional importance. With regards to this submission, the extractive industry should be treated no differently here as other land-users are treated.	We seek to disallow the whole of this submission including other submissions which seek to remove natural heritage and landscape overlays, as if those values didn't exist.	Accept	11.1
575.26	Fulton Hogan Limited	Oppose	Delete the Significant Amenity Landscape on the Tuakau quarry land (Friedlander Road, Tuakau - property 301603). (A map of the respective area sought for deletion is attached to the original submission as Appendix B). OR Amend the Significant Amenity Landscape on Tuakau quarry land (Friedlander Road, Tuakau - property 301603) to reduce the extent as shown on Appendix B of the submission to only cover farmland. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential and additional amendments as necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	This a misrepresentation of what the existing environment looks like (which has been operating as a quarry for over a decade) and is inappropriate given the use of the land for a quarry and other activities not usually found in SALs (such as farming, treatment ponds etc). Overlay overlaps with the 'Aggregate Extraction Areas' overlay, and this overlap creates unnecessary confusion as to what takes priority and will make any future expansion of the quarry unnecessarily complex and costly. Request that the SAL overlay be removed insofar as it impacts on the quarry. They further request that the remaining overlay be removed OR reduced insofar as it covers the surrounding farm lands.	Accept in part Accept in part Accept in part	15.1 16.1 16.1
576.42	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	Support	Retain the definition for "Outstanding Natural Feature" in Chapter 13 Definitions, as notified.	The definition is supported on the basis it applies to the area as identified on the planning maps. Such identification assists plan users and provides clarity on the application of the Proposed District Plan provisions that relate to the definition.	Accept in part	10.1
576.43	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	Support	Retain the definition for "Outstanding Natural Character Area" in Chapter 13 Definitions, as notified.	The definition is supported on the basis it applies to the area as identified on the planning maps. Such identification assists plan users and provides clarity on the application of the Proposed District Plan provisions that relate to the definition.	Accept in part	10.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
576.44	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	Support	Retain the definition for "Outstanding Natural Landscape" in Chapter 13 Definitions, as notified.	The definition is supported on the basis it applies to the area as identified on the planning maps. Such identification assists plan users and provides clarity on the application of the Proposed District Plan provisions that relate to the definition.	Accept in part	10.1
576.46	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	Support	Retain the definition for "Significant Amenity Landscape" in Chapter 13 Definitions, as notified.	The definition is supported on the basis it applies to the area as identified on the planning maps. Such identification assists plan users and provides clarity on the application of the Proposed District Plan provisions that relate to the definition.	Accept in part	10.1
579.67	Simon Ash for Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited	Oppose	Delete the Significant Natural Feature overlays from the lake edge within the Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited property, Te Kauwhata (see map included in submission). AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any amendments or consequential changes that are necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.		Reject	11.1
580.22	Andrew Feierabend for Meridian Energy Limited	Support	Retain Policy 3.3.2 Recognising values and qualities.	Endorses the approach proposed by Policy 3.3.2.	Accept	5.1
580.23	Andrew Feierabend for Meridian Energy Limited	Neutral/Amend	Retain Policy 3.3.3 Protection from inappropriate subdivision, use and development, except for the amendment sought below AND Amend Policy 3.3.3(a)(i) Protection from inappropriate subdivision, use and development as follows: (i) requiring buildings and structures to be integrated into the Outstanding Natural Landscape or feature to the extent reasonably practicable to minimise any visual impacts. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.	Supports the approach provided it recognises the functional and operational difficulty that some large-scale infrastructure (e.g. wind turbines) will have integrating into the landscape.	Reject	5.1
FSI 223.112	Mercury NZ Limited	Support	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure perspective. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is	Reject	5.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
FSI342.146	Federated Farmers	Support	Allow submission point 580.23.	FFNZ supports the amendment to introduce some recognition that the functional and operational requirements of existing land uses can sometimes be difficult to integrate into a landscape ideal.	Reject	5.1
585.34	Lucy Roberts for Department of Conservation	Oppose	Retain the mapping of the Coastal Environment line, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend the coastal environment line at Port Waikato to take into account the position of the boundary for the coastal marine area as shown in the Waikato Regional Coastal Plan and make any consequential amendments.	Supports the mapping of the Coastal Environment line in the district, however requests a reassessment of any discrepancies.	Accept	17.1
FSI381.3	Counties Power Limited	Support	Support in part.	Counties Power Limited (CPL) support this submission in part, on the proviso that the proposed Coastal Environment overlay can be retained upon further detailed assessment of the Coastal Environment being undertaken as outlined in Section 4.1.8 b) ii) of the Waikato Regional Policy Statement. The proposed Coastal Environment overlay as notified is very broad and its mapping criteria not well understood. A section within the Proposed District Plan is required that outlines the methodology undertaken for the identification of the proposed Coastal Environment overlay and the associated issues, objectives, policies and implementation methods. It is unclear if the provision of nationally or regionally significant infrastructure (including network utilities and the provision of renewable energy) is provided for within the proposed Coastal Environment overlay and clarification is sought.	Accept	17.1
FSI277.137	Waikato Regional Council	Support	Amend plan as requested by Department of Conservation.	The Regional Coastal Plan and the WRPS both map this Coastal Environmental Line.	Accept	17.1
585.36	Lucy Roberts for Department of Conservation	Oppose	Add a schedule identifying the Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes.	Requests the reintroduction of schedules for Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes to better recognise the individual attributes that make specific areas outstanding.	Accept	9.1
FSI340.96	TaTa Valley Limited	Support	Support.	The submitter supports submission 585.36 as the	Accept	9.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				proposed plan should identify, through a schedule, ONFs and ONLs so that it is clear where they are present.		
FS1377.164	Havelock Village Limited	Oppose	Oppose in part.	Providing for a schedule of Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes would provide greater clarity and certainty for plan users. However, any provisions associated with Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes need to provide for an appropriate level of development and recognise existing uses taking into account the recognised values for which it is protected.	Reject	9.1
FS1223.172	Mercury NZ Limited	Oppose	Mercury seeks that the submission point is disallowed.	Mercury has an interest in the submission points listed in paragraphs 11.1 and 11.2 above. Mercury supports the protection of outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes in the context of section 6(b) of the RMA, where there has been a robust expert assessment undertaken to describe the values supporting an assessment of what is outstanding. The Waikato RPS Table 12.2 sets out factors that District Councils are to consider when undertaking such an assessment. Mercury considers that such a robust assessment has not been undertaken as part of the preparation of the PWDP.	Reject	9.1
598.22	Withers Family Trust	Neutral/Amend	Amend terminology so that there is consistency between the district plan text and planning maps, for example Natural Character versus Outstanding Natural Character.	There appears to be inconsistency between terminology in the district plan text and planning maps. For example, the Rural Zone refers to 'Outstanding Natural Character' whereas the planning maps refer to 'Natural Character'.	Accept	18.1
644.11	Spark New Zealand Trading Limited	Support	Retain Objective 3.3.1 Outstanding natural features and landscapes, as notified.	Policy 6.1.10 in Infrastructure section directly addresses infrastructure in 'Identified Areas,' requiring a consideration of the values and attributes of these areas where new infrastructure or significant upgrades are required in these areas. Policy 6.1.10 will need to be read in conjunction with Natural Environment provisions where assessing proposals in these areas. Submitter considers Natural Environment provisions, as drafted, set out a workable framework for assessing telecommunications infrastructure in these areas, particularly where assessed in conjunction with Policy 6.1.10. Submitter wishes to preserve its standing on these provisions should changes be sought by other parties.	Accept	5.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
644.12	Spark New Zealand Trading Limited	Support	Retain Policy 3.3.2 Recognizing values and qualities, as notified.	Policy 6.1.10 in Infrastructure section directly addresses infrastructure in 'Identified Areas,' requiring a consideration of the values and attributes of these areas where new infrastructure or significant upgrades are required in these areas. Policy 6.1.10 will need to be read in conjunction with Natural Environment provisions where assessing proposals in these areas. Submitter considers Natural Environment provisions, as drafted, set out a workable framework for assessing telecommunications infrastructure in these areas, particularly where assessed in conjunction with Policy 6.1.10. Submitter wishes to preserve its standing on these provisions should changes be sought by other parties.	Accept	5.1
644.13	Spark New Zealand Trading Limited	Support	Retain Policy 3.3.3 Protection from inappropriate subdivision, use and development, as notified.	Policy 6.1.10 in Infrastructure section directly addresses infrastructure in 'Identified Areas,' requiring a consideration of the values and attributes of these areas where new infrastructure or significant upgrades are required in these areas. Policy 6.1.10 will need to be read in conjunction with Natural Environment provisions where assessing proposals in these areas. Submitter considers Natural Environment provisions, as drafted, set out a workable framework for assessing telecommunications infrastructure in these areas, particularly where assessed in conjunction with Policy 6.1.10. Submitter wishes to preserve its standing on these provisions should changes be sought by other parties.	Accept	5.1
644.14	Spark New Zealand Trading Limited	Support	Retain Objective 3.5.1 Natural Character, as notified.	Policy 6.1.10 in Infrastructure section directly addresses infrastructure in 'Identified Areas,' requiring a consideration of the values and attributes of these areas where new infrastructure or significant upgrades are required in these areas. Policy 6.1.10 will need to be read in conjunction with Natural Environment provisions where assessing proposals in these areas. Submitter considers Natural Environment provisions, as drafted, set out a workable framework for assessing telecommunications infrastructure in these areas, particularly where assessed in conjunction with Policy 6.1.10. Submitter wishes to preserve its standing on these provisions should	Accept	5.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				changes be sought by other parties.		
644.15	Spark New Zealand Trading Limited	Support	Retain Policy 3.5.2 Recognising natural character, as notified.	Policy 6.1.10 in Infrastructure section directly addresses infrastructure in 'Identified Areas,' requiring a consideration of the values and attributes of these areas where new infrastructure or significant upgrades are required in these areas. Policy 6.1.10 will need to be read in conjunction with Natural Environment provisions where assessing proposals in these areas. Submitter considers Natural Environment provisions, as drafted, set out a workable framework for assessing telecommunications infrastructure in these areas, particularly where assessed in conjunction with Policy 6.1.10. Submitter wishes to preserve its standing on these provisions should changes be sought by other parties.	Accept	5.3
644.16	Spark New Zealand Trading Limited	Not Stated	Retain Policy 3.5.3- Protecting the natural character qualities of the coastal environment as notified.	Policy 6.1.10 in Infrastructure section directly addresses infrastructure in 'Identified Areas,' requiring a consideration of the values and attributes of these areas where new infrastructure or significant upgrades are required in these areas. Policy 6.1.10 will need to be read in conjunction with Natural Environment provisions where assessing proposals in these areas. Submitter considers Natural Environment provisions, as drafted, set out a workable framework for assessing telecommunications infrastructure in these areas, particularly where assessed in conjunction with Policy 6.1.10. Submitter wishes to preserve its standing on these provisions should changes be sought by other parties.	Accept in part	5.3
644.17	Spark New Zealand Trading Limited	Support	Retain Policy 3.5.4- Protecting the natural character of wetlands, and lakes and rivers and their margins as notified.	Policy 6.1.10 in Infrastructure section directly addresses infrastructure in 'Identified Areas,' requiring a consideration of the values and attributes of these areas where new infrastructure or significant upgrades are required in these areas. Policy 6.1.10 will need to be read in conjunction with Natural Environment provisions where assessing proposals in these areas. Submitter considers Natural Environment provisions, as drafted, set out a workable framework for assessing telecommunications infrastructure in these areas, particularly where assessed in conjunction with Policy 6.1.10. Submitter wishes	Accept in part	5.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				to preserve its standing on these provisions should changes be sought by other parties.		
644.43	Spark New Zealand Trading Limited	Support	Retain Policy 3.3.4 The relationships of Maori with natural resources and land, as notified.	Policy 6.1.10 in Infrastructure section directly addresses infrastructure in 'Identified Areas,' requiring a consideration of the values and attributes of these areas where new infrastructure or significant upgrades are required in these areas. Policy 6.1.10 will need to be read in conjunction with Natural Environment provisions where assessing proposals in these areas. Submitter considers Natural Environment provisions, as drafted, set out a workable framework for assessing telecommunications infrastructure in these areas, particularly where assessed in conjunction with Policy 6.1.10. Submitter wishes to preserve its standing on these provisions should changes be sought by other parties.	Accept	5.1
644.44	Spark New Zealand Trading Limited	Support	Retain Objective 3.4.1 Significant amenity landscapes, as notified.	Policy 6.1.10 in Infrastructure section directly addresses infrastructure in 'Identified Areas,' requiring a consideration of the values and attributes of these areas where new infrastructure or significant upgrades are required in these areas. Policy 6.1.10 will need to be read in conjunction with Natural Environment provisions where assessing proposals in these areas. Submitter considers Natural Environment provisions, as drafted, set out a workable framework for assessing telecommunications infrastructure in these areas, particularly where assessed in conjunction with Policy 6.1.10. Submitter wishes to preserve its standing on these provisions should changes be sought by other parties.	Accept	5.2
644.45	Spark New Zealand Trading Limited	Support	Retain Policy 3.4.2 Recognizing Significant Amenity Landscapes, as notified.	Policy 6.1.10 in Infrastructure section directly addresses infrastructure in 'Identified Areas,' requiring a consideration of the values and attributes of these areas where new infrastructure or significant upgrades are required in these areas. Policy 6.1.10 will need to be read in conjunction with Natural Environment provisions where assessing proposals in these areas. Submitter considers Natural Environment provisions, as drafted, set out a workable framework for assessing telecommunications infrastructure in	Accept	5.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				these areas, particularly where assessed in conjunction with Policy 6.1.10. Submitter wishes to preserve its standing on these provisions should changes be sought by other parties.		
644.46	Spark New Zealand Trading Limited	Support	Retain Policy 3.4.3 Maintaining and enhancing Significant Amenity Landscapes, as notified.	Policy 6.1.10 in Infrastructure section directly addresses infrastructure in 'Identified Areas,' requiring a consideration of the values and attributes of these areas where new infrastructure or significant upgrades are required in these areas. Policy 6.1.10 will need to be read in conjunction with Natural Environment provisions where assessing proposals in these areas. Submitter considers Natural Environment provisions, as drafted, set out a workable framework for assessing telecommunications infrastructure in these areas, particularly where assessed in conjunction with Policy 6.1.10. Submitter wishes to preserve its standing on these provisions should changes be sought by other parties.	Accept in part	5.2
644.47	Spark New Zealand Trading Limited	Support	Retain Policy 3.4.4 The relationships of Maori with their resources and land, as notified.	Policy 6.1.10 in Infrastructure section directly addresses infrastructure in 'Identified Areas,' requiring a consideration of the values and attributes of these areas where new infrastructure or significant upgrades are required in these areas. Policy 6.1.10 will need to be read in conjunction with Natural Environment provisions where assessing proposals in these areas. Submitter considers Natural Environment provisions, as drafted, set out a workable framework for assessing telecommunications infrastructure in these areas, particularly where assessed in conjunction with Policy 6.1.10. Submitter wishes to preserve its standing on these provisions should changes be sought by other parties.	Accept	5.2
646.11	Vodafone New Zealand Limited	Support	Retain Objective 3.3.1- Outstanding natural features and landscapes as notified.	Policy 6.1.10 in the Infrastructure section directly addresses infrastructure in "Identified Areas," requiring consideration of the values and attributes of these area where new infrastructure or significant upgrades are required in such areas. Policy 6.1.10 needs to be read in conjunction with the Natural Environment provisions where assessing proposals in Identified Areas. Natural Environment Provisions as drafted set out a workable framework for assessing	Accept	5.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				telecommunications infrastructure. Submitter wishes to preserve its standing on such provisions should changes be sought by other parties.		
646.12	Vodafone New Zealand Limited	Support	Retain Policy 3.3.2- Recognising values and qualities as notified.	Policy 6.1.10 in the Infrastructure section directly addresses infrastructure in "Identified Areas," requiring consideration of the values and attributes of these area where new infrastructure or significant upgrades are required in such areas. Policy 6.1.10 needs to be read in conjunction with the Natural Environment provisions where assessing proposals in Identified Areas. Natural Environment Provisions as drafted set out a workable framework for assessing telecommunications infrastructure. Submitter wishes to preserve its standing on such provisions should changes be sought by other parties.	Accept	5.1
646.13	Vodafone New Zealand Limited	Support	Retain Policy 3.3.3- Protection from inappropriate subdivision, use and development as notified.	Policy 6.1.10 in the Infrastructure section directly addresses infrastructure in "Identified Areas," requiring consideration of the values and attributes of these area where new infrastructure or significant upgrades are required in such areas. Policy 6.1.10 needs to be read in conjunction with the Natural Environment provisions where assessing proposals in Identified Areas. Natural Environment Provisions as drafted set out a workable framework for assessing telecommunications infrastructure. Submitter wishes to preserve its standing on such provisions should changes be sought by other parties.	Accept	5.1
646.14	Vodafone New Zealand Limited	Support	Retain Policy 3.5.1- Natural Character as notified.	Policy 6.1.10 in the Infrastructure section directly addresses infrastructure in "Identified Areas," requiring consideration of the values and attributes of these area where new infrastructure or significant upgrades are required in such areas. Policy 6.1.10 needs to be read in conjunction with the Natural Environment provisions where assessing proposals in Identified Areas. Natural Environment Provisions as drafted set out a workable framework for assessing telecommunications infrastructure. Submitter wishes to preserve its standing on such provisions should changes be sought by other parties.	Accept	5.3
646.15	Vodafone New Zealand	Support	Retain Policy 3.5.2- Recognising natural character as	Policy 6.1.10 in the Infrastructure section directly	Accept	5.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
	Limited		notified.	addresses infrastructure in "Identified Areas," requiring consideration of the values and attributes of these area where new infrastructure or significant upgrades are required in such areas. Policy 6.1.10 needs to be read in conjunction with the Natural Environment provisions where assessing proposals in Identified Areas. Natural Environment Provisions as drafted set out a workable framework for assessing telecommunications infrastructure. Submitter wishes to preserve its standing on such provisions should changes be sought by other parties.		
646.16	Vodafone New Zealand Limited	Support	Retain Policy 3.5.3- Protecting the natural character qualities of the coastal environment as notified.	Policy 6.1.10 in the Infrastructure section directly addresses infrastructure in "Identified Areas," requiring consideration of the values and attributes of these area where new infrastructure or significant upgrades are required in such areas. Policy 6.1.10 needs to be read in conjunction with the Natural Environment provisions where assessing proposals in Identified Areas. Natural Environment Provisions as drafted set out a workable framework for assessing telecommunications infrastructure. Submitter wishes to preserve its standing on such provisions should changes be sought by other parties.	Accept in part	5.3
646.17	Vodafone New Zealand Limited	Support	Retain Policy 3.5.4- Protecting the natural character of wetlands, and lakes and rivers and their margins as notified.	Policy 6.1.10 in the Infrastructure section directly addresses infrastructure in "Identified Areas," requiring consideration of the values and attributes of these area where new infrastructure or significant upgrades are required in such areas. Policy 6.1.10 needs to be read in conjunction with the Natural Environment provisions where assessing proposals in Identified Areas. Natural Environment Provisions as drafted set out a workable framework for assessing telecommunications infrastructure. Submitter wishes to preserve its standing on such provisions should changes be sought by other parties.	Accept in part	5.3
646.44	Vodafone New Zealand Limited	Support	Retain Policy 3.3.4- The relationships of Maori with natural resources and land as notified.	Policy 6.1.10 in the Infrastructure section directly addresses infrastructure in "Identified Areas," requiring consideration of the values and attributes of these area where new infrastructure or significant upgrades are required in such areas. Policy 6.1.10 needs to be read in conjunction with	Accept	5.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				the Natural Environment provisions where assessing proposals in Identified Areas. Natural Environment Provisions as drafted set out a workable framework for assessing telecommunications infrastructure. Submitter wishes to preserve its standing on such provisions should changes be sought by other parties.		
646.45	Vodafone New Zealand Limited	Support	Retain Objective 3.4.1- Significant amenity landscapes as notified.	Policy 6.1.10 in the Infrastructure section directly addresses infrastructure in "Identified Areas," requiring consideration of the values and attributes of these area where new infrastructure or significant upgrades are required in such areas. Policy 6.1.10 needs to be read in conjunction with the Natural Environment provisions where assessing proposals in Identified Areas. Natural Environment Provisions as drafted set out a workable framework for assessing telecommunications infrastructure. Submitter wishes to preserve its standing on such provisions should changes be sought by other parties.	Accept	5.2
646.46	Vodafone New Zealand Limited	Support	Retain Policy 3.4.2- Recognising Significant Amenity Landscapes as notified.	Policy 6.1.10 in the Infrastructure section directly addresses infrastructure in "Identified Areas," requiring consideration of the values and attributes of these area where new infrastructure or significant upgrades are required in such areas. Policy 6.1.10 needs to be read in conjunction with the Natural Environment provisions where assessing proposals in Identified Areas. Natural Environment Provisions as drafted set out a workable framework for assessing telecommunications infrastructure. Submitter wishes to preserve its standing on such provisions should changes be sought by other parties.	Accept	5.2
646.47	Vodafone New Zealand Limited	Support	Retain Policy 3.4.3- Maintaining and enhancing Significant Amenity Landscapes as notified.	Policy 6.1.10 in the Infrastructure section directly addresses infrastructure in "Identified Areas," requiring consideration of the values and attributes of these area where new infrastructure or significant upgrades are required in such areas. Policy 6.1.10 needs to be read in conjunction with the Natural Environment provisions where assessing proposals in Identified Areas. Natural Environment Provisions as drafted set out a workable framework for assessing telecommunications infrastructure. Submitter	Accept in part	5.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				wishes to preserve its standing on such provisions should changes be sought by other parties.		
646.48	Vodafone New Zealand Limited	Support	Retain Policy 3.4.4- The relationships of Maori with their resources and land as notified.	Policy 6.1.10 in the Infrastructure section directly addresses infrastructure in "Identified Areas," requiring consideration of the values and attributes of these area where new infrastructure or significant upgrades are required in such areas. Policy 6.1.10 needs to be read in conjunction with the Natural Environment provisions where assessing proposals in Identified Areas. Natural Environment Provisions as drafted set out a workable framework for assessing telecommunications infrastructure. Submitter wishes to preserve its standing on such provisions should changes be sought by other parties.	Accept	5.2
648.11	Chorus New Zealand Limited	Support	Retain Objective 3.3.1 - Outstanding natural features and landscapes as notified.	Policy 6.1.10 in Infrastructure section directly addresses infrastructure in 'Identified Areas,' requiring a consideration of the values and attributes of these areas where new infrastructure or significant upgrades are required in these areas. Policy 6.1.10 will need to be read in conjunction with Natural Environment provisions where assessing proposals in these areas. Submitter considers Natural Environment provisions, as drafted, set out a workable framework for assessing telecommunications infrastructure in these areas, particularly where assessed in conjunction with Policy 6.1.10. Submitter wishes to preserve its standing on these provisions should changes be sought by other parties.	Accept	5.1
648.12	Chorus New Zealand Limited	Support	Retain Policy 3.3.2 - Recognising values and qualities as notified.	Policy 6.1.10 in Infrastructure section directly addresses infrastructure in 'Identified Areas,' requiring a consideration of the values and attributes of these areas where new infrastructure or significant upgrades are required in these areas. Policy 6.1.10 will need to be read in conjunction with Natural Environment provisions where assessing proposals in these areas. Submitter considers Natural Environment provisions, as drafted, set out a workable framework for assessing telecommunications infrastructure in these areas, particularly where assessed in conjunction with Policy 6.1.10.	Accept	5.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				Submitter wishes to preserve its standing on these provisions should changes be sought by other parties.		
648.13	Chorus New Zealand Limited	Support	Retain Policy 3.3.3 - Protection from inappropriate subdivision, use and development as notified.	Policy 6.1.10 in Infrastructure section directly addresses infrastructure in 'Identified Areas,' requiring a consideration of the values and attributes of these areas where new infrastructure or significant upgrades are required in these areas. Policy 6.1.10 will need to be read in conjunction with Natural Environment provisions where assessing proposals in these areas. Submitter considers Natural Environment provisions, as drafted, set out a workable framework for assessing telecommunications infrastructure in these areas, particularly where assessed in conjunction with Policy 6.1.10. Submitter wishes to preserve its standing on these provisions should changes be sought by other parties.	Accept	5.1
648.14	Chorus New Zealand Limited	Support	Retain Objective 3.5.1- Natural Character as notified.	Policy 6.1.10 in Infrastructure section directly addresses infrastructure in 'Identified Areas,' requiring a consideration of the values and attributes of these areas where new infrastructure or significant upgrades are required in these areas. Policy 6.1.10 will need to be read in conjunction with Natural Environment provisions where assessing proposals in these areas. Submitter considers Natural Environment provisions, as drafted, set out a workable framework for assessing telecommunications infrastructure in these areas, particularly where assessed in conjunction with Policy 6.1.10. Submitter wishes to preserve its standing on these provisions should changes be sought by other parties.	Accept	5.3
648.15	Chorus New Zealand Limited	Support	Retain Policy 3.5.2 - Recognising natural character as notified.	Policy 6.1.10 in Infrastructure section directly addresses infrastructure in 'Identified Areas,' requiring a consideration of the values and attributes of these areas where new infrastructure or significant upgrades are required in these areas. Policy 6.1.10 will need to be read in conjunction with Natural Environment provisions where assessing proposals in these areas. Submitter considers Natural Environment	Accept	5.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				provisions, as drafted, set out a workable framework for assessing telecommunications infrastructure in these areas, particularly where assessed in conjunction with Policy 6.1.10. Submitter wishes to preserve its standing on these provisions should changes be sought by other parties.		
648.16	Chorus New Zealand Limited	Support	Retain Policy 3.5.3 - Protecting the natural character qualities of the coastal environment as notified.	Policy 6.1.10 in Infrastructure section directly addresses infrastructure in 'Identified Areas,' requiring a consideration of the values and attributes of these areas where new infrastructure or significant upgrades are required in these areas. Policy 6.1.10 will need to be read in conjunction with Natural Environment provisions where assessing proposals in these areas. Submitter considers Natural Environment provisions, as drafted, set out a workable framework for assessing telecommunications infrastructure in these areas, particularly where assessed in conjunction with Policy 6.1.10. Submitter wishes to preserve its standing on these provisions should changes be sought by other parties.	Accept in part	5.3
648.17	Chorus New Zealand Limited	Support	Retain Policy 3.5.4 - Protecting the natural character of wetlands, and lakes and rivers and their margins as notified.	Policy 6.1.10 in Infrastructure section directly addresses infrastructure in 'Identified Areas,' requiring a consideration of the values and attributes of these areas where new infrastructure or significant upgrades are required in these areas. Policy 6.1.10 will need to be read in conjunction with Natural Environment provisions where assessing proposals in these areas. Submitter considers Natural Environment provisions, as drafted, set out a workable framework for assessing telecommunications infrastructure in these areas, particularly where assessed in conjunction with Policy 6.1.10. Submitter wishes to preserve its standing on these provisions should changes be sought by other parties.	Accept in part	5.3
648.45	Chorus New Zealand Limited	Support	Retain Policy 3.3.4 - The relationships of Maaori with natural resources and land as notified.	Policy 6.1.10 in Infrastructure section directly addresses infrastructure in 'Identified Areas,' requiring a consideration of the values and attributes of these areas where new infrastructure or significant upgrades are required in these areas.	Accept	5.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				Policy 6.1.10 will need to be read in conjunction with Natural Environment provisions where assessing proposals in these areas. Submitter considers Natural Environment provisions, as drafted, set out a workable framework for assessing telecommunications infrastructure in these areas, particularly where assessed in conjunction with Policy 6.1.10. Submitter wishes to preserve its standing on these provisions should changes be sought by other parties.		
648.46	Chorus New Zealand Limited	Support	Retain Objective 3.4.1 - Significant amenity landscapes as notified.	Policy 6.1.10 in Infrastructure section directly addresses infrastructure in 'Identified Areas,' requiring a consideration of the values and attributes of these areas where new infrastructure or significant upgrades are required in these areas. Policy 6.1.10 will need to be read in conjunction with Natural Environment provisions where assessing proposals in these areas. Submitter considers Natural Environment provisions, as drafted, set out a workable framework for assessing telecommunications infrastructure in these areas, particularly where assessed in conjunction with Policy 6.1.10. Submitter wishes to preserve its standing on these provisions should changes be sought by other parties.	Accept	5.2
648.47	Chorus New Zealand Limited	Support	Retain Policy 3.4.2 - Recognising Significant Amenity Landscapes as notified.	Policy 6.1.10 in Infrastructure section directly addresses infrastructure in 'Identified Areas,' requiring a consideration of the values and attributes of these areas where new infrastructure or significant upgrades are required in these areas. Policy 6.1.10 will need to be read in conjunction with Natural Environment provisions where assessing proposals in these areas. Submitter considers Natural Environment provisions, as drafted, set out a workable framework for assessing telecommunications infrastructure in these areas, particularly where assessed in conjunction with Policy 6.1.10. Submitter wishes to preserve its standing on these provisions should changes be sought by other parties.	Accept	5.2
648.48	Chorus New Zealand	Support	Retain Policy 3.4.3 - Maintaining and enhancing Significant	Policy 6.1.10 in Infrastructure section directly	Accept in part	5.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
	Limited		Amenity Landscapes as notified.	addresses infrastructure in 'Identified Areas,' requiring a consideration of the values and attributes of these areas where new infrastructure or significant upgrades are required in these areas. Policy 6.1.10 will need to be read in conjunction with Natural Environment provisions where assessing proposals in these areas. Submitter considers Natural Environment provisions, as drafted, set out a workable framework for assessing telecommunications infrastructure in these areas, particularly where assessed in conjunction with Policy 6.1.10. Submitter wishes to preserve its standing on these provisions should changes be sought by other parties.		
648.49	Chorus New Zealand Limited	Support	Retain Policy 3.4.4 - The relationships of Maaori with their resources and land as notified.	Policy 6.1.10 in Infrastructure section directly addresses infrastructure in 'Identified Areas,' requiring a consideration of the values and attributes of these areas where new infrastructure or significant upgrades are required in these areas. Policy 6.1.10 will need to be read in conjunction with Natural Environment provisions where assessing proposals in these areas. Submitter considers Natural Environment provisions, as drafted, set out a workable framework for assessing telecommunications infrastructure in these areas, particularly where assessed in conjunction with Policy 6.1.10. Submitter wishes to preserve its standing on these provisions should changes be sought by other parties.	Accept	5.2
680.38	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Support	Retain Objective 3.3.1 Outstanding natural features and landscapes, as notified.	The submitter understands the intent of this Objective is to meet RMA obligations and Waikato Regional Policy Statement direction.	Accept	5.1
FS1223.185	Mercury NZ Limited	Oppose	Mercury seeks that the submission point is disallowed.	Mercury has an interest in the submission points listed in paragraphs 11.1 and 11.2 above. Mercury supports the protection of outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes in the context of section 6(b) of the RMA, where there has been a robust expert assessment undertaken to describe the values supporting an assessment of what is outstanding. The Waikato RPS Table 12.2 sets out factors that District Councils are to consider when undertaking such an assessment. Mercury considers	Reject	5.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>that such a robust assessment has not been undertaken as part of the preparation of the PWDP.</i>		
680.39	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 3.3.2 (a) Recognising values and qualities, as follows: (a)... (vi) existing -water reservoirs and dams; (vii) existing pastoral farming activities on the margins of these areas. (b) ... (vi) existing pastoral farming activities on the margins of these areas. (c) ... (v) existing pastoral farming activities on the margins these areas. AND Any consequential changes needed to give effect to this relief.	The submitter understands the policy in the context of the Waikato Regional Policy Statement. However, the Proposed District Plan must ensure that ONFs and ONLs (which have been identified over private farmland), enable farming activities that contribute to the values and qualities of pastoral working landscapes. These are dynamic and changing, and it is not appropriate for the Proposed District Plan to seek to 'freeze' landscape character by rendering farming land use and development as 'static' in this context. Farmers have a legitimate right to be able to use their land resource in a way that meets their social and economic wellbeing. This includes being able to respond to a range of variables including economic drivers and market trends and adapt, through change. It is accepted that adverse effects need to be managed to an appropriate standard. However, the Proposed District Plan policy framework as proposed, will force unduly onerous and unnecessary assessment requirements on resource consent applicants for little or no environmental benefit if it only focuses on recognising existing farms and farming infrastructure. The Proposed District Plan policy should instead emphasise values and attributes, and the type of farming activities which give rise to these, rather than restricting recognition specifically to existing activities.	Reject	5.1
FS1223.186	Mercury NZ Limited	Oppose	<i>Mercury seeks that the submission point is disallowed.</i>	<i>Mercury has an interest in the submission points listed in paragraphs 11.1 and 11.2 above. Mercury supports the protection of outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes in the context of section 6(b) of the RMA, where there has been a robust expert assessment undertaken to describe the values supporting an assessment of what is outstanding. The Waikato RPS Table 12.2 sets out factors that District Councils are to consider when undertaking such an assessment. Mercury considers that such a robust assessment has not been undertaken as part of the preparation of the PWDP.</i>	Accept	5.1
680.40	Federated Farmers of New	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 3.3.3 Protection from inappropriate	The submitter understands the intent of this	Reject	5.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
	Zealand		subdivision, use and development, as follows: (a) Ensure that the attributes of identified Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes are protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development by: (i) requiring <u>new</u> buildings and structures to be integrated into the Outstanding Natural Landscape or feature to minimise any visual impacts; (ii) managing the adverse effects of <u>new</u> building platforms, buildings, driveways and roads through appropriate subdivision design; (iii) requiring subdivision and development to retain views of Outstanding Natural Landscapes and features from public places; and (iv) avoiding the adverse effects of extractive industries and <u>inappropriate</u> earthworks. AND Any consequential changes needed to give effect to this relief.	policy. However consider that amendments are required to better meet RMA obligations and Waikato Regional Policy Statement direction.		
FS1223.187	Mercury NZ Limited	Oppose	Mercury seeks that the submission point is disallowed.	Mercury has an interest in the submission points listed in paragraphs 11.1 and 11.2 above. Mercury supports the protection of outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes in the context of section 6(b) of the RMA, where there has been a robust expert assessment undertaken to describe the values supporting an assessment of what is outstanding. The Waikato RPS Table 12.2 sets out factors that District Councils are to consider when undertaking such an assessment. Mercury considers that such a robust assessment has not been undertaken as part of the preparation of the PWDP.	Accept	5.1
680.41	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Support	Retain Policy 3.3.4 The relationships of Maaori with natural resources and land, as notified.	The submitter supports the principle of this policy which recognises that balance and compromise is required to be struck between the competing values of resource use and resource protection. The submitter expects this principle as expressed in 3.3.4 (b) to be applied consistently and a better balance struck in relation to use and development of private land within Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Outstanding Natural Features.	Accept	5.1
680.42	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Add a new clause (b) to Objective 3.4.1 Significant amenity landscapes, as follows: <u>(b) These areas will be identified and applied over public land only in recognition that zone specific rules are designed, in part, to manage adverse effects on amenity values created by private land use.</u>	The submitter understands the intent of this objective is to meet Waikato Regional Policy Statement (WRPS) Policy 12.3 direction. The WRPS does not explicitly require the amenity values of rural landscapes to be identified and managed. The submitter views the extra overlay of	Reject	5.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			where appropriate. AND Any consequential changes needed to give effect to this relief.	SAL objectives, polices and rules as they relate to rural activities on private land are an unnecessary duplication of rural zone rules. The submitter is opposed to any protection of a rural ideal, landscape or amenity that largely involves working landscapes there as a result of the activities you would expect to find in the rural zone. The submitter does not support unnecessary controls on activities in the rural area. The submitter is concerned at the lack of landowner involvement in the process of identifying significant amenity landscapes and understand that substantial areas of some farmland has been included. .		
FS1223.188	Mercury NZ Limited	Oppose	Mercury seeks that the submission point is disallowed.	Mercury has an interest in the submission points listed in paragraphs 11.1 and 11.2 above. Mercury supports the protection of outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes in the context of section 6(b) of the RMA, where there has been a robust expert assessment undertaken to describe the values supporting an assessment of what is outstanding. The Waikato RPS Table 12.2 sets out factors that District Councils are to consider when undertaking such an assessment. Mercury considers that such a robust assessment has not been undertaken as part of the preparation of the PWDP.	Accept	5.2
FS1108.51	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)	Oppose	Null	Inappropriate addition.	Accept	5.2
FS1139.42	Turangawaewae Trust Board	Oppose	Null	Inappropriate addition.	Accept	5.2
680.43	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 3.4.2 (a) Recognising Significant Amenity Landscapes, as follows: (a) Recognise the attributes which contribute to identified Significant Amenity Landscapes. (i) This policy will be implemented by the relevant zone rules which control effects of land use relative to the zone. AND Any consequential changes needed to give effect to this relief.	The submitter understands the intent of this policy is to meet Waikato Regional Policy Statement Policy (WRPS) 12.3 direction. However, the WRPS does not explicitly require the amenity values of rural landscapes to be identified and managed. The extra overlay of Significant Amenity Landscape objectives, polices and rules (as they relate to rural activities on private land) serve no useful purpose. These are an unnecessary duplication of other Rural Zone rules that control amenity through provisions for managing building bulk and location and certain earthworks. The submitter opposes any 'protection' of rural pastoral landscape amenity or characteristic over farmland, no matter how	Reject	5.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>'significant' such amenity may seem and oppose any associated restriction on land use within farmland, aimed at such protection. Farmland is a 'working landscape' that is always changing as a result of the rural-based activities that would be expected to be found within rural areas. Any restrictions aimed at protecting rural farmland amenity are completely unnecessary and do not achieve any environment benefit. Rather they only serve to burden farmers with undue delay and cost in having to seek resource consents in order to carry out routine farming activity and associated development.</p>		
FS1223.189	Mercury NZ Limited	Oppose	Mercury seeks that the submission point is disallowed.	Mercury has an interest in the submission points listed in paragraphs 11.1 and 11.2 above. Mercury supports the protection of outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes in the context of section 6(b) of the RMA, where there has been a robust expert assessment undertaken to describe the values supporting an assessment of what is outstanding. The Waikato RPS Table 12.2 sets out factors that District Councils are to consider when undertaking such an assessment. Mercury considers that such a robust assessment has not been undertaken as part of the preparation of the PWDP.	Accept	5.2
680.44	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 3.4.3 Maintaining and enhancing Significant Amenity Landscapes as follows: Policy 3.4.3 Maintaining and or where appropriate enhancing the attributes of Significant Amenity Landscapes (a) Maintain and, where appropriate, enhance the attributes of identified Significant Amenity Landscapes, during subdivision, land use and development, in particular by: (i) requiring buildings and structures to be integrated into the Significant Amenity Landscape to minimise any visual impacts; (ii) managing the adverse effects of building platforms, buildings, driveways and roads through appropriate subdivision design; (iii) recognising and providing for the continuation development of rural production farming activities within hill country landscapes and volcanic features; (iv) managing the adverse effects of earthworks; and (v) promoting and encouraging maintenance and enhancement of their attributes. (b) Note: There are no rules relating specifically to Significant Amenity Landscapes in Chapter 22. However, where discretionary or non-complying activity resource consents are required under rules of this Plan, and where	The submitter's relief in this respect is contingent on relief sought in relation to Objective 3.4.1 and Policy 3.4.2. The proposed policy as drafted contains a number of unnecessary duplications and is inconsistent with the enabling approach adopted under 3.4.4. The potential adverse effects associated with new development can be addressed under (ii). Non rural development earthworks will be addressed under (ii) so (iv) is an unnecessary duplication which may capture farming related earthworks inappropriately. The activities that have attributes which contribute to amenity values should be enabled and so it is important to acknowledge this in (iii), but it is broader than just farming. The proposed amendments are required to ensure a consistent planning response is adopted. Reference to made to the enabling intent of 3.4.4(b), which appropriately prioritises economic, social and cultural wellbeing over second tier amenity	Accept in part	5.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p><u>those activities are located within significant amenity landscapes, the proposed activities will be assessed in terms of their consistency with this policy.</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential changes needed to give effect to this relief.</p>	<p>landscapes. The Waikato Regional Policy Statement doesn't require rules as such. Rather, the overarching requirement to 'maintain and enhance' can be achieved by recognising all types of farming activity as contributing to rural landscape amenity, and excluding it from requirement for resource consent.</p> <p>Implementing the policy can be achieved when discretionary activity or non-complying activity status is triggered as a result of other resource consent requirements in the Proposed District Plan. An assessment of the adverse effects of the proposed activity can be considered, if appropriate, at that time. against significant landscape amenity values and the ability to avoid, remedy or mitigate those effects.</p>		
FS1223.190	Mercury NZ Limited	Oppose	Mercury seeks that the submission point is disallowed.	Mercury has an interest in the submission points listed in paragraphs 11.1 and 11.2 above. Mercury supports the protection of outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes in the context of section 6(b) of the RMA, where there has been a robust expert assessment undertaken to describe the values supporting an assessment of what is outstanding. The Waikato RPS Table 12.2 sets out factors that District Councils are to consider when undertaking such an assessment. Mercury considers that such a robust assessment has not been undertaken as part of the preparation of the PWDP.	Accept in part	5.2
FS1108.52	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)	Oppose	Null	Inappropriate addition.	Accept in part	5.2
FS1139.43	Turangawaewae Trust Board	Oppose	Null	Inappropriate addition.	Accept in part	5.2
680.45	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Support	Retain Policy 3.4.4 The relationships of Maaori with their resources and land, as notified.	The submitter supports the principle of this policy which recognises that balance and compromise is required to be struck between the competing values of resource use and resource protection, but this is contingent on our relief sought in relation to Objective 3.4.1 and Policies 3.4.2 and 3.4.3. The submitter expects this principle as expressed in 3.4.4(b) to be applied consistently across the district regardless of the land title.	Accept	5.2
680.46	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Support	Retain Objective 3.5.1 Natural Character, as notified.	The submitter understands the purpose and intent of this Objective.	Accept	5.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FSI223.191	Mercury NZ Limited	Oppose	Mercury seeks that the submission point is disallowed.	Mercury has an interest in the submission points listed in paragraphs 11.1 and 11.2 above. Mercury supports the protection of outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes in the context of section 6(b) of the RMA, where there has been a robust expert assessment undertaken to describe the values supporting an assessment of what is outstanding. The Waikato RPS Table 12.2 sets out factors that District Councils are to consider when undertaking such an assessment. Mercury considers that such a robust assessment has not been undertaken as part of the preparation of the PWDP.	Reject	5.3
680.47	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Oppose	Delete Policy 3.5.2 Recognising natural character AND Any consequential changes needed to give effect to this relief.	The submitter understands the coastal environment and rivers and lakes are particularly valued for natural character qualities which are predominant in these areas and the RMA section 6(a) and the Waikato Regional Policy Statement Policy 12.2 requirements. In the submitter's view, Policies 3.5.3 and 3.5.4 achieve those goals more appropriately, with Policy 3.5.2 being an unnecessary duplication, which has the ability to cause confusion and uncertainty leading to unnecessarily onerous requirements for assessment in resource consent applications. It is important to note the planning map legend includes overlays as 'coastal environment', 'natural character', 'outstanding natural landscapes'. There are no overlays on the legend which match the areas specified under 3.5.2(b).	Reject	5.3
FSI108.53	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)	Oppose	Null	Inappropriate addition.	Accept	5.3
FSI139.44	Turangawaewae Trust Board	Oppose	Null	Inappropriate addition.	Accept	5.3
680.48	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Delete clause (a)(vi) from Policy 3.5.3 (a) Protecting the natural character qualities of the coastal environment AND Amend Policy 3.5.3 (a) (viii) Protecting the natural character qualities of the coastal environment as follows: (viii) recognising historic farming operations that continue today; AND Add to Policy 3.5.3 (a) Protecting the natural character qualities of the coastal environment, a new 'Note' as	Whilst the submitter understands the intent of this policy it is important the note the planning map legend lists overlays as 'coastal environment', 'natural character', 'outstanding natural landscapes'. There are no overlays on the legend which match areas specified as outstanding natural character areas. Focus must be on land use controls to purposes which fall within the jurisdiction of the district council.	Accept in part	5.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p>follows: Note the Policy will not be implemented until such time as the areas of outstanding natural character within the coastal environment have been appropriately identified and included into the planning maps.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential changes needed to give effect to this relief.</p>			
FS1275.4	Zeala Limited trading as Aztech Buildings	Support	Allow.	Like all aspects of society farming is evolving, with many innovations providing both increased productivity and enhance environmental outcomes. Having a Policy relating to the protection of the natural qualities of the coastal environment limited to historic farming operations in inappropriate.	Accept in part	5.3
FS1223.192	Mercury NZ Limited	Oppose	Mercury seek that the submission point is disallowed.	Mercury has an interest in the submission points listed in paragraphs 11.1 and 11.2 above. Mercury supports the protection of outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes in the context of section 6(b) of the RMA, where there has been a robust expert assessment undertaken to describe the values supporting an assessment of what is outstanding. The Waikato RPS Table 12.2 sets out factors that District Councils are to consider when undertaking such an assessment. Mercury considers that such a robust assessment has not been undertaken as part of the preparation of the PWDP.	Accept in part	5.3
FS1108.54	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)	Oppose	Null	Inappropriate addition.	Accept in part	5.3
FS1139.45	Turangawaewae Trust Board	Oppose	Null	Inappropriate addition.	Accept in part	5.3
680.49	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 3.5.4 Protecting the natural character of wetlands, and lakes and rivers and their margins, as follows: (a) Protect the natural character qualities of wetlands, and lakes and rivers and their margins from inappropriate subdivision, use and development by: (i) ensuring that location, intensity, scale and form of subdivision, use and development are appropriate; (ii) minimising, to the extent practicable and necessary indigenous vegetation clearance and modification (including earthworks, disturbance and structures); (iii) encouraging any new activities to consolidate within, and around, existing developments or, where the natural character and landscape values have already been compromised, to avoid development sprawling; and (iv) requiring appropriate setbacks of	The submitter understands that the intent of this policy is to meet RMA section 6(a) and the Waikato Regional Policy statement Policy 2.2 requirements, however considers amendments are required to better meet the Waikato Regional Policy Statement direction. The submitter is unsure of the drafting of 3.5.4 (a)(ii) and what the relationship between the activities contained within the brackets is.	Accept in part	5.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p>activities from wetlands, lakes and rivers. (b) <u>Determining what is inappropriate use and development will be considered with respect to the level of natural character. Where man-made elements/influences are dominant, it may be appropriate that activities result in further adverse effect on natural character.</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential changes needed to give effect to this relief.</p>			
FS1223.193	Mercury NZ Limited	Oppose	Mercury seeks that the submission point is disallowed.	Mercury has an interest in the submission points listed in paragraphs 11.1 and 11.2 above. Mercury supports the protection of outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes in the context of section 6(b) of the RMA, where there has been a robust expert assessment undertaken to describe the values supporting an assessment of what is outstanding. The Waikato RPS Table 12.2 sets out factors that District Councils are to consider when undertaking such an assessment. Mercury considers that such a robust assessment has not been undertaken as part of the preparation of the PWDP.	Accept in part	5.3
695.10	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Oppose	Delete Policy 3.5.3(a)(iii) Protecting the natural character qualities of the coastal environment.	It is too open ended. It has no threshold required by s95 and 104 of the Resource Management Act to define a potential or actual effect or assisting to write certain resource conditions. It is unclear if the overlay only applies to part of a site or part of an area proposed to be developed. Policy 3.5.3(ii) is considered to cover this aspect and places the onus on the applicant to demonstrate evidence.	Reject	5.3
FS1223.202	Mercury NZ Limited	Oppose	Mercury seeks that the submission point is disallowed.	Mercury has an interest in the submission points listed in paragraphs 11.1 and 11.2 above. Mercury supports the protection of outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes in the context of section 6(b) of the RMA, where there has been a robust expert assessment undertaken to describe the values supporting an assessment of what is outstanding. The Waikato RPS Table 12.2 sets out factors that District Councils are to consider when undertaking such an assessment. Mercury considers that such a robust assessment has not been undertaken as part of the preparation of the PWDP.	Accept	5.3
695.11	Sharp Planning Solutions	Oppose	Delete Policy 3.5.4(a)(iii) Protecting the natural character	Policy 3.5.4(a)(iii) is meaningless It is too open	Reject	5.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
	Ltd		of wetlands, and lakes and rivers and their margins.	ended It has no threshold required by s95 and 104 of the Act to define a potential or actual effect or assisting to write certain resource conditions Development cannot consolidate with existing development unless it adjoins such land and connections have been provided for in that previous development. It is very unclear as to what extent does the "natural character and landscape values have already been compromised" mean to the user of the Plan. All development takes up land - "sprawling' is not defined as to what it means in terms of an identifiable threshold or ration of area and a reference to an objective definition or source may assist.		
FS1223.203	Mercury NZ Limited	Oppose	Mercury seeks that the submission point is disallowed.	Mercury has an interest in the submission points listed in paragraphs 11.1 and 11.2 above. Mercury supports the protection of outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes in the context of section 6(b) of the RMA, where there has been a robust expert assessment undertaken to describe the values supporting an assessment of what is outstanding. The Waikato RPS Table 12.2 sets out factors that District Councils are to consider when undertaking such an assessment. Mercury considers that such a robust assessment has not been undertaken as part of the preparation of the PWDP.	Accept	5.3
FS1377.199	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	HVL supports amendments to the Plan that provide for a greater development potential and a wider variety of densities and zones. Policy 3.5.4(a)(iii) should be amended so as to recognise other effects management tools.	Reject	5.3
FS1108.147	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)	Oppose	Null	Delete policy protecting natural character.	Accept	5.3
695.12	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Oppose	Amend Policy 3.5.4(a)(iv) Protecting the natural character of wetlands, and lakes and rivers and their margins to include a reference to a specific rule, or requirement of the Resource Management Act, is placed here to assist the reader.	Open ended subjective statements will only frustrate applicants as it provides no certainty what is actually to be complied with.	Reject	5.3
FS1223.204	Mercury NZ Limited	Oppose	Mercury seeks that the submission point is disallowed.	Mercury has an interest in the submission points listed in paragraphs 11.1 and 11.2 above. Mercury supports the protection of outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes in the context of section 6(b) of the RMA, where there has been a	Accept	5.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>robust expert assessment undertaken to describe the values supporting an assessment of what is outstanding. The Waikato RPS Table 12.2 sets out factors that District Councils are to consider when undertaking such an assessment. Mercury considers that such a robust assessment has not been undertaken as part of the preparation of the PWDP.</i>		
695.87	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.2.4.4 Earthworks - Landscape and Natural Character Areas so that the 50m ² area figure is volume and the 250m ³ volume figure is area.	The volume compared to area is 5:1 ratio, so every 1m ² of works can allow 5m ³ volume to occur, which is very intensive and likely to cause environmental damage. The figures seem to be inconsistent with Rule 22.2.3.3 and is considered an error.	Accept	7.1
695.88	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.2.4.4 Earthworks - Landscape and Natural Character so that the earthworks applied within the affected area by the overlay (as distinct from the whole of the site) as a 1:5 ratio to site area. i.e if 500m ² occurs in the overlay, only 100m ² area and 100m ³ volume will be allowed.	This better reflects the qualities of the overlay intent of the natural character. 250m ³ of works as a static approach regardless of site size is not practical.	Reject	7.1
731.11	Jean Tregidga	Oppose	Amend Policy 3.4.3 (a) Maintaining and enhancing Significant Amenity Landscapes, by inserting an additional sub-clause (vi) as follows: <u>(vi) recognising historic farming and forestry operations that continue today.</u>	In the event that the policy is not deleted, the requested sub-clause (a)(vi) adopts words from Policy 3.5.3 (Protecting the natural character qualities of the coastal environment) about historic land use which are equally appropriate to Significant Natural Areas, Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes which are mapped on this submitter's properties at Lyons Road, Mangatawhiri.	Reject	5.2
FS1180.11	Jean Tregidga	Support	Seek that the whole of the submission be allowed.	<i>These are the only properties in NZ that I am aware of that have been planted and left to mature with Indigenous species. Conservation lands administered by DOC are protected under the Conservation Act and no harvesting is permitted Therefore it leaves a private land owner to supply interested parties with a supply of indigenous timber. My blocks were set up for the long term supply of specialised timber for use in boat building, furniture, poles, farm gates, fence posts/batteries and other small items. Nothing was ever wasted right down to even small branches. The Forest Act recognises the rights of land owners to obtain an economic return from a privately owned asset but also identifies their responsibility to maintain a healthy forest and functioning ecosystem. It aims to</i>	Reject	5.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>achieve an appropriate balance between productive use and maintenance of the forests natural values.</i>		
747.7	Ryburn Lagoon Trust Limited	Oppose	Delete Rule 22.2.3.4 PI (a)(i)-(iv) Earthworks within Landscape and Natural Character Areas AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to provide other such relief and consequential amendments as to give effect sought in the submissions.	Rule 22.2.3.4 PI (a) applies conditions to earthworks for the maintenance of existing tracks, fences, or drains within an identified Landscape and Natural Character Area. The conditions specifying volumes, depth and slope ((i)-(iv)) should be deleted from the maintenance of existing tracks, fences, or drains in these rules. The maintenance of these features as they are, and within the footprints already occupied, will ensure the characteristics that contribute to the significance of the area are not adversely affected. The conditions at (v)-(vii) provide standards for the reinstatement of earthworks, including re-vegetation, sediment control and natural water flow requirements. There is no reason to apply additional limitations on volumes, depth and setback of earthworks given the earthworks are for physical features already in place.	Accept in part	7.1
FS1387.987	Mercury NZ Limited	Oppose		At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure.	Accept in part	7.1
749.84	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.2.4.4 PI (a)(ii) Earthworks - Landscape and Natural Character Areas to change the area from 50m ² to 250m ² and the volume from 250m ³ to 50m ³ . AND Amend the Proposed District Plan as consequential or additional relief as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission as necessary.	The submitter generally opposes the maximum volume and area allowed in the permitted activities listed in 16.2.4.4 and seeks the figures are amended.	Accept	7.1
FS1293.58	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	<i>The Director-General opposes an increase to permitted activity standards for earthworks. Earthworks increase the amount of sediment entering waterways, impacting on waterways, estuaries and the coast. Earthworks can also have visual amenity effects. The Director-General opposes an increase in permitted earthworks area and volume in landscape and natural character areas which have identified values that require protecting and can be easily adversely</i>	Reject	7.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>impacted by earthworks.</i>		
749.93	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Neutral/Amend	Amend the Proposed District Plan to clarify what is meant by 'high' and 'very high' natural character areas such as through additional or amended definitions of the terms. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan as consequential or additional relief as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission as necessary.	The submitter generally supports the objectives and policies of the Natural Character. However, it is unclear to what is 'high' and 'very high' natural character areas mean. The words are outlined in Policies 3.5.2(b)(ii) however there is no definition or explanation to the meanings of high and very high natural character areas.	Accept	10.1
FS1377.261	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	HVL supports amendments that improve clarity and usability in the Plan.	Accept	10.1
780.21	John Lawson on behalf of Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Incorporated Society	Oppose	Add policies and rules to protect ridgelines from development. AND Amend Policy 3.3.2 (a0(i) to not just recognise but to protect.	Policy 3.3.2 (a) (i) only recognises the attributes. Ridgelines are widely visible, so development of them has a disproportionate effect.	Reject	5.1
FS1258.32	Meridian Energy Limited	Oppose	Disallow	The submission point does not specify the location or extent of ridgelines to which the mooted rules should apply and does not define what 'protect' means in terms of rules and policy framework. It is not possible to determine what the potential effect would be for structures, including infrastructure installations. Meridian questions the vires of the requested amendment and, in the absence of the necessary detail, Meridian opposes the submission point.	Accept	5.1
FS1377.275	Havelock Village Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	There is no statutory basis for the protection of ridgelines that are not within a high value overlay and no need or justification for any additional provisions in the Plan on this matter.	Accept	5.1
FS1342.213	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow submission point 780.21.	FFNZ opposes the relief sought. The notified Policy 3.3.2 has the appropriate focus and direction required to meet RMA requirements.	Accept	5.1
FS1340.143	TaTa Valley Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	The submitter opposes submission 780.21 as some development should be able to occur on ridgelines. Development on ridgelines is subject to LVA considerations and as such protection to ridgelines already exists. It is also unclear as to what policies and rules are envisioned and as such, the submitter opposes the submission on the basis that it is unclear as to what is proposed. The amendment to Policy 3.3.2 (a)(i) will also result in any development being	Accept	5.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>subject to an overly restrictive policy framework.</i>		
785.71	Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Limited and Mobil Oil NZ Limited for 'Oil Companies'	Support	Retain the mapping of the Coastal Environment, insofar the only relevant provisions are Objective 3.5.1 (a) and maximum permitted earthworks thresholds within mapped High or Outstanding Natural Character areas of the coastal environment. AND Retain Objective 3.5.1 (a) Natural Character as notified. AND Retain the maximum permitted earthwork thresholds of 50m ² area and 250m ³ volume within mapped High or Outstanding Natural Character areas of the coastal environment, noting these earthworks provisions apply to all zones with the exception of the Business Zone.	The submitter supports the mapping of the Coastal Environment, insofar as outlined in Objective 3.5.1 and the relevant earthworks thresholds. Given the sensitive nature of High or Outstanding Natural Character areas of the coastal environment and the fact that they are mapped in the proposed District Plan, the submitter supports a more conservative approach in regards to the permitted earthworks volumes within this overlay. The submitter notes that the earthwork volumes do not apply to the Business Zone.	Reject	17.1
81.104	Waikato Regional Council	Support	Retain Objective 3.3.1 Outstanding natural features and landscapes.	Objective 3.3.1 is supported as it gives effect to Objective 3.20 and Policy 12.1 of the WRPS.	Accept	5.1
81.105	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Section 3.3 Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes to require that adverse effects of activities on the values and characteristics of Outstanding Natural Feature Landscapes are avoided in the coastal environment.	The policy framework under section 3.3 takes the same approach to Outstanding natural features and landscapes (ONFL) regardless of whether they are in the coastal environment or outside of the coastal environment. Policy 6.2(c), Implementation Method 12.1.1 (a)(i) of the WRPS and Policy 15 of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement require that the adverse effects of activities on ONFL are avoided. Policy 3.3.3 (iv) of the Proposed Plan talks about avoiding, however that is only in the context of two specific activities; extractive industries and earthworks.	Accept in part	5.1
<i>FS1223.150</i>	<i>Mercury NZ Limited</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Mercury seeks that these submissions are allowed</i>	<i>Mercury supports the protection of outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes in the context of section 6(b) of the RMA, where there has been a robust expert assessment undertaken to describe the values supporting an assessment of what is outstanding. The Waikato RPS Table 12.2 sets out factors that District Councils are to consider when undertaking such an assessment. Mercury considers that such a robust assessment has not been undertaken as part of the preparation of the PWDP.</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>5.1</i>
81.106	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Section 3.3 Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes to ensure that, for areas outside of the coastal environment, the hierarchy set out in Implementation Method 12.1.1 (a)(ii) of the WRPS is reflected. I.e. avoid adverse effects, where avoidance is not possible remedy or	For areas outside of the coastal environment, the policy framework in section 3.3 does not reflect the mitigation hierarchy that is expressed in Implementation Method 12.1.1 (a)(ii) of the WRPS that is avoid adverse effects of activities on the	Accept in part	5.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			mitigate.	values and characteristics of ONFL, and if avoidance is not possible remedy or mitigate the adverse effects.		
FS1223.151	Mercury NZ Limited	Support	Mercury seeks that these submissions are allowed	Mercury supports the protection of outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes in the context of section 6(b) of the RMA, where there has been a robust expert assessment undertaken to describe the values supporting an assessment of what is outstanding. The Waikato RPS Table 12.2 sets out factors that District Councils are to consider when undertaking such an assessment. Mercury considers that such a robust assessment has not been undertaken as part of the preparation of the PWDP.	Accept in part	5.1
81.107	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Section 3.3 Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes to address cumulative adverse effects.	The policies do not specifically address cumulative adverse effects as required by Policy 12.1 of the WRPS.		5.1
FS1223.152	Mercury NZ Limited	Support	Mercury seeks that these submissions are allowed	Mercury supports the protection of outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes in the context of section 6(b) of the RMA, where there has been a robust expert assessment undertaken to describe the values supporting an assessment of what is outstanding. The Waikato RPS Table 12.2 sets out factors that District Councils are to consider when undertaking such an assessment. Mercury considers that such a robust assessment has not been undertaken as part of the preparation of the PWDP.		5.1
81.108	Waikato Regional Council	Support	Retain objectives, policies, rules and maps for Significant Amenity Landscapes.	The submitter supports the approach to significant amenity landscapes as a way to give effect to Policy 12.3 of the WRPS.	Accept	5.2
FS1334.87	Fulton Hogan Limited	Support	Allow with the exception of removing the Significant Amenity Landscapes overlay as it applies to Tuakau Quarry and the areas identified within the Aggregate Extraction Area overlay as per submission point 575.26.	In principle, Fulton Hogan supports the identification and protection of Significant Amenity Landscapes across the district. However, in the case of the Tuakau Quarry, Fulton Hogan oppose the application of the Significant Amenity Landscape as this is a misrepresentation of what the existing environment looks like and is inappropriate given the use of the land for a quarry and other activities not usually found in Significant Amenity Landscapes. More importantly, this overlay overlaps with the Aggregate Extraction Area overlay, creating unnecessary confusion as to what takes priority and will make any future expansion of the quarry unnecessarily complex	Accept	5.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>and costly.</i>		
FS1340.23	TaTa Valley Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	The submitter opposes submission point 81.108. The objectives and policies reference the 'attributes' and 'features' of SALs which are not provided in the Proposed District Plan.	Reject	5.2
81.109	Waikato Regional Council	Support	Retain Objective 3.5.1 Natural character.	Objective 3.5.1 is supported as it gives effect to Objective 3.22 of the WRPS.	Accept	5.3
81.162	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Clarify the earthwork thresholds (area and volume) for the landscape and natural character areas, across all zones.	The submitter notes that the earthwork thresholds are lower for Landscape and Natural Character Areas in comparison to the rest of the Rural Zone. This is appropriate to achieve Policy 12.1, 12.2 and 12.3 of the WRPS. However, the submitter seeks clarity on what the thresholds are for the second part of the table that runs onto page 13. It is unclear if the 50m2 area and 250m3 volume applies or if the figures have been omitted.	Accept	7.1
81.165	Waikato Regional Council	Support	Retain Rule 22.3.3 Buildings and structures in Landscape and Natural Character Areas.	The submitter supports the provision of dwellings, buildings and structures in landscape or natural character areas as a discretionary activity. This gives effect to Policy 6.2, 12.1, 12.2, 12.3 of the WRPS.	Accept	8.1
81.181	Waikato Regional Council	Support	Retain Outstanding Natural Features as identified in the planning maps.	The WRPS identifies outstanding natural features and landscapes of regional significant in Section 12A.	Accept in part	11.1
FS1334.86	Fulton Hogan Limited	Support	Allow with the exception of removing the Outstanding Natural Feature Overlay as it applies to Waingaro Quarry and the areas identified within the Aggregate Extraction Area overlay as per submission point 575.25.	In principle, Fulton Hogan support the identification and protection of Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes across the district. However, in the case of Waingaro Quarry, Fulton Hogan oppose the application of the Outstanding Natural Feature overlay as it is directly adjacent to current operations and land that is subject to the Aggregate Extraction Areas overlay. The overlapping overlays creates unnecessary confusion as to what takes priority and will make any future expansion of these quarries complex and costly.	Accept in part	11.1
FS1333.25	Fonterra Limited	Support	Allow the relief.	Fonterra supports the confirmation that the Plan correctly reflects all areas identified within the WRPS.	Accept in part	11.1
81.182	Waikato Regional Council	Support	Retain Outstanding Natural Landscapes as identified in the planning maps.	The WRPS identifies outstanding natural features and landscapes of regional significant in Section 12A.	Accept in part	12.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1062.14	Andrew and Christine Gore	Oppose	Seek to disallow submission point 81.182.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These landscapes have not been identified by experts. • A blanket overlay approach is not acceptable. 	Accept in part	12.1
FS1333.26	Fonterra Limited	Support	Allow the relief.	Fonterra supports the confirmation that the Plan correctly reflects all areas identified within the WRPS.	Accept in part	12.1
81.183	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Clarify the approach taken to the extent of the outstanding natural feature for Mount Karioi.	The WRPS identifies outstanding natural features and landscapes of regional significant in Section 12A. ONFL 4 Mount Karioi and Outstanding Natural Feature Landscape 7 Mount Pirongia are within, or partly within the Waikato District. These Outstanding Natural Feature Landscapes have been identified in the Proposed Plan planning maps. However the extent of the Outstanding Natural Feature Landscape overlay for Mount Karioi is significantly less than what is identified in the WRPS, with the rest of the area identified as Significant Amenity Landscape. The submitter seeks to understand further the rationale behind this approach.	Accept	11.1
81.184	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Clarify the approach taken to the extent of the outstanding natural landscape for Mount Karioi.	The WRPS identifies outstanding natural features and landscapes of regional significant in Section 12A. Outstanding Natural Feature Landscape 4 Mount Karioi and ONFL 7 Mount Pirongia are within, or partly within the Waikato District. These Outstanding Natural Feature Landscape have been identified in the proposed plan planning maps. However the extent of the Outstanding Natural Feature Landscape L overlay for Mount Karioi is significantly less than what is identified in the WRPS, with the rest of the area identified as Significant Amenity Landscape. The submitter seeks to understand further the rationale behind this approach.	Accept	12.1
81.185	Waikato Regional Council	Support	Retain Natural Character on the planning maps.	Areas of outstanding and high natural character have been assessed and mapped in the Coastal Environment. The submitter supports this as a way of achieving section 6(a) RMA, Policy 12.2 of the WRPS and Policy 13 of the NZCPS.	Accept in part	14.1
81.189	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Add to Policy 3.3.2(b) an additional bullet point recognising the flood protection and flood water attenuation properties of the features for example: (vii) existing water reservoirs and dams.	Policy 3.3.2 (b) pertains to recognising the value and qualities of various sites. Flood infrastructure, particularly the use of Lake Waikare and Whangamarino is not included,	Reject	5.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				however, plays an important role in managing flood waters in the area. While not specifically listed in this policy, Lake Waikere is listed as an outstanding natural feature, and could also be listed here. No relief has been sought for this however.		
FS1223.148	Mercury NZ Limited	Support	Mercury seeks that these submissions are allowed	Mercury supports a policy framework that provides for a functional, resilient stormwater and flood storage system. The RMA requires Waikato District Council to evaluate flood and stormwater risk in its section 32 assessment and to have regard to the evaluation report when preparing the PWDP. Mercury does not consider an adequate assessment has been undertaken and therefore the current policy framework for stormwater and flood storage is flawed.	Reject	5.1
FS1045.10	Auckland/Waikato Fish and Game Council	Oppose	Existing reservoirs and dams are not attributes which fall under the category of "outstanding natural features" and it is inappropriate to include these in this section. Listing Lake Waikare as an outstanding natural feature, as stated in the "reasons" of the submission would appropriately address the relief sought if it is not already encompassed by the provision.		Accept	5.1
825.21	John Lawson	Oppose	Add policies and rules to protect ridgelines from development. AND Amend Policy 3.3.2 (a)(i) t not just recognise but protect.	Policy 3.3.2 (a) (i) only recognises the attributes. Ridgelines are widely visible, so development of them has a disproportionate effect.	Reject	5.1
FS1342.231	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow submission point 825.21.	FFNZ opposes the relief sought. The notified Policy 3.3.2 has the appropriate focus and direction required to meet RMA requirements.	Accept	5.1
FS1258.33	Meridian Energy Limited	Oppose	Disallow	The submission point does not specify the location or extent of ridgelines to which the mooted rules should apply and does not define what 'protect' means in terms of rules and policy framework. It is not possible to determine what the potential effect would be for structures, including infrastructure installations. Meridian questions the vires of the requested amendment and, in the absence of the necessary detail, Meridian opposes the submission point	Accept	5.1
FS1208.13	Rangitahi Limited	Oppose	Seek that the whole of the submission point be disallowed.	Housing affordability will be assisted by increasing the number of houses in Raglan and providing a range of housing options .	Accept	5.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
827.10	New Zealand Steel Holdings Ltd	Support	Amend the provisions to clarify that the Natural Character overlay includes both high and outstanding natural character areas. AND Any other further or consequential amendments required.	There are no high outstanding natural character areas identified on the mine site.	Accept	18.1
831.18	Gabrielle Parson on behalf of Raglan Naturally	Oppose	Amend the Coastal Environment Overlay to become a conservation area that includes Raglan and require all major developments that infringe the District Plan rules or exceed one storey to be publicly notified.	The character of Raglan is of value and should be perpetuated by limiting developments to one storey and requiring features as described in the 2003 Waikato District Council Design Guide. Most of the street corners have single storey building which are, or should be, heritage buildings. The character statement for Raglan recognises small scale buildings (that have one or two levels with narrow frontages).	Reject	17.1
FS1276.246	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Support	WED seeks that the whole of the submission point be allowed.	Raglan has long been recognised by Council as being a 'jewel in the crown' and having a 'seaside village character.' Retention of that character is threatened by a uniformity of new developments, which are of an urban character. These submissions address that threat and should be incorporated in the District Plan, primarily by confirming Raglan Naturally's role, as set out in the Waikato Blueprint adopted by council in June 2019, which aims to "provide a high-level 'spatial picture' of how the district could progress over the next 30 years, address the community's social, economic and environmental needs, and respond to its regional context. The Blueprint will provide the Waikato District Council with an effective and legible tool to move from vision to strategy, and from strategy to action by setting out specific, prioritised initiatives at the district and local level." And which includes these statements- "WDC should work with the Community Board and Raglan Naturally and Tangata Whenua to define, strengthen and communicate Raglan's special identity. The top priority initiatives for Raglan include: Building a strong identity for the town. Supporting Raglan Naturally in their prioritised local initiatives such as local food production, energy self sufficiency, alternatives to weed spraying, GE free approaches and education regarding climate change. Partnering with Raglan Naturally in respect to planning processes."	Reject	17.1
FS1381.7	Counties Power Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	CPL opposes the entire Coastal Environment overlay becoming a conservation area (including Raglan),	Accept	17.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				where all major changes and consents which infringe District Plan rules, of which exceed one storey, are publicly notified. The submitter seeks to introduce a compulsory public notification of all development that fails to meet any of the district plan standards within the Coastal Overlay. This is inefficient and will result in costly consent costs. Not all rules relate to the built form and not all development, two storied or otherwise, will necessarily create adverse environmental effects that warrant public notification. It is considered that it is more efficient to rely on the process embedded within the RMA to determine the appropriate level of notification for any resource consent application		
FS1329.23	Koning Family Trust and Martin Koning	Oppose	Oppose. Disallow that part of the submission that seeks to establish compulsory notification in the Coastal Overlay Area.	The submitter seeks to introduce a compulsory public notification of all development that fails to meet any of the district plan standards or is two storied within the Coastal Overlay. This is inefficient and will result in costly consent costs. Not all rules relate to the built form and not all development, two storied or otherwise, will necessarily create adverse environmental effects that warrant public notification. It is considered that it is more efficient to rely on the process embedded within the RMA to determine the appropriate level of notification for any resource consent application.	Accept	17.1
FS1276.141	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Support	WED seeks that the whole submission point be allowed.	WED supports all activities that do not comply with the District Plan being publicly notified in order to protect the character of Raglan.	Reject	17.1
831.65	Gabrielle Parson on behalf of Raglan Naturally	Support	Retain Policy 3.5.4 Protecting the natural character of wetlands, and lakes and rivers and their margins, and the associated rules.	The submitter supports the restoration of wetlands.	Accept in part	5.3
836.33	Rebecca Dearden on behalf of Powerco	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 3.4.3(a)(i) Maintaining and enhancing Significant Amenity Landscapes as follows: (i) requiring buildings and structures (excluding support structures) to be integrated into the Significant Amenity Land to minimise any visual impacts; OR Add an introduction to Chapter 6 Infrastructure to clearly state that these objectives and policies supersede underlying zone and overlay objectives and policies.	Support structures come in standard sizes and materials to meet a functional need and achieve electrical safety requirements. They cannot be painted or planted around to mitigate visual effects. Support structures and lines are already in the existing environment of Significant Amenity Landscapes and does not detract from these areas. Given the narrow width of the narrow width of support structures and limited visibility of the lines existing within these landscapes, it is considered they be excluded from this policy.	Reject	5.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
924.11	Alice Barnett for Genesis Energy Limited	Neutral/Amend	Delete the Significant Amenity Landscape overlay from the Huntly Power Station on the Planning Maps.	The submitter supports the general approach to maintain and enhance identified Significant Amenity Landscapes (SAL) as detailed in Section 3.4- Significant Amenity Landscapes. The area of the site's intake forebay and cooling water discharge has been identified as a SAL. It is not appropriate for this area be mapped as a SAL as public access is restricted due to significant health and safety risk. This area is zoned Heavy Industrial in the Proposed District Plan and there are no amenity landscapes in this area that need to be mapped or protected.	Accept in part Accept in part Accept in part	15.1 16.1 16.1
924.12	Alice Barnett for Genesis Energy Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Planning Maps by removing the Significant Amenity Landscape (SAL) overlay from 'Scott Farm,' Te Ohaki Road, Huntly as identified on the submission map.	The submitter supports the general approach to maintain and enhance identified Significant Amenity Landscapes (SAL) as detailed in Section 3.4- Significant Amenity Landscapes. An area of the 'Scott Farm' land which the submitter owns has been identified as a SAL. This area is a productive dairy farm, in a rural landscape, and it forms part of the overall Huntly Power Station ash management regime, rather than an area with high amenity value that warrants protection. The submitter is concerned that the overlay may compromise the existing use of that land as a pastoral farm, the operation of the Huntly Power Station ash disposal system and the site enhancement and/or remediation work that the submitter is undertaking or proposes. Identification of this land as part of a SAL is inconsistent with operational uses of the land and health and safety matters arising from those operations.	Accept in part Accept in part Accept in part	15.1 16.1 16.1
942.12	Angeline Greensill for Tainui o Tainui	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 3.3.2(a)(i) Recognising values and qualities to recognise and "protect" the attributes of ridgelines.	No reasons provided.	Reject	5.1
FS1377.301	Havelock Village Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	Some development should be able to occur on ridgelines if they are not considered as prominent ridgelines and there are other methods to mitigate effects.	Accept	5.1
FS1258.44	Meridian Energy Limited	Oppose	Disallow	The submission point does not specify the location or extent of ridgelines to which the mooted protections should apply and does not define what 'protect' means in terms of rules and policy framework. It is not possible to determine what the potential effect would	Accept	5.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>be for structures, including infrastructure installations. In the absence of this detail, Meridian opposes the submission point.</i>		
942.42	Angeline Greensill for Tainui o Tainui	Oppose	No specific decision sought, but the submitter comments that the methodology (including section 1.5.7.2 Landscape and Natural Character) used to assess landscape and natural character is eurocentric and ignores cultural context.	The methodology used to assess landscape and natural character continues to deal with these in a eurocentric manner ignoring the cultural context.	Reject	4.3
943.20	McCracken Surveys Limited	Oppose	Amend the planning maps to identify "Outstanding Natural Character Areas" and "High Natural Character Areas".	"Outstanding Natural Character Areas" and "High Natural Character Areas" appear throughout the Proposed Waikato District Plan but are not defined on the planning maps.	Accept	18.1
984.17	Glenda Raumati on behalf of Trustee Turangawaewae Trust Board	Not Stated	No specific decision sought but submission supports the identification of areas of high and outstanding natural character and outstanding natural features and landscapes, and the engagement of experts in this field and with mana whenua.	No reason provided.	Accept in part Accept in part Accept	11.1 12.1 14.1
984.18	Glenda Raumati on behalf of Trustee Turangawaewae Trust Board	Not Stated	Amend the Proposed District Plan to include the Waikato River in its entirety as both an Outstanding Natural Feature and an Outstanding Natural Landscape AND Amend the Proposed District Plan maps to include the Waikato River in its entirety as both an Outstanding Natural Feature and an Outstanding Natural Landscape.	Turangawaewae Trust Board do not support the assessment of, and the non-inclusion of the Waikato River as an Outstanding Natural Feature and/or Landscape. Turangawaewae Trust Board do not believe that parts of the Waikato River can be cut into sections and not viewed holistically. The assessment of the Waikato River as an Outstanding Natural Feature and Landscape is both a historic and contemporary issue. A variety of legislative and policy directions have been developed that support the identification of the Waikato River as an Outstanding Natural Feature and Landscape. The Waikato-Tainui Raupatu Claims (Waikato River) Settlement Act 2010 talks of the significance and holistic nature of the Waikato River is viewed. The submission quotes Part 2, Settlement redress through legislation (8). This acknowledgement by the Crown that the Waikato River should be considered in its entirety and not divided, as it has been assessed in the Proposed District Plan, provides what the river settlement legislation was seeking. The Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River was required to be included without amendment in the Waikato Regional Policy Statement. The Regional Policy Statement	Accept in part	13.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>review assessed the Waikato River as an Outstanding Natural Feature and Landscape. This was removed in the decision's version on the basis that the Waikato River had been modified too significantly, in particular the part of the river flowing through Hamilton City to be deemed an Outstanding Natural Feature or Landscape and that the necessary assessments and understanding of the cultural significance has not been undertaken to support the rivers inclusion. Fast forward to the current situation where Waikato District Council are assessing the river at a more detailed district level, that does not include Hamilton City. In addition Waikato District Council have a greater understanding of the cultural significance of the Waikato River to Waikato-Tainui through the engagement process. The Proposed Plan and maps provide for the Waikato River as an Outstanding Natural Feature, only from the river Delta to inside the river mouth. Turangawaewae Trust Board are of the opinion the Waikato River is an Outstanding Natural Feature in its entirety and the reasons for it not attaining regionally significance was based on interpretation and lack of work on behalf of those researching the cultural significance of the river. The Waikato River is recognised by statute and is the subject of a previously unique authority that funds the restoration and protection annually. Alone this legislative weight potentially justifies its status as an Outstanding Natural Feature and Landscape at a district level. Of more importance is the cultural connection that Waikato-Tainui have with the Waikato River. Whilst the landscape assessment attached to the Proposed Plan does not support the entire river being included, it does as a starting point provide justification as to how the assessment was made (submission refers to the Proposed Plan Appendix 3). The cultural and heritage values do not neatly fit into the specific feature or landscape assessment criteria, however engagement with iwi and understanding the districts identity should have seen the Waikato River included as an Outstanding Natural Feature or Landscape or both. The lines that are blurred on the margins of</p>		

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				the river by wetlands, tributaries, islands and river use in general only add to the rivers significance. Because the river does not sit neatly as an Outstanding Natural Feature or Outstanding Natural Landscape, that it should be considered both, and afforded the highest protection rather than defaulting to a partial categorisation that undermines its significance. The assessment criteria used appears to isolate features or places, rather than taking a more holistic approach. If this had been the case Waikato-Tainui assume that the Waikato River would have been deemed Outstanding; both as a landscape and a feature.		
FS1345.137	Genesis Energy Limited	Oppose	Reject submission point.	The implications of identifying the entire Waikato River as an ONF and ONL have not been fully assessed and there may be significant unintended consequences of identifying the entire river as an ONL and ONF.	Accept in part	13.1
FS1108.184	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)	Support	Null	Oppose in principle.	Accept in part	13.1
984.19	Glenda Raumati on behalf of Trustee Turangawaewae Trust Board	Not Stated	Amend the Proposed District Plan after undertaking a natural character assessment for the Waikato River to determine if there are any areas of high or outstanding natural character.	Turangawaewae Trust Board have concerns that no natural character assessment has been undertaken for the Waikato River.	Reject	14.1
FS1340.196	TaTa Valley Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	The submitter considers this relief to be unnecessary given the recognition of the Waikato River under the Vision and Strategy.	Accept	14.1
680.143	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Oppose	Delete the definition of "High Natural Character Area" from Chapter 13 Definitions. AND Any consequential amendments needed to give effect to this relief.	This definition provides no purpose as there is no High Natural Character Area layer identified on the planning maps.	Reject	10.1
680.207	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.2.3.4 PI Earthworks - within Landscape and Natural Character Areas, as follows: (a) <u>Ancillary rural earthworks</u> for are for the maintenance of existing tracks, fences or drains within an identified Landscape or Natural Character Area and must meet all of the following conditions: (iii) The height of the resulting cut or batter face in stable ground does not exceed 1.5m; (iv) The maximum slope of the resulting cut or batter face in stable ground does not exceed 1:2 (1m vertical to 2m horizontal); (v) Areas exposed by the earthworks are	The submitter understands that outstanding landscapes and features which meet certain criteria can be subject to land use controls for the purposes of managing adverse effects on the landscape values. The District Plan must focus on the values of the features and landscapes to recognise that landscapes across rural areas are changing all the time and that the working nature of the farming activities occurring in that space are part of that values system. To place arbitrary	Reject	7.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p>revegetated to achieve 80% ground cover within 6 months of the commencement of the earthworks; (vi) Sediment is retained on the site through implementation and maintenance of erosion and sediment controls; (vii) The earthworks do not divert or change natural water flows, water bodies or established drainage paths. (b) <u>Earthworks for other purposes must meet all of the following conditions:</u>... (i) The earthworks are undertaken within a single consecutive 12 month time period; (ii) The earthworks must not exceed the following areas and volumes within a single consecutive 12 month period:... Landscape or natural character area Area (m2) Volume (m3) Hill Country Significant Amenity Landscape 1,000 500 Significant Amenity Landscape Waikato River Margins and Lakes 500 500 Significant Amenity Landscape (SAL) sand dune) High or Outstanding Natural Character area of the coastal) environment Outstanding Natural Feature sand dune) 50 250 Outstanding Natural Feature (ONF) Outstanding Natural Landscapes (ONLs)</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential changes needed to give effect to this relief. AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments to Chapter 23: Country Living Zone to address areas of existing farmland zoned as Country Living Zone</p>	<p>earthworks thresholds as the trigger for consent is a relatively blunt planning technique. The submitter is concerned that the size of earthworks allowed per site in any 12-month period is far too restrictive to have meaning for farming activities. Earthworks can be required for a number of reasons some of which are outside a farmers control for example to repair slip or flood damage. It is unduly onerous to require resource consent to mitigate damage from a natural event. Earthworks can be required to maintain and construct tracks and fencing which are a vital network through farms. The submitter appreciates why Council seeks to protect Outstanding Landscapes and understand these standards are being used to implement Chapter 3 Objectives. However, the goals can be achieved with reasonable permitted activity standards for activities which have, in part, contributed to the landscape values. The conditions need to fall within the jurisdiction of the district council. The submitter seeks that Significant Amenity Landscapes (SAL) references be deleted from these rules consistent with other relief sought in relation to SALs in this regard.</p>		
680.208	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Oppose	<p>Amend Rule 22.2.3.4 DI Earthworks - within Landscape and Natural Character Areas, as follows: DI RD1 (a) Earthworks within an identified Landscape or Natural Character Area that do not comply with Rule 22.2.3.4 P1. AND</p> <p>Add new clause (b) to Rule 22.2.3.4 DI Earthworks - within Landscape and Natural Character Areas, as follows: (b) <u>Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters: (i) Visibility from public place; and (ii) Scale of earthworks and effects on the landscape values; (iii) The purpose and functional need of the earthworks</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential changes needed to give effect to this relief. AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments to Chapter 23: Country Living Zone to address areas of existing farmland zoned as Country Living Zone.</p>	<p>The leap from permitted activity status with standards to Discretionary is inappropriate for a consenting pathway in this context. A restricted discretionary activity status is more consistent with the Proposed District Plan rules framework and the matters which Council should focus on are easily defined.</p>	Accept in part	7.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FSI 108.70	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)	Oppose	Null	Inappropriate addition.	Accept in part	7.1
FSI 139.61	Turangawaewae Trust Board	Oppose	Null	Inappropriate addition.	Accept in part	7.1
680.220	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Oppose	<p>Amend Rule 22.2.3 Buildings and structures in Landscape and Natural Character Areas so that only natural features and natural landscapes that have demonstrable outstanding natural qualities and are identified and mapped as Outstanding Landscapes or Features are subject to this rule.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend Rule 22.3.3 D1 Buildings and structures in Landscape and Natural Character Areas as follows: D1 <u>RDI</u> (a) Building or structure located within any: (i) Outstanding Natural Feature; (ii) Outstanding Natural Landscape; (iii) <u>Outstanding Natural Character Area</u>; (iv) <u>High Natural Character Area</u>.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Add a new restricted discretionary activity rule (b) to Rule 22.3.3 D1 Buildings and structures in Landscape and Natural Character Areas, as follows: (b) <u>Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters: (i) The extent to which the building or structure adversely affects the stated landscape or feature values, and in particular whether the activity is prominent when viewed from the road or other public land. (ii) The functional or operational need of the building or structure to locate within the identified area.</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential changes needed to give effect to this relief.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments to Chapter 23: Country Living Zone to address areas of existing farmland zoned as Country Living Zone.</p>	<p>The submitter has serious concerns with the proposed planning approach. It is overly restrictive and will inappropriately capture farming relating buildings and structures such as stock yards. A permitted activity response with associated restricted discretionary activity rule is more consistent with the Proposed District Plan rules framework and the matters which Council should focus on are easily defined. The submitter understands the purpose of the rule is to manage the adverse effects of buildings and structures on Outstanding Natural Feature's (ONFs) and Outstanding Natural Landscape's (ONLs), however the proposed rule makes no distinction between development which is appropriate and that which may have inappropriate effects on the values of the ONFs and ONLs. The district's landscapes are inhabited by people and subject to human activity and change; they have never been static. The rural landscape in particular has been shaped by the activity of people and more recently farming activities over several generations, and will continue to be in future. Submitter supports the development of workable solutions for the management of ONFs and ONLs across the district. But there is no reason for normal rural activities such as construction of farm buildings and structures or placement of large tanks to be subject to the expense and time delays associated with discretionary resource consents. The submitter has concerns with both the use of the term 'Outstanding Natural Character' Area and 'High Natural Character Area' and the lack of consultation through which they have been incorporated into the proposed plan. The submitter requests that only natural features and natural landscapes that have demonstrable outstanding natural qualities are identified and mapped as Outstanding Landscapes or Features are therefore subject to this Rule.</p>	Reject	8.1
FSI 139.66	Turangawaewae Trust Board	Oppose	Null	Inappropriate addition.	Accept	8.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1223.194	Mercury NZ Limited	Oppose	Mercury seeks that the submission point is disallowed.	Mercury has an interest in the submission points listed in paragraphs 11.1 and 11.2 above. Mercury supports the protection of outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes in the context of section 6(b) of the RMA, where there has been a robust expert assessment undertaken to describe the values supporting an assessment of what is outstanding. The Waikato RPS Table 12.2 sets out factors that District Councils are to consider when undertaking such an assessment. Mercury considers that such a robust assessment has not been undertaken as part of the preparation of the PWDP.	Accept	8.1
FS1108.75	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)	Oppose	Null	Inappropriate addition.	Accept	8.1
680.221	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Not Stated	Add a new permitted activity rule P1 to Rule 22.3.3 Buildings and structures in Landscape and Natural Character Areas, as follows: P1 (a) Maintenance and replacement of existing buildings, or structures within an identified outstanding natural feature or landscape. (b) <u>New buildings and structures ancillary to agricultural production activities within pastoral landscapes that form part of an Outstanding Natural Feature and Landscape that:</u> (i) When visible from a road or other public place does not extend above any ridgeline and does not have a backdrop of a lake or sky; (ii) That the maximum floor area is 600m ² , and (iii) That the maximum height is 10 metres. AND Any consequential changes needed to give effect to this relief. AND Any consequential amendments to Chapter 23: Country Living Zone to address areas of existing farmland zoned as Country Living Zone.	This relief is required to give effect to submission points raised in relation to Rule 22.3.3 D1.	Reject	8.1
FS1387.215	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid,	Accept	8.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
680.260	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Amend the definition of "Outstanding Natural Feature" in Chapter 13 Definitions, as follows: Means a feature identified as an Outstanding Natural Feature on the planning maps, listed in Appendix XX and described in the <u>individual assessment sheet</u> . AND Any consequential changes needed to give effect to this relief.	Conditional support is extended to this definition. Submitter supports the principle of identifying these areas, listing them on a schedule, which summaries the associated values, and including the overlay on planning maps.	Accept in part	10.1
FS1223.195	Mercury NZ Limited	Oppose	Mercury seeks that the submission is disallowed.	Mercury has an interest in the submission points listed in paragraphs 11.1 and 11.2 above. Mercury supports the protection of outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes in the context of section 6(b) of the RMA, where there has been a robust expert assessment undertaken to describe the values supporting an assessment of what is outstanding. The Waikato RPS Table 12.2 sets out factors that District Councils are to consider when undertaking such an assessment. Mercury considers that such a robust assessment has not been undertaken as part of the preparation of the PWDP.	Accept in part	10.1
680.261	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Oppose	Delete the definition of "Outstanding Natural Character Area" in Chapter 13 Definitions. AND Any consequential amendments needed to give effect to this relief.	This definition provides no purpose as there is no Outstanding Natural Character Area layer identified on the planning maps.	Reject	10.1
FS1223.196	Mercury NZ Limited	Oppose	Mercury seeks that the submission point is disallowed.	Mercury has an interest in the submission points listed in paragraphs 11.1 and 11.2 above. Mercury supports the protection of outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes in the context of section 6(b) of the RMA, where there has been a robust expert assessment undertaken to describe the values supporting an assessment of what is outstanding. The Waikato RPS Table 12.2 sets out factors that District Councils are to consider when undertaking such an assessment. Mercury considers that such a robust assessment has not been undertaken as part of the preparation of the PWDP.	Accept	10.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
680.262	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Amend the definition of "Outstanding Natural Landscape" in Chapter 13 Definitions as follows: Means a landscape identified as an Outstanding Natural Landscape on the planning maps, listed in Appendix XX and described in the individual assessment sheet. AND Any consequential changes needed to give effect to this relief.	Conditional support is extended to this definition. Submitter supports the principle of identifying these areas, listing them on a schedule, which summaries the associated values, and including the overlay on planning maps.	Accept in part	10.1
FS1223.197	Mercury NZ Limited	Oppose	Mercury seeks that the submission point is disallowed.	Mercury has an interest in the submission points listed in paragraphs 11.1 and 11.2 above. Mercury supports the protection of outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes in the context of section 6(b) of the RMA, where there has been a robust expert assessment undertaken to describe the values supporting an assessment of what is outstanding. The Waikato RPS Table 12.2 sets out factors that District Councils are to consider when undertaking such an assessment. Mercury considers that such a robust assessment has not been undertaken as part of the preparation of the PWDP.	Accept in part	10.1
680.267	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Oppose	Delete the definition of "Significant Amenity Landscape" in Chapter 13 Definitions. AND Any consequential changes needed to give effect to this relief.	The submitter understands the purpose of the definition and subsequent policy framework is to give effect to the Waikato Regional Policy Statement (WRPS). However, the submitter considers the Proposed District Plan has not implemented the WRPS direction appropriately and identified rural productive areas as Significant Amenity Landscapes (SAL) unnecessarily. The primary concern is with the use of the SAL overlays affecting everyday farming operations in the Rural Zone by triggering an onerous and unnecessary requirement for farmers to have to seek and obtain resource consent for any practical development of farms for farming, for what amounts to little or no environmental benefit. Farming is part of the landscape character of rural areas, and farming should not be subject to onerous requirements for resource consent to develop their farms for farming purposes.	Reject	10.1
FS1223.198	Mercury NZ Limited	Oppose	Mercury seeks that the submission point is disallowed.	Mercury has an interest in the submission points listed in paragraphs 11.1 and 11.2 above. Mercury supports the protection of outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes in the context of	Accept	10.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				section 6(b) of the RMA, where there has been a robust expert assessment undertaken to describe the values supporting an assessment of what is outstanding. The Waikato RPS Table 12.2 sets out factors that District Councils are to consider when undertaking such an assessment. Mercury considers that such a robust assessment has not been undertaken as part of the preparation of the PWDP.		
FS1108.79	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)	Oppose	Null	Inappropriate addition.	Accept	10.1
FS1139.70	Turangawaewae Trust Board	Oppose	Null	Inappropriate addition.	Accept	10.1
695.110	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.2.3.4 P1(a)(ii) Earthworks - within Landscape and Natural Character Areas so that the 50m2 area figure is volume and the 250m3 volume is area.	The submitter considers the reference to m2 and m3 is an error.	Reject	7.1
FS1223.205	Mercury NZ Limited	Oppose	Mercury seeks that the submission point is disallowed.	Mercury has an interest in the submission points listed in paragraphs 11.1 and 11.2 above. Mercury supports the protection of outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes in the context of section 6(b) of the RMA, where there has been a robust expert assessment undertaken to describe the values supporting an assessment of what is outstanding. The Waikato RPS Table 12.2 sets out factors that District Councils are to consider when undertaking such an assessment. Mercury considers that such a robust assessment has not been undertaken as part of the preparation of the PWDP.	Accept	7.1
695.130	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 24.2.4.4 P1(a)(ii) Earthworks - within Landscape and Natural Character Areas, so that the 50m2 area figure is volume and the 250m3 volume is area.	This is considered an error.	Reject	7.1
FS1223.207	Mercury NZ Limited	Oppose	Mercury seeks that the submission point is disallowed.	Mercury has an interest in the submission points listed in paragraphs 11.1 and 11.2 above. Mercury supports the protection of outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes in the context of section 6(b) of the RMA, where there has been a robust expert assessment undertaken to describe the values supporting an assessment of what is outstanding. The Waikato RPS Table 12.2 sets out factors that District Councils are to consider when undertaking such an assessment. Mercury considers that such a robust assessment has not been undertaken as part of the preparation of the PWDP.	Accept	7.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
695.208	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.2.3.4 Earthworks within Landscape and Natural Character Areas so that earthworks are based on the site area. i.e a 1:1 ratio so that a 450m2 site would provide 450m3 of earthworks.	The Proposed District Plan penalizes bigger sites for no apparent outcome, especially when a bigger site is likely to be better able to absorb and diffuse effects. Earthworks totals should not cancel each other out, i.e. cut and fill add together.	Reject	7.1
FS1223.208	Mercury NZ Limited	Oppose	Mercury seeks that the submission point is disallowed.	Mercury has an interest in the submission points listed in paragraphs 11.1 and 11.2 above. Mercury supports the protection of outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes in the context of section 6(b) of the RMA, where there has been a robust expert assessment undertaken to describe the values supporting an assessment of what is outstanding. The Waikato RPS Table 12.2 sets out factors that District Councils are to consider when undertaking such an assessment. Mercury considers that such a robust assessment has not been undertaken as part of the preparation of the PWDP.	Accept	7.1
695.209	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Support	Retain a maximum area of earthworks in Rule 22.2.3.4 Earthworks within Landscape and Natural Character Areas.	No reasons provided.	Accept	7.1
FS1223.209	Mercury NZ Limited	Oppose	Mercury seeks that the submission point is disallowed.	Mercury has an interest in the submission points listed in paragraphs 11.1 and 11.2 above. Mercury supports the protection of outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes in the context of section 6(b) of the RMA, where there has been a robust expert assessment undertaken to describe the values supporting an assessment of what is outstanding. The Waikato RPS Table 12.2 sets out factors that District Councils are to consider when undertaking such an assessment. Mercury considers that such a robust assessment has not been undertaken as part of the preparation of the PWDP.	Reject	7.1
697.112	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete from Rule 16.2.4.4 PI (a)(ii) Earthworks-Landscape and Natural Character Areas the table titled Landscape or Natural Character Area. AND Amend the heading of Permitted Activities Rule 16.2.4.4 Earthworks-Landscape and Natural Character Areas as follows: Earthworks - Landscapes, <u>Natural Features</u> and Natural Character Areas AND Amend Rule 16.2.4.4 PI (a)(i) and (ii) Earthworks-	The heading and structure of the rule do not make it clear that all of matters under Permitted Activity PI (a) apply to the landscapes, character and features listed in the table in (a)(ii).	Reject	7.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p>Landscape and Natural Character Areas as follows Earthworks for the maintenance of existing tracks, fences or drains <u>within the following landscapes, natural features and natural character areas: (i) Significant Amenity Landscape (SAL); (ii) High or Outstanding Natural Character area of the coastal environment; (iii) Outstanding Natural Feature (ONF) sand dune (iv) Outstanding Natural Feature (ONF); and (v) Outstanding Natural Landscape (ONL) an identified Landscape or Natural Character Area and must meet all of the following conditions; A. The earthworks are undertaken within a single consecutive 12 month period; B. The earthworks must not exceed the following areas and volumes an area of 50m2 and a volume of 250m2</u> within a single consecutive 12 month period:</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend Rule 16.2.4.4 PI(a) by renumbering (iii)-(vii) as C.-G.</p>			
FS1340.119	TaTa Valley Limited	Support	Support.	The submitter supports submission 697.112 as it makes the rule clearer as to where the rule applies, and which specific overlays are of relevance. Previously, it was unclear.	Reject	7.1
697.508	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend the definition for "Significant Amenity Landscape" as follows: Significant amenity landscape or SAL	Amend to be consistent with other abbreviated terms.	Reject	10.1
697.627	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	<p>Delete the table in Rule 20.2.5.3 PI(ii) Earthworks - Landscape and Natural Character Areas;</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend Rule 20.2.5.3 PI(a) Earthworks - Landscape and Natural Character Areas, as follows: (a) Earthworks <u>are</u> for the maintenance of existing tracks, fences or drains <u>within the following landscapes, natural features and natural character areas: (i) Significant Amenity Landscape (SAL) - sand dune (ii) High Natural Character area (iii) Outstanding Natural Character area of the coastal environment (iv) Outstanding Natural feature - sand dune (v) Outstanding Natural feature (vi) Outstanding Natural landscapes an identified Landscape or Natural Character Area and</u> must meet all of the following conditions; (vii) The earthworks are undertaken within a single consecutive 12 month period; (viii) The earthworks must not exceed <u>the following areas and volumes an area of 50m3 and a volume of 250m2</u></p>	The additional wording provides clarification as to which areas are being encompassed by this rule and sets out the volume and area thresholds more clearly.	Reject	7.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			within a single consecutive 12 month period.			
FS1387.629	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	7.1
697.702	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete the table in Rule 21.2.5.3 PI(a) Earthworks - Landscape and Natural Character Areas. AND Amend Rule 21.2.5.3 PI(a) Earthworks - Landscape and Natural Character Areas, as follows: (b) Earthworks are for the maintenance of existing tracks, fences or drains within the following landscape, natural features and natural character areas: (i) Significant Amenity Landscape (SAL) - sand dune (ii) High Natural Character area (iii) Outstanding Natural Character area of the coastal environment (iv) Outstanding Natural feature - sand dune (v) Outstanding Natural feature (vi) Outstanding Natural landscapes an identified Landscape or Natural Character Area and must meet all of the following conditions; (c) The earthworks are undertaken within a single consecutive 12 month period; (d) The earthworks must not exceed the following areas and volumes an area of 50m2 and a volume of 250m3 within a single consecutive 12 month period.	The additional wording provides clarification as to which areas are being encompassed by this rule and sets out the volume and area thresholds more clearly.	Reject	7.1
FS1387.648	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy	Accept	7.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
697.776	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.2.3.4 P1(a) Earthworks - within Landscape and Natural Character Areas, as follows: (a) Earthworks are for the maintenance of existing tracks, fences or drains within the following landscapes, natural features and natural character areas: (i) Hill Country Significant Amenity Landscape; (ii) Significant Amenity Landscape (SAL) - Waikato river and margins and lakes; (iii) Significant Amenity Landscape (SAL) - sand dune (iv) High or Outstanding Natural Character area of the coastal environment (v) Outstanding Natural Feature sand dune (vi) Outstanding Natural Feature (ONF) (vii) Outstanding Natural Landscapes (ONLs) an identified Landscape or Natural Character Area and must meet all of the following conditions:	The additional wording provides clarification as to which areas are being encompassed by this rule.	Reject	7.1
697.799	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.3.3 DI (a) Buildings and structures in Landscape and Natural Character Areas, as follows: (a) Building or structure located within any of the following landscape and natural character areas: ...	Additional words in this rule provide clarity.	Reject	8.1
697.869	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.2.3.4 P1(a) Earthworks - within Landscape and Natural Character Areas, as follows: (a) Earthworks are for the maintenance of existing tracks, fences or drains within the following landscapes, natural features and natural character areas: (i) Hill Country Significant Amenity Landscape; (ii) Significant Amenity Landscape (SAL) - Waikato river and margins and lakes; (iii) Significant Amenity Landscape (SAL) - sand dune (iv) High or Outstanding Natural Character area of the coastal environment (v) Outstanding Natural Feature sand dune (vi) Outstanding Natural Feature (ONF) (vii) Outstanding Natural Landscapes (ONLs) an identified Landscape or Natural Character Area and must meet all of the following conditions: (i) The earthworks are undertaken within any single consecutive 12 month period; (ii) The earthworks must not exceed the following areas and volumes within any single consecutive 12 month period:	The additional wording provides clarification as to which areas are being encompassed by this rule. The words "any single consecutive" provides clarity to the rule.	Reject	7.1
697.958	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 24.2.4.4 P1(a) Earthworks - landscape and natural character areas, as follows: (e) Earthworks are	The additional wording provides clarification as to which areas are being encompassed by this rule.	Reject	7.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			for the maintenance of existing tracks, fences or drains within <u>the following landscapes, natural features and natural character areas: (i) Significant Amenity Landscape (SAL) - sand dune (ii) Natural Character area (iii) Outstanding Natural Character area of the coastal environment an identified Landscape or Natural Character Area</u> and must meet all of the following conditions;			
FS1387.749	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	7.1
697.959	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete the table under Rule 24.2.4.4 P1 (a)(iii) Earthworks - Landscape and Natural Character Areas; AND Amend Rule 24.2.4.4 P1(c) Earthworks - Landscape and Natural Character Areas: (c) The earthworks must not exceed <u>the following areas and volumes an area of 50m2 and a volume of 250m2</u> within a single consecutive 12 month period.:	This change removes the table and makes the volumes and thresholds clearer.	Reject	7.1
FS1387.750	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the	Accept	7.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
742.186	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Neutral/Amend	Retain the Outstanding Natural Feature overlay, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend the Outstanding Natural Features overlay by reviewing and removing any such areas from existing New Zealand Transport Agency designations. AND Request any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the submission.	The objective of identifying Outstanding Natural Features and landscapes is to ensure that these landscapes and their attributes are recognised and protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development. The submitter supports this objective however, this also needs to recognise the functional need for infrastructure to be located within these areas and land transport designated corridors are generally highly modified areas.	Accept in part	11.1
FS1062.100	Andrew and Christine Gore	Oppose	Disallow submission point 742.186.	• It is important that if a road goes through a SNA that this designation remains in that area. • Roading should not be exempt from considering the environment and mitigating effect of the infrastructure.	Accept in part	11.1
FS1277.149	Waikato Regional Council	Oppose	Retain mapped extents of Outstanding Natural Landscapes on the Planning Maps as notified.	This is inconsistent with Section 6(b) RMA, and does not give effect to Policy 12.1 and associated methods of the WRPS	Accept in part	11.1
FS1293.49	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	Outstanding Natural Features are identified as having specific values. This is not influenced by the existence of a designation. The Director-General opposes reviewing the ONF overlays to remove designations. NZTA designations can be broad and have a large impact on ONFs.	Accept in part	11.1
742.187	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Neutral/Amend	Retain the Outstanding Natural Landscapes overlay, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend the Outstanding Natural Landscapes overlay by reviewing and removing any such areas from existing New Zealand Transport Agency designations. AND Request any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the submission.	The objective of identifying Outstanding Natural Features and landscapes is to ensure that these landscapes and their attributes are recognised and protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development. The submitter supports this objective however, this also needs to recognise the functional need for infrastructure to be located within these areas and land transport designated corridors are generally highly modified areas.	Reject	12.1
FS1277.150	Waikato Regional Council	Oppose	Retain mapped extents of Outstanding Natural Landscapes on the Planning Maps as notified.	This is inconsistent with Section 6(b) RMA, and does not give effect to Policy 12.1 and associated methods of the WRPS	Accept	12.1
FS1293.50	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	Outstanding Natural Features are identified as having specific values. This is not influenced by the existence	Accept	12.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				of a designation. The Director-General opposes reviewing the ONL overlays to remove designations. NZTA designations can be broad and have a large impact on ONLs.		
FS1062.101	Andrew and Christine Gore	Oppose	Disallow submission point 742.187.	• It is important that if a road goes through a SNA that this designation remains in that area. • Roading should not be exempt from considering the environment and mitigating effect of the infrastructure.	Accept	12.1
742.188	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Neutral/Amend	Retain the Outstanding Natural Character overlay, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend the Outstanding Natural Character overlay by reviewing and removing any such areas from existing New Zealand Transport Agency designations. AND Request any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the submission.	The objective of identifying Outstanding Natural Character is to protect the natural character of the coastal environment and waterways from inappropriate subdivision, use and development. The submitter supports this objective however, this also needs to recognise the functional need for infrastructure to be located within these areas and land transport designated corridors are generally highly modified areas.	Reject	14.1
FS1293.51	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	Outstanding Natural Character Areas are identified as having specific values. This is not influenced by the existence of a designation. The Director-General opposes reviewing the ONC overlays to remove designations. NZTA designation can be broad and have a large impact on ONCs.	Accept	14.1
FS1277.151	Waikato Regional Council	Oppose	Retain mapped extents of SNA's on the Planning Maps as notified.	This is inconsistent with Section 6(b) RMA, and does not give effect to Policy 12.2 and associated methods of the WRPS	Accept	14.1
697.1030	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 25.2.4.4 PI Earthworks - within Landscapes and Natural Character Areas, as follows: (a) Earthworks <u>are</u> for the maintenance of existing tracks, fences or drains <u>within the following landscapes, natural character areas: (i) Significant Amenity Landscape (ii) High Natural Character area (i) Outstanding Natural Character area of the coastal environment (ii) Outstanding Natural Landscapes (iii) Outstanding Natural Features</u> and must comply with all of the following conditions: (†) <u>A The earthworks are undertaken within a single consecutive 12 month period; (ii) B The earthworks do not exceed the following areas and volumes:</u>	Amend for consistency with the equivalent rule in other chapters.	Reject	7.1
FS1387.776	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood	Accept	7.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
81.24	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Undertake a natural character assessment for wetlands, lakes, rivers and their margins.	The RMA (section 6a) and WRPS (12.2 and 12.2.1) seek to manage natural character in the coastal environment and wetlands, lakes and rivers and their margins. There is policy support for this in Section 3.5 of the Proposed Plan however that does not flow through to other provisions. There has been no assessment of the natural character of wetlands, lakes and rivers and their margins and as a consequence natural character has not been mapped outside of the coastal environment. The Policies in section 3.5 that relate to the wetlands, lakes and rivers and their margins will only come into play for discretionary and non-complying consent applications. As a result there may be permitted, controlled and restricted discretionary activities that are inappropriate to the level of natural character.	Reject	14.1
FS1107.2	Simon Upton	Support	My reason flows from the observation that the PDP proposes residential zoning across a gully and wetland system on the southern boundary of Ngaruawahia despite the fact that this drainage system has been identified as important by the Waikato River Authority.		Reject	14.1
FS1330.9	Middlemiss Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	Reject submission.	The proposed assessment and mapping exercise has the potential to delay the current Proposed Plan and could be included to Stage 2 if required.	Accept	14.1
FS1293.11	Department of Conservation	Support	Seek that the submission point is allowed.	The Director-General supports the undertaking of a natural character assessment for wetlands, lakes, rivers and their margins to give effect to Section 6(a).	Reject	14.1
FS1342.47	Federated Farmers	Support	Allow in part submission point 81.24. Support is extended to an assessment being undertaken with full landowner consultation	FFNZ extends support on the proviso that there is full landowner consultation and involvement in the	Reject	14.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			and FFNZ involvement in the planning response.	planning response.		
576.7	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	Support	Retain Objective 3.3.1 Outstanding natural features and landscapes, as notified.	The submitter supports the mapping of such areas and their clear identification as it assists plan users and provides clarity as to the application of the Proposed District Plan provisions. The submitter supports reference within the objective to 'inappropriate' as such reference is consistent with Section 6(b) of the RMA, Waikato RPS Objectives 3.12 and 3.20, and also recognises that not all development is to be avoided, rather the emphasis is on that which is inappropriate.	Accept	5.1
576.8	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	Support	Retain Objective 3.5.1 Natural Character, as notified.	The submitter supports the mapping of such areas and their clear identification as it assists plan users and provides clarity as to the application of the Proposed District Plan provisions. The submitter supports reference within the objective to 'inappropriate' as such reference is consistent with Section 6(a) of the RMA, Waikato RPS Objectives 3.12 and 3.22, and also recognises that not all development is to be avoided, rather the emphasis is on that which is inappropriate.	Accept	5.3
481.1	Bruce and Kirstie Hill for Culverden Farm	Oppose	Amend the approach to identifying Significant Natural Areas and Significant Amenity Landscapes from private land so that identification is provisional based on owners acceptance and therefore contestable submission seeks that Council has discloses the specific criteria and significance levels for each of these areas, followed by ground-truthing and acceptance by the landowner.	The mapped Significant Natural Areas and Significant Amenity Landscapes have not been fully investigated and it is unclear how these areas have been identified or what a landowner's obligations are. Rules for these areas potentially render land incapable of reasonable use and could impact on health and safety standards, existing farm practices and a property's capital value. The consultation process for the Proposed District Plan has not provided sufficient information on how each Significant Natural Area or Significant Amenity Landscape has been defined on private land. Ecologists report noted that there was incomplete information and it was a desktop exercise. It can have a serious impact on the farming use of parts of properties and should be properly investigated before being imposed on landowners.	Accept in part Accept in part	15.1 16.1
482.5	Hill Country Farmers Group	Oppose	Amend the approach to identifying Significant Natural Areas and Significant Amenity Landscapes, for private land so that identification is provisional based on owners acceptance and therefore contestable. Submission seeks	The mapped Significant Natural Areas and Significant Amenity Landscapes have not been fully investigated and it is unclear how these areas have been identified or what a landowner's obligations	Accept in part Accept in part	15.1 16.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			that Council discloses the criteria and significance levels for each of these areas, followed by ground-truthing and acceptance by the landowner.	are. Rules for these areas potentially render land incapable of reasonable use and could impact on health and safety standards, existing farm practices and a property's capital value. The consultation process for the Proposed District Plan has not provided sufficient information on how each Significant Natural Area or Significant Amenity Landscape has been defined on private land. Ecologist's reports notes that there is incomplete information and it was a desktop exercise. It can have a serious impact on the farming use of parts of properties and should be properly investigated before being imposed on landowners.		
FS1340.84	TaTa Valley Limited	Support	Support in part.	The submitter supports in part submission point 482.5 in that identified SALs often do not accurately reflect what is present at the subject site and should be contestable if this is in fact the case. However, the submitter does not agree that it should be based on owners' acceptance. Moreover, a researched and ground truthed method (which can be contestable on qualitative matters) should occur.	Accept in part Accept in part	15.1 16.1
706.1	Francis and Susan Turton	Oppose	No specific decision sought, but the submission opposes Significant Natural Areas and Significant Amenity Landscapes being identified on private land.	No consultation and data on the identified areas. This has the potential to have far reaching implications on private property rights, farm profitability and farm values. Unclear and inaccurate provisions mean that it is impossible to make informed decisions.	Accept in part Accept in part	15.1 16.1
FS1007.14	Phillip John Swann	Support			Accept in part	15.1 16.1
FS1387.786	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land	Accept in part	15.1 16.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
261.3	Rita Carey	Oppose	Amend the approach to Significant Natural Areas and Significant Amenity Landscapes through the following: Council purchase the land; Council to fund fencing; Council to maintain those areas or promote acknowledgement of the areas; Reward landowners for past care; Create an incentive programme for future care; and Initial capital outlay such as fences be at Council cost.	Appears the council is determined to penalize, persecute and generally make life and business difficult for land owners for having areas of 'national treasure' on their land. Will have to argue with lawyers at a huge cost in the future if ever it is necessary to do something in and around those areas. Appears to the submitter council want to take land from them but expect them to pay for the upkeep. Purchased land legally and should be able to do with it what they like. If council wants it, they should purchase it of the submitter at riverfront, riparian right prices and pay for the upkeep themselves.	Reject	5.2
481.16	Bruce and Kirstie Hill for Culverden Farm	Not Stated	Amend the rules relating to Significant Natural Areas and Significant Amenity Landscapes to better enable existing practices for activities which are usual and expected in the Rural Zone.	Such overlays and associated restrictions potentially render land incapable of reasonable use. This has wide ranging impacts on maintenance of health and safety standards, the economics of current farming operations, as well as significant implications on capital land value.	Accept in part	6.1
731.13	Jean Tregidga	Oppose	Delete the map annotations of Significant Natural Area, Outstanding Natural Landscape and Outstanding Natural Feature affecting the submitter's properties at Lyons Road, Mangatawhiri, being Lots 3, 4, and 5 DP 62084.	The submitter's three properties at Lyons Road, Mangatawhiri are unique. They were set up in the 1920s as a sustainable source of native timber and no felling has occurred since the 1960s. No monetary return has been recognised from these properties for over 50 years despite costs relating to rates, insurance, pest control and maintenance. Other milling statements can be issued to mill indigenous timber such as windblown trees, naturally dead trees and trees removed for the construction or maintenance of an accessway where they are not subject to a registered plan or permit. Refer to these documents attached to original submission for further detail: The Waipoua Argument: Letters to the NZ Herald, Rudolf Hohneck aka Ron Hohneck Tane's Tree Trust, Newsletter No. 2 November - Guest Editorial by Lindsay Poole Paper presented to The Seventh Conference of the Australian Forestry History Society, Christchurch 29 January-2 February 2007 - The Legacy of Rudolf Hohneck "A Lover of Trees: A Forester Unique" by Ian Barton A	Accept in part Accept in part	11.1 12.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				page from another article by Ian Barton A few poems written by the submitter's late mother (Ina Trump aka Ina Johnson, neeHohneck Obituary - Mr R Hohneck		
FS1293.135	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.	Accept in part Accept in part	11.1 12.1
81.178	Waikato Regional Council	Support	Retain Rule 23.3.3 Buildings and structures in Landscape and Natural Character Areas.	The submitter supports the discretionary activity status assigned to dwellings, buildings and structures within an Outstanding Natural Feature Landscape or natural character area.	Accept	8.1
330.108	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 23.3.3 Buildings and structures in Landscape and Natural Character Areas.	No reasons provided.	Reject	8.1
862.37	Havelock Village Limited	Oppose	Delete the Significant Amenity Landscape from the properties at 242 and 278 Bluff Road, Pokeno. AND Any consequential amendments and alternative relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	The area of this SAL on the submitter's land appears to be a rollover of the previous District Plan notation with no ground truthing undertaken to confirm if the attributes listed in the study are still applicable in this location. The conclusion of an expert assessment contained in Appendix O of the submission was that the attributes onsite are not aligned to those described in the study and the SAL should be removed from the site.	Accept in part Accept in part	15.1 16.1
FS1090.5	Jenny Forsyth	Oppose	I oppose the submission to remove the significant amenity landscape designation from this area on the basis of one report commissioned by an interested party. This is an SAL within the Waikato River catchment and should be preserved and protected as intended by its designation.	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed. It is widely accepted that interference with significant natural areas causes adverse ecological effects.	Accept in part Accept in part	15.1 16.1
FS1086.37	Yashili Dairy Company Limited	Support	Support the original submission.	Yashili supports the original submission by Havelock Village Limited subject to the inclusion of adequate mitigation measures and/or an appropriate set back distance between the proposed residential development and its industrial site(s) within the	Accept in part Accept in part	15.1 16.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>provisions of the Proposed Plan to address any potential adverse reverse sensitivity effects, in particular in respect of noise, related to this interface. Havelock Village Limited and related companies control land in southern Pokeno at 88,242 (in part) and 278 Bluff Road (the site). That land is in proximity to Yashili's dairy plant. Havelock Village's submission seeks, amongst other things, the rezoning of the site to Residential zone in order to provide for approximately 1025 new residential lots and new neighbourhood centre. In the alternative it seeks the rezoning of the site to Aggregate Extraction Zone. Yashili is strongly supportive of the ongoing growth and development of Pokeno. As a result, it supports the additional housing and population that would be created by the rezoning of the site. The additional population will assist to improve the economic vitality of Pokeno. The rezoning will provide much needed residential land and will promote more affordable houses and housing choice, including for employees at Yashili's plant. In addition, the proposed new neighbourhood centre will provide a range of amenities and commercial services to cater for the day-to-day needs of the local community, including new residents and employees at Yashili's plant. Provided the matters raised above are sufficiently addressed through the provisions of the Proposed Plan, Yashili seeks that submission 862 be allowed.</p>		
FS1186.37	Pokeno Nutritional Park Limited	Support	Pokeno Nutritional supports the original submission by Havelock Village Limited in its entirety.	<p>Havelock Village Limited and related companies control land in southern Pokeno at 88, 242 (in part) and 278 Bluff Road (the site). That land is in proximity to Pokeno Nutritional's new dairy plant. Havelock Village's submissions seeks, amongst other things, the rezoning of the Site to residential zone in order to provide for approximately 1025 new residential lots and new neighbourhood centre. In the alternative it seeks the rezoning of the Site to Aggregate Extraction Zone. Pokeno Nutritional is strongly supportive of the ongoing growth and development of Pokeno. As a result, it supports the additional housing and population that would be created by the rezoning of the Site. The additional population will assist to improve the economic vitality of Pokeno. The rezoning will provide much needed residential land and will promote more affordable houses and housing choice, including for employees at Pokeno Nutritional's plant.</p>	Accept in part Accept in part	15.1 16.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				In addition, the proposed new neighbourhood centre will provide a range of amenities and commercial services to cater for the day-to-day needs of the local community, including new residents and employees at Pokeno Nutritional's plant. Finally, Pokeno Nutritional's supports the inclusion within the Masterplan for the Site of reserve land on the eastern boundary of the Site. This reserve land will provide an appropriate set back between the residential development and the adjacent industrial land and address any potential adverse effects related to this interface.		
FS1281.53	Pokeno Village Holdings Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	PVHL opposes the deletion of the Significant Amenity Landscape from 242 and 278 Bluff Road, Pokeno.	Accept in part Accept in part	15.1 16.1
FS1301.37	New Zealand Health Food Park Limited	Support	Support the submission in its entirety.	Havelock Village Limited and related companies control land in southern Pokeno at 88, 242 (in part) and 278 Bluff Road (the site). That land is in proximity to Health Food Park's property. Havelock Village's submissions seeks, amongst other things, the rezoning of the site to Residential zone in order to provide for approximately 1025 new residential lots and new neighbourhood centre. In the alternative it seeks the rezoning of the site to Aggregate Extraction Zone. Health Food Park is strongly supportive of the ongoing growth and development of Pokeno. As a result, it supports the additional housing and population that would be created by the rezoning of the site. The additional population will assist to improve the economic vitality of Pokeno. In addition, the proposed new neighbourhood centre will provide a range of amenities and commercial services to cater for the day-to-day needs of the local community. An additional benefit of the Havelock Village Development is the direct linkage between the Pokeno Town Centre and Potter Road proposed on the Havelock Village Masterplan allowing the residents on Potter Road, Ewing Road and Trig Road to be more connected to the Pokeno community.	Accept in part Accept in part	15.1 16.1
FS1303.37	Charlie Harris	Support	I support the original submission by Havelock Village Limited in its entirety.	Havelock Village Limited and related companies control land in southern Pokeno at 88,242 (in part) and 278 Bluff Road (the site).That land is in proximity to my property.Havelock Villager's submission seeks amongst other things, the rezoning or the site to residential zone in order to provide for approximately	Accept in part Accept in part	15.1 16.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>1025 new residential lots and new neighbourhood centre. In the alternative it seeks the rezoning of the Site to Aggregate Extraction Zone. I am strongly supportive of the ongoing growth and development of Pokeno. As a result, I support the additional housing and population that would be created by the rezoning of the Site. The additional population will assist to improve the economic vitality of Pokeno. In addition, the proposed new neighbourhood centre will provide a range of amenities and commercial services to cater for the day-to-day needs of the local community. An additional benefit of the Havelock Village Development is the direct linkage between the Pokeno Town Centre and Bluff Road proposed on the Havelock Village Masterplan which would allow residents on Bluff Road, Pioneer Road and Miller Road to be more connected to the Pokeno community. As a resident of Miller Road, I consider this would provide a much-improved connection for the Pokeno South community.</p>		
FS1340.184	TaTa Valley Limited	Support	Support.	<p>The submitter supports submission 862 in its entirety. In particular, the submitter supports rezoning TaTa Valley as requested in its submission to provide for additional economic opportunities and amenities with Pokeno. There are also potential efficiencies in the delivery of infrastructure if both TaTa Valley and Havelock Village are rezoned and developed.</p>	<p>Accept in part Accept in part</p>	<p>15.1 16.1</p>
862.31	Havelock Village Limited	Oppose	<p>Add a schedule that reflects the outcomes of the Waikato District Landscape Study, which notes the attributes and features that lend itself to the Significant Amenity Landscape status; OR If a schedule is not included, delete all Significant Amenity Landscapes from the Proposed District Plan; AND Any consequential amendments and alternative relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.</p>	<p>There is a Significant Amenity Landscapes on the submission site. It is understood that the Waikato District Landscape Study was prepared to support the mapping of the Significant Amenity Landscapes and it sets out the areas of Significant Amenity Landscapes and their attributes. It is considered that these attributes should be included in the District Plan as a schedule. Without this detail it is difficult to efficiently assess a resource consent application against the objective and policies. Objective 3.4.1 (a), Policy 3.4.2 (a) and Policy 3.4.3 (a) (v) all make reference to attributes and features of Significant Amenity Landscapes. The Significant Amenity Landscape appears to be a rollover of the previous District Plan notation with no ground truthing undertaken to confirm if the attributes listed in the study are still applicable in this location. Attributes onsite are not aligned to those</p>	<p>Accept</p>	<p>9.1</p>

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				described in the study. An expert assessment has been undertaken (see Appendix O of the submission) which recommends its deletion.		
FS1086.31	Yashili Dairy Company Limited	Support	Support the original submission.	Yashili supports the original submission by Havelock Village Limited subject to the inclusion of adequate mitigation measures and/or an appropriate set back distance between the proposed residential development and its industrial site(s) within the provisions of the Proposed Plan to address any potential adverse reverse sensitivity effects, in particular in respect of noise, related to this interface. Havelock Village Limited and related companies control land in southern Pokeno at 88, 242 (in part) and 278 Bluff Road (the site). That land is in proximity to Yashili's dairy plant. Havelock Village's submission seeks, amongst other things, the rezoning of the site to Residential zone in order to provide for approximately 1025 new residential lots and new neighbourhood centre. In the alternative it seeks the rezoning of the site to Aggregate Extraction Zone. Yashili is strongly supportive of the ongoing growth and development of Pokeno. As a result, it supports the additional housing and population that would be created by the rezoning of the site. The additional population will assist to improve the economic vitality of Pokeno. The rezoning will provide much needed residential land and will promote more affordable houses and housing choice, including for employees at Yashili's plant. In addition, the proposed new neighbourhood centre will provide a range of amenities and commercial services to cater for the day-to-day needs of the local community, including new residents and employees at Yashili's plant. Provided the matters raised above are sufficiently addressed through the provisions of the Proposed Plan, Yashili seeks that submission 862 be allowed.	Accept	9.1
FS1186.31	Pokeno Nutritional Park Limited	Support	Pokeno Nutritional supports the original submission by Havelock Village Limited in its entirety.	Havelock Village Limited and related companies control land in southern Pokeno at 88, 242 (in part) and 278 Bluff Road (the site). That land is in proximity to Pokeno Nutritional's new dairy plant. Havelock Village's submissions seeks, amongst other things, the rezoning of the Site to residential zone in order to provide for approximately 1025 new residential lots and new neighbourhood centre. In the alternative it seeks the rezoning of the Site to Aggregate Extraction	Accept	9.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>Zone. Pokeno Nutritional is strongly supportive of the ongoing growth and development of Pokeno. As a result, it supports the additional housing and population that would be created by the rezoning of the Site. The additional population will assist to improve the economic vitality of Pokeno. The rezoning will provide much needed residential land and will promote more affordable houses and housing choice, including for employees at Pokeno Nutritional's plant. In addition, the proposed new neighbourhood centre will provide a range of amenities and commercial services to cater for the day-to-day needs of the local community, including new residents and employees at Pokeno Nutritional's plant. Finally, Pokeno Nutritional's supports the inclusion within the Masterplan for the Site of reserve land on the eastern boundary of the Site. This reserve land will provide an appropriate set back between the residential development and the adjacent industrial land and address any potential adverse effects related to this interface.</p>		
FS1301.31	New Zealand Health Food Park Limited	Support	Support the submission in its entirety.	<p>Havelock Village Limited and related companies control land in southern Pokeno at 88, 242 (in part) and 278 Bluff Road (the site). That land is in proximity to Health Food Park's property. Havelock Village's submissions seeks, amongst other things, the rezoning of the site to Residential zone in order to provide for approximately 1025 new residential lots and new neighbourhood centre. In the alternative it seeks the rezoning of the site to Aggregate Extraction Zone. Health Food Park is strongly supportive of the ongoing growth and development of Pokeno. As a result, it supports the additional housing and population that would be created by the rezoning of the site. The additional population will assist to improve the economic vitality of Pokeno. In addition, the proposed new neighbourhood centre will provide a range of amenities and commercial services to cater for the day-to-day needs of the local community. An additional benefit of the Havelock Village Development is the direct linkage between the Pokeno Town Centre and Potter Road proposed on the Havelock Village Masterplan allowing the residents on Potter Road, Ewing Road and Trig Road to be more connected to the Pokeno community.</p>	Accept	9.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1303.31	Charlie Harris	Support	I support the original submission by Havelock Village Limited in its entirety.	Havelock Village Limited and related companies control land in southern Pokeno at 88.242 (in part) and 278 Bluff Road (the site). That land is in proximity to my property. Havelock Villager's submission seeks amongst other things, the rezoning of the site to residential zone in order to provide for approximately 1025 new residential lots and new neighbourhood centre. In the alternative it seeks the rezoning of the Site to Aggregate Extraction Zone. I am strongly supportive of the ongoing growth and development of Pokeno. As a result, I support the additional housing and population that would be created by the rezoning of the Site. The additional population will assist to improve the economic vitality of Pokeno. In addition, the proposed new neighbourhood centre will provide a range of amenities and commercial services to cater for the day-to-day needs of the local community. An additional benefit of the Havelock Village Development is the direct linkage between the Pokeno Town Centre and Bluff Road proposed on the Havelock Village Masterplan which would allow residents on Bluff Road, Pioneer Road and Miller Road to be more connected to the Pokeno community. As a resident of Miller Road, I consider this would provide a much-improved connection for the Pokeno South community.	Accept	9.1
FS1340.178	TaTa Valley Limited	Support	Support.	The submitter supports submission 862 in its entirety. In particular, the submitter supports rezoning TaTa Valley as requested in its submission to provide for additional economic opportunities and amenities with Pokeno. There are also potential efficiencies in the delivery of infrastructure if both TaTa Valley and Havelock Village are rezoned and developed.	Accept	9.1
FS1345.113	Genesis Energy Limited	Support	Accept in part.	For the reasons presented in the submission and subject to the exact nature of the amendments.	Accept	9.1
944.1	Janet Evans on behalf of Brodick Farms Ltd		Amend the planning maps by deleting the identified areas (Significant Natural Area and Significant Amenity Landscape) from the property at 849 Matahuru Road, Matahuru.		Accept in part Accept in part	15.1 16.1