

Appendix 2: Table of submission points (Subdivision)

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
Objectives 4.3.1 and Policy 4.3.2						
697.999	Waikato District Council	Support	Amend Rule 24.4 Subdivision as follows: 24.4 Rules	Amend Rule 24.4 Subdivision as follows: 24.4 Rules	Accepted	4.1
FS1387.768	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. 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.	Rejected	4.1
749.4	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Support	Retain Objectives and Policies in Section 4.3 Village Zone as notified.	The submitter supports the objectives and policies of the Village Zone.	Accepted in Part	4.1
FS1387.991	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	Accepted in Part	4.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p><i>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.</i></p>		
81.129	Waikato Council Regional	Neutral/Amended	Amend Objective 4.3.1 Village Zone character to include a description or explanation of the character and purpose of the Village Zone including anticipated intensity of development.	<p>Submitter seeks amendments to provisions to provide greater clarity about critical elements of the character of the Village Zone that is to be maintained, (for example, the rationale behind the desired intensity of development) and to make a stronger correlation between infrastructure provision and the outcomes sought in terms of the zone. The submitter is concerned that in combination, the minimum density of 8-10 households per hectare for Village Zone sites proposed in Policy 4.1.5 Density where public reticulated services can be provided, and the requirement for a 3000m² minimum lot size (Rule 24.4.1) promote a rural rather than an urban outcome for the Village Zone. This would not achieve the sustainable, compact urban form necessary to support efficient, effective transport and other infrastructure services. The submitter is also of the view that the density policy and subdivision rule promote a settlement pattern that will be difficult to change if</p>	Accepted	4.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				additional, more intensive development is required to provide for future growth around the district's urban settlements.		
FS1091.48	GD Jones	Support	The submission is allowed.	Generally consistent with relief sought by GD Jones (110.2).	Accepted	4.1
FS1091.50	GD Jones	Support	The submission is allowed.	The Village zone's purpose is unclear, particularly due to its dual use as the single residential zone in smaller townships and as a lower-density residential zone in larger townships.	Accepted	4.1
81.130	Waikato Council	Regional Neutral/Amended	Amend Policy 4.3.2 Character to provide greater clarity about the character of the Village Zone; to make a stronger correlation between infrastructure provision and the outcomes sought in terms of the Village zone; and to remove reference to 'semi-rural character'.	Submitter seeks amendments to the provisions to provide greater clarity about critical elements of the character of the Village Zone that is to be maintained, (for example, the rationale behind the desired intensity of development) and to make a stronger correlation between infrastructure provision and the outcomes sought in terms of the zone. The submitter is concerned that in combination, the minimum density of 8-10 households per hectare for Village Zone sites proposed in Policy 4.1.5 Density where public reticulated services can be provided, and the requirement for a 3000m2 minimum lot size (Rule 24.4.1) promote a rural rather than an urban outcome for the Village zone. This would not achieve the sustainable, compact urban form necessary to support efficient, effective transport and other infrastructure services. The submitter is also of the view that the density policy and subdivision rule promote a settlement pattern that will be difficult to change if additional, more intensive development is	Accepted	4.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				required to provide for future growth around the district's urban settlements. The 'semi-rural character' reference is inappropriate for a zone that is to be used to manage activities in an urban environment.		
FS1091.52	GD Jones	Support	The submission is allowed.	The Village zone's purpose is unclear, particularly due to its dual use as the single residential zone in smaller townships and as a lower-density residential zone in larger townships.	Accepted	4.1
535.22	Lance Vervoort for Hamilton City Council	Oppose	<p>Amend Section 4.3 Village Zone, to better define the purpose of the Village Zone which has more alignment with the objectives and policies relating to rural amenity. The Village Zone needs to better consider cross-boundary impacts of growth.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>	<p>The submitter is concerned that the overall strategic direction of the Proposed Plan directs growth similarly to towns and villages. Preferably there would be a strong objective and policy framework to direct growth opportunities to existing towns, rather than comparatively large lots within the villages which would weaken sub-regional infrastructure planning for public transport and 3-waters. It would create densities that may make accommodating future growth projections difficult. Policies in Section 4.3 (e.g. 4.3.2- Character) are very similar to those of section 5.6 Country living Zone. In many ways, the purpose of these two separate zones is very similar, and both, if occurring in the outskirts of Hamilton, cause some concern for Hamilton City Council. In the past, development within the Country living Zone has caused cross-boundary issues within Hamilton, including the road networks, provided little impetus to improve passenger transport patronage and placed strain on existing facilities.</p>	Accepted	4.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				The new Village Zone, particularly when located in the outskirts of Hamilton, has the potential to have the same cross boundary issues. Given the Village Zone (1000m ² to 3000m ²) accommodates smaller lot sizes than the Country Living Zone (5,000m ²), the cross boundary impacts are arguably exacerbated.		
FS1091.20	GD Jones	Support	The submission is allowed.	The Village zone's purpose is unclear, particularly due to its dual use as the single residential zone in smaller townships and as a lower-density residential zone in larger townships.	Accepted	4.1
FS1335.2	Greig Metcalfe for CKL	Oppose	Null	The objectives and policies are consistent with the outcome sought by Future Proof. Te Kowhai is specifically identified as a growth area and Future Proof anticipates different densities depending on whether reticulated wastewater is available. The Village Zone is different from the Country Living Zone in that growth is centred on existing communities and amenities and there is the potential for reticulated services being provided.	Rejected	4.1
FS1388.696	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	Rejected	4.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>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>		
81.180	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend subdivision provisions to implement the objectives and policies of Chapter 4 subject to previous submission points.	The submitter requests amendments as per other submission points. Refer to submission point regarding the Village Zone in Chapter 4 Urban Environment. It is unclear the exact submission point that has been referred to as there are a number of submission points by the submitter (81.123, 81.134, 81.135, 81.136 and 81.150) that have reference to both Chapter 4 and the Village Zone.	Accepted	4.1
923.52	Waikato District Health Board	Neutral/Amend	Amend Objective 4.3.1- Village Zone character to include a stronger description of the character and purpose of the Village Zone including anticipated intensity of development.	Should be amended to make a stronger correlation between infrastructure provision and the outcomes sought in terms of the zone, and to provide a stronger description as to what the Village Zone characteristics are that the objective seeks to maintain. This is significant given that absence of any meaningful description as to the purpose of the Village Zone.	Accepted	4.1
FS1091.58	GD Jones	Support	<i>The submission is allowed.</i>	<i>The Village zone's purpose is unclear, particularly due to its dual use as the single residential zone in smaller townships and as a lower-density residential zone in larger townships.</i>	Accepted	4.1
923.53	Waikato District Health Board	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 4.3.2- Character to provide greater clarity about the character of the Village Zone and to make stronger correlation	Should be amended to make a stronger correlation between infrastructure provision and the outcomes sought in	Accepted	4.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			with Infrastructure.	terms of the zone and the associated objective.		
FS1091.59	GD Jones	Support	The submission is allowed.	The Village zone's purpose is unclear, particularly due to its dual use as the single residential zone in smaller townships and as a lower-density residential zone in larger townships.	Accepted	4.1
451.3	Steven & Teresa Hopkins	Support	Retain Policy 4.3.2 Character.	Supports the policy outlining the character of the Village Zone. Proposed residential development for the submission site would align with this policy being low density, semi-rural in character and provided with on-site three waters infrastructure.	Accepted in Part	4.1
FS1075.3	Steven and Teresa Hopkins	Support	Accept submission in its entirety and rezone the submission area to Village zoning and make changes to the identified plan provisions accordingly.	We continue to support our original submission for Village zoning across the submission area as we consider this the most appropriate zoning and will positively support the growth of Pokeno. In the interim following the close of the first submission period, a geotechnical feasibility assessment has been commissioned for the site (enclosed within Appendix A) which concludes that the majority of the site is located on land that is "considered to be suitable for residential development and should provides safe and stable conditions" (Pg. 3). This report supports the Village zoning that is sought ensuring that the character and landscape can be retained without the need for significant modification.	Accepted in Part	4.1
378.69	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Retain Policy 4.3.2 Character.	FENZ supports Policy 4.3.2 as it requires activities within the Village Zone to be self-sufficient in the provision of on-site water supply, unless a reticulated supply is available.	Accepted	4.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1035.176	Pareoranga Te Kata	Support	Obtain statement of performance expectation (SPE) to allow submission to be accepted.	Fire safety and fire prevention to undertake training activities for fire fighters within the region.	Accepted	4.1
FS1075.10	Steven & Teresa Hopkins	Support	Accept submission point and retain policy as notified.	We are in agreement with the direction of this policy and the character that is outlined for the Village Zone.	Accepted	4.1
24.4.1 Subdivision – General						
697.936	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amended	Amend Rule 24(2) Village Zone, as follows: The rules that apply to subdivision in the Village Zone are contained in Rule 24.4 <u>and the relevant rules in 14 Infrastructure and Energy; and 15 Natural Hazards and Climate Change (Placeholder).</u>	This is to clarify that the rules in Chapter 14: Infrastructure and Energy and Chapter 15: Natural Hazards and Climate Change apply to subdivision as well as to land use activities.	Accepted	24.4
FS1387.739	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	Rejected	24.4
626.2	Vineyard Road Properties Limited	Oppose	Amend the minimum net site area for general subdivision in the Village Zone to 2000m2, whether or not the lots are publicly	A lot size of 2000m2 creates an open space rural-residential character but can be planted, fenced, mowed and	Rejected	24.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			reticulated; AND/OR Amend the Proposed District Plan with any necessary consequential or other relief that addresses these concerns.	maintained easily while achieving a rural setting. This lot size can still accommodate on-site services and it also involves a more efficient use of the land resource compared to 5000m2 lots in the Country Living Zone. A smaller lot size of 2000m2 achieves an appropriate level of amenity while still having a low intensity of development and a Rural outlook and character.		
FS1387.21	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.	Accepted	24.4
FS1015.1	Michael Klaja	Oppose	Null	Objections: We moved to Te Kauwhata two and half years ago from Ellerslie and the city of Auckland to start our rural life style, we bought our lifestyle block under the premise that this area had been zoned Rural Country Living for this purpose. Our block is in the first phase of the Vineyard Road development of which all three areas were to be developed under this same rural zoning.	Accepted	24.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>We are angry, one that we have been deceived by the developers understanding they now wish to rezone to Village status including all the areas already sold and developed. And two its being requested without any consolation with the occupants. Waikato District Council have been allowing the development of various types of sites in the area and increasing the population and by so doing offering potential families an opportunity to buy a variety of housing development, Hence the mix of zones within the Te Kauwhata area that are already provided for in the Council zoning. We moved from Auckland to a development on the outskirts of Te Kauwhata to ensure we could have a lifestyle block close to a thriving rural community. We bought on the outskirts to ensure we could live in a rural block of 5000m2 or more. Waikato District Council are already aware that there is poor telecommunication connectivity and with the proposed increase in housing for Vineyard Road this will only put increased strain on the telecommunication challenges residents in the Vineyard Road development are already facing. Our understanding of rural community development is that intensive housing always in the central village areas and then moves to larger section zoning as you move away from the center. From Travers Road and beyond Council have zoned the outer areas rural country living. We would be at a loss to understand why Council would allow a developer to change zoning purely to line pockets of a developer. The requested smaller sections would still have to provide their own water supply and sewerage. Storm water management in</p>		

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>Part 1 and 2 of Vineyard Road has been developed with the need to service non-permeable storm water management for blocks within a rural country living zone. Changing the rural zone to village zone enables anyone in the development to seek ability to subdivide and we are aware there are already residents having challenges with water run-off from neighbouring blocks. Increasing non-permeable surfaces will only increase these storm water issues. We are at a loss to understand how the developer can argue that the rural zone should be changed because it doesn't allow the land to be productive. The developments and covenants that they have put on the present sites do not allow for productive sites but are aimed at rural lifestyle living. They were aware of this when they began the development. All blocks in Part 1 and 2 have been sold under this premise. Residents living next to undeveloped blocks are at risk of neighbouring blocks being redeveloped into smaller sites and more housing which they didn't expect when they recently bought. The housing market has slowed in the past two years and hence house and section sales have also slowed in both Hamilton and Auckland. We question if the drive from the developer to request to change the zone to smaller sections would potentially sell quicker than lifestyle blocks. Smaller sections will affect the aesthetic potential for the current house owners. Will Waikato District Council look to improve the pedestrian access on Vineyard Road. As dog owners who regularly walk are already challenged with the volume of traffic and lack of paths. Understanding Vineyard Road already falls</p>		

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				outside of a grant to enable fibre to be installed into the development does not fill us with confidence that any other services will be offered despite an increase in rates revenue that would be received through changing the zoning and allowing more housing. Travers Road which is remaining rural falls within the grant zone. This is developer greed that is driving this application and we don't agree with the developer's application.		
FS1133.4	Dave Roebeck	Oppose	Same reasons as point 626.1	Same reasons as point 626.1	Accepted	24.4
FS1197.27	Bowrock Properties Limited	Support	That the submission point is accepted.	Support general intent of submission as it relates to Village and Country Living Zones.	Rejected	24.4
FS1091.26	GD Jones	Oppose	A single minimum allotment size for this zone does not recognise the advantages of or incentivise providing reticulated services	The submission is allowed insofar as it relates to the minimum site area for an unserviced site, and is disallowed insofar as it relates to the minimum site area for a serviced site	Accepted	24.4
FS1056.1	Tony Harford	Oppose	I wish to oppose the proposal to request zone change from CLZ to VZ for the following reasons it would negatively impact on our current amenity values , in other words it will compromise our property value.our section was purchased on the understanding that the properties surrounding us would also be of 5000sq metres it would negatively impact on our open space character over capitalization of rural land it is unfair we have to retrospectively oppose this, its not what we signed up for. Negatively impact on our current covenants Negatively impact on increase road traffic currently no road markings ,no footpath or lighting and increased traffic would compromise our safety concern regarding increase road parking ,currently no provision for road parking and increased residence would increased demand for parking significant concern that there would be		Accepted	24.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p>increased storm water run off as a direct result of increased impermeable surfaces increased additional expenses for current residence to manage said extra storm water run off we currently experience very poor connectivity and increase pressure on rural broadband will only add to the problem increased construction noise and building associated activity impact of set back rules on current properties potential over shadowing of current properties loss of privacy for current residence.it is unfair to say we exhibit a compromised and fragmented rural character as we are new subdivision and all houses have adhered to the covenants regarding house still and set back.</p>			
FS1112.1	Rosalie Klaus	Oppose	<p>I oppose the proposal to re zone Vineyard Road subdivision from CLZ to VE for the following reasons It would negatively impact on our current amenity values, in other words it would compromise our property value Our section was purchased on the understanding that the surrounding properties would also be of 5000 square metres approx. It would negatively impact on our open space character Over capitalisation of rural land it is unfair we have to retrospectively oppose this , it's not what we signed up for It would negatively impact on our current covenants Negative impact of increased road traffic We currently have no road markings, footpaths or lighting and increased traffic would compromise our safety Concern regarding increased demand for road parking, currently there is no provision for road parking and increased residents with smaller sections may not have the provision to park on their property significant concern that there would be increased storm water run off as a direct result of increased impermeable surfaces and current storm water drainage is challenging Potential</p>		Accepted	24.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p>increased additional expenses for current residents to manage said extra storm water run off We currently experience very poor connectivity and increased pressure on Rural Broadband will only add to the problem Increased construction noise and building associated activities Impact of set back rules for current property Potential overshadowing of current properties Loss of privacy for current residents It is unfair to say the development exhibits a compromised and fragmented rural character because we have all adhered to the required covenants This is a new subdivision and properties are still developing gardens etc so to say they are too big to be easily managed as lifestyle properties is inaccurate, we specifically purchased this section to have a lifestyle block Many of the covenants restrict our ability to be productive and is not as a result of the block size. There are other areas in Te Kauwhata that could be used to accommodate VZ living eg failed sub division on Wayside Road</p>			
FS1144.2	Mark Glover for Kivitykes Ltd on behalf of Glover Family Trust	Oppose	Null	<p>8.1) The current district plan does provide an appropriate and efficient opportunity for rural residential lifestyle development. To provide for more appropriate and efficient land use there is significant other land areas available. 8.2) CLZ is not about efficient use of land for productivity in the opinion of Vineyard Road residents. Lots were not purchased to be used for production or grazing. In fact, covenants were placed on the land specifically restricting what can and cannot be done. The comment "too big to be managed" is not relevant to the application for land zone change, this is the responsibility of owners to be managed as they see fit. Again, specific covenants require the land to be kept to certain standards. 3 8.3) The</p>	Accepted	24.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>residents on Vineyard rd. do not wish to see a more intensive rural- residential lifestyle opportunity. The sections were sold, purchased and built in accordance with the current CLZ. a) A more intensive subdivision is not required to make the land more efficient, there is ample land available in Te Kauwhata for higher density living, see failed sub division on eastern side of Wayside Ave, specifically 24 Wayside Ave. b) A smaller site of 2000m2 would not provide an opportunity in Vineyard rd. it would severely fragment the current outlook in the form of sections having both singular rural houses next to over capitalized and developed 2000m2 sections. c) It would disadvantage those that have already built in accordance with current covenants while advantaging those that have blank sections. d) In looking at District plan submissions for Te Kauwhata there are a number of submissions for higher density housing. 8.4) The comments of 'relaxation' pose serious concern for residents on Vineyard Road. It has already been the subject to relaxations around telecommunications which has proved problematic and further intensive housing will increase the problem. 8.5) Kivitykes Ltd. Opposes that 2000m2 for on-site services is achievable for wastewater and water. There have already been numerous issues with drainage on Vineyard Road with a number of properties struggling to drain themselves and other sections. A higher density would place further strain on the systems and would be to the detriment of those with 5000m2. It should not be the job of the large sections to provide drainage areas for the smaller sections which could happen. It is our</p>		

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>understanding that the original subdivision size was a requirement in part due to stormwater management. 8.6) The properties on Vineyard Road do not exhibit a compromised and fragmented character; this is the opinion of Vineyard Road Properties Ltd. The current look is not relevant. The current look is because the sub division is still in its infancy and was only signed off for development in 2015. It would be unfair to consider the area mature after only 4 years. The submitter also wishes the WAIDC to understand that the sections were sold by Vineyard Road ltd originally as 5000m2 sections to have 'a rural lifestyle' and that this submission is clearly around capital greed rather efficient land use. It should also be noted that Vineyard Road Ltd. Is still advertising sections at 5000m2 somewhat misleading prospective purchasers. 8.7) There is no reason to treat Te Kauwhata the same as Tuakau or Te Kowhai, there as much dissimilar as they are similar. This is not about being fair and consistent across towns but fair and consistent to those people affected. 8.8) It could be argued that Te Kauwhata does not have the required infrastructure to absorb the increased density. Whilst the motorway may afford the current rd. on Vineyard rd. is not suitable for higher density traffic. Education facilities are currently at maximum, there is only 1 playground in Te Kauwhata and shopping somewhat limited. Most residents in Te Kauwhata do not do their main shopping here but travel some distance to either Pukekohe, Huntly or Hamilton. Vineyard Road also does not have telecommunication provisions as it was signed off as a wireless</p>		

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>telecommunication resource consent. Even with current density of houses the service is basically unusable and placing more houses at a higher density will only negatively impact further. 8.9) Te Kauwhata may be a 'spill over' area for Auckland, however with the Winton group placing high density housing at Lakeside and land available on Wayside Ave. for development, high density 4 housing is not needed on Vineyard rd. as other land is available. It is also noted how many other areas have submissions currently for increased density housing in Te Kauwhata. 8.10) A greater mass of rate payers to contribute is available in other land. This is clearly a grab at the Council 'carrot' to tempt the council into higher density land zone which is not needed here. Lakeside will provide the critical mass required should it be successful. See point 8.3 (c) There are enough submissions by other parties in Te Kauwhata to provide for higher density houses. 8.11) Kiwitykes Ltd is not convinced that on site servicing can be achieved in this area on. 2000m2 sections due to the local effects of drainage. It is also not convinced that open space, rural views and landscaped areas can be achieved due to restriction of views by higher density of housing. 8.12) Kiwitykes Ltd. Also asserts that it is unclear what the effects of property values would be by mixing the sections, however its likely to devalue the property in the opinion of the submitter due to the mismatch of housing. Vineyard Road property Ltd asserts that there is a fragmented look on Vineyard Road which Kiwitykes Ltd disagrees with. It is more likely that if the area was rezoned that a fragmented look would ensue mixing high</p>		

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>density and lifestyle look. 9.0) That overall this will have a negative impact on our amenity value compromising our property values. 9.1) The sections were purchased on the understanding of 5000m2, a change to this will negatively impact on our space character 9.2) Land for higher density housing is available in a number of locations in Te Kauwhata, such as Wayside Ave, The Lakeside development and east of Te Kauwhata in the Swan Road development. See point 8.3 (c) Again there are a number of applications for higher density housing in Te Kauwhata. 9.3) It seems unfair that this needs to be retrospectively opposed. There has been no notification to Vineyard rd residents. 9.4) This will have a negative impact on the current covenants on the land, and in most cases will not be able to comply with. 9.5) Increased traffic and safety concerns such as no lighting, no footpaths and no parking areas. 9.6) Increased noise from housing and also traffic. 9.7) Increased storm water run-off due to impermeable surfaces. A significant part of the original subdivision sign-off for 5000m2 was the ability for each section to independently manage its own stormwater. Increased density will increase catchment and runoff whilst also reducing the size of sections to be able to manage. The Waikato Regional Council should be consulted with respect to stormwater issues. There are considerations around catchment as well as discharge and in particular the quality of water being discharged to the Whangamarino Wetlands. Kivitykes Ltd. Formally requests that the WAIDC request the Waikato Regional Council to do due diligence on the existing</p>		

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>subdivision to ensure that we do not create any unforeseen issues. 9.8) Increased and additional expenses to existing properties to manage storm water run off 9.9) Current poor connectivity to telecommunication services and a higher demand on rural (wireless) broadband services make render an already poor service virtually unusable. 5 9.10) Overshadowing and loss of privacy for current residents. 10) Overall it appears to Kivitykes Ltd. That this is a retrospective grab from the developer. The sections were sold at 5000m2 and a change to 2000m2 can only be seen as a cash grab to sell more sections at a similar price while packaging up the submission to the WAIDC as increased efficient use of land and an increase of rate retrieval. It should also be noted that the developer is still selling sections at 5000m2 telling prospective buyers that this is what they are buying into. This is clearly deceitful and misleading. The overall net effects of the decision would be negative to all properties and owners on Vineyard Road. That this area has already been re-zoned once and given a formal status for sub-division and should not be done again.</p>		
FSI308.89	The Surveying Company	Support	Null	<p>Where reticulation exists, opportunities for subdivision at a higher density should prevail. A reduced minimum lot size where lots can be reticulated will provide more efficient use of both the land resource and the corresponding available infrastructure. The Village Zone is an urban environment that anticipates low density development. A minimum lot size of 1000m2 will continue to maintain open space and achieve the appropriate level of amenity.</p>	Rejected	24.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1187.15	Greig Developments No 2 Limited	Support	Oppose submission point 626.2.	Where reticulation exists, opportunities for subdivision at a higher density should prevail. A reduced minimum lot size where lots can be reticulated will provide more efficient use of both the land resource and the corresponding available infrastructure. The Village Zone is an urban environment that anticipates low-density development. A minimum lot size of 1000m2 will continue to maintain open space and achieve the appropriate level of amenity.	Rejected	24.4
FS1311.22	Ethan & Rachael Findlay	Support	Support submission point 626.2.	To provide provisions to allow most efficient use of land. To support general intent of submission as it relates to Village and Country Living Zones.	Rejected	24.4
626.4	Vineyard Road Properties Limited	Support	Retain the restricted discretionary activity status for general subdivision in the Village Zone and the matters of discretion for those.	No reasons provided.	Accepted	24.4
FS1144.4	Mark Glover for Kivitykes Ltd on behalf of Glover Family Trust	Oppose	Null	8.1) The current district plan does provide an appropriate and efficient opportunity for rural residential lifestyle development. To provide for more appropriate and efficient land use there is significant other land areas available. 8.2) CLZ is not about efficient use of land for productivity in the opinion of Vineyard Road residents. Lots were not purchased to be used for production or grazing. In fact, covenants were placed on the land specifically restricting what can and cannot be done. The comment "too big to be managed" is not relevant to the application for land zone change, this is the responsibility of owners to be managed as they see fit. Again, specific covenants require the land to be kept to certain standards. 3 8.3) The residents on Vineyard rd. do not wish to see	Rejected	24.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>a more intensive rural- residential lifestyle opportunity. The sections were sold, purchased and built in accordance with the current CLZ. a) A more intensive subdivision is not required to make the land more efficient, there is ample land available in Te Kauwhata for higher density living, see failed sub division on eastern side of Wayside Ave, specifically 24 Wayside Ave. b) A smaller site of 2000m2 would not provide an opportunity in Vineyard rd. it would severely fragment the current outlook in the form of sections having both singular rural houses next to over capitalized and developed 2000m2 sections. c) It would disadvantage those that have already built in accordance with current covenants while advantaging those that have blank sections. d) In looking at District plan submissions for Te Kauwhata there are a number of submissions for higher density housing. 8.4) The comments of 'relaxation' pose serious concern for residents on Vineyard Road. It has already been the subject to relaxations around telecommunications which has proved problematic and further intensive housing will increase the problem. 8.5) Kiwitykes Ltd. Opposes that 2000m2 for on-site services is achievable for wastewater and water. There have already been numerous issues with drainage on Vineyard Road with a number of properties struggling to drain themselves and other sections. A higher density would place further strain on the systems and would be to the detriment of those with 5000m2. It should not be the job of the large sections to provide drainage areas for the smaller sections which could happen. It is our understanding that the original subdivision</p>		

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>size was a requirement in part due to stormwater management. 8.6) The properties on Vineyard Road do not exhibit a compromised and fragmented character, this is the opinion of Vineyard Road Properties Ltd. The current look is not relevant. The current look is because the sub division is still in its infancy and was only signed off for development in 2015. It would be unfair to consider the area mature after only 4 years. The submitter also wishes the WAIDC to understand that the sections were sold by Vineyard Road Ltd originally as 5000m2 sections to have 'a rural lifestyle' and that this submission is clearly around capital greed rather efficient land use. It should also be noted that Vineyard Road Ltd. Is still advertising sections at 5000m2 somewhat misleading prospective purchasers. 8.7) There is no reason to treat Te Kauwhata the same as Tuakau or Te Kowhai, there as much dissimilar as they are similar. This is not about being fair and consistent across towns but fair and consistent to those people affected. 8.8) It could be argued that Te Kauwhata does not have the required infrastructure to absorb the increased density. Whilst the motorway may afford the current rd. on Vineyard rd. is not suitable for higher density traffic. Education facilities are currently at maximum, there is only 1 playground in Te Kauwhata and shopping somewhat limited. Most residents in Te Kauwhata do not do their main shopping here but travel some distance to either Pukekohe, Huntly or Hamilton. Vineyard Road also does not have telecommunication provisions as it was signed off as a wireless telecommunication resource consent. Even</p>		

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>with current density of houses the service is basically unusable and placing more houses at a higher density will only negatively impact further. 8.9) Te Kauwhata may be a 'spill over' area for Auckland, however with the Winton group placing high density housing at Lakeside and land available on Wayside Ave. for development, high density 4 housing is not needed on Vineyard rd. as other land is available. It is also noted how many other areas have submissions currently for increased density housing in Te Kauwhata. 8.10) A greater mass of rate payers to contribute is available in other land. This is clearly a grab at the Council 'carrot' to tempt the council into higher density land zone which is not needed here. Lakeside will provide the critical mass required should it be successful. See point 8.3 (c) There are enough submissions by other parties in Te Kauwhata to provide for higher density houses. 8.11) Kiwitykes Ltd is not convinced that on site servicing can be achieved in this area on. 2000m2 sections due to the local effects of drainage. It is also not convinced that open space, rural views and landscaped areas can be achieved due to restriction of views by higher density of housing. 8.12) Kiwitykes Ltd. Also asserts that it is unclear what the effects of property values would be by mixing the sections, however its likely to devalue the property in the opinion of the submitter due to the mismatch of housing. Vineyard Road property Ltd asserts that there is a fragmented look on Vineyard Road which Kiwitykes Ltd disagrees with. It is more likely that if the area was rezoned that a fragmented look would ensue mixing high density and lifestyle look. 9.0) That overall</p>		

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p><i>this will have a negative impact on our amenity value compromising our property values. 9.1) The sections were purchased on the understanding of 5000m2, a change to this will negatively impact on our space character 9.2) Land for higher density housing is available in a number of locations in Te Kauwhata, such as Wayside Ave, The Lakeside development and east of Te Kauwhata in the Swan Road development. See point 8.3 (c) Again there are a number of applications for higher density housing in Te Kauwhata. 9.3) It seems unfair that this needs to be retrospectively opposed. There has been no notification to Vineyard rd residents. 9.4) This will have a negative impact on the current covenants on the land, and in most cases will not be able to comply with. 9.5) Increased traffic and safety concerns such as no lighting, no footpaths and no parking areas. 9.6) Increased noise from housing and also traffic. 9.7) Increased storm water run-off due to impermeable surfaces. A significant part of the original subdivision sign-off for 5000m2 was the ability for each section to independently manage its own stormwater. Increased density will increase catchment and runoff whilst also reducing the size of sections to be able to manage. The Waikato Regional Council should be consulted with respect to stormwater issues. There are considerations around catchment as well as discharge and in particular the quality of water being discharged to the Whangamarino Wetlands. Kivitykes Ltd. Formally requests that the WAIDC request the Waikato Regional Council to do due diligence on the existing subdivision to ensure that we do not create</i></p>		

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>any unforeseen issues. 9.8) Increased and additional expenses to existing properties to manage storm water run off 9.9) Current poor connectivity to telecommunication services and a higher demand on rural (wireless) broadband services make render an already poor service virtually unusable. 5 9.10) Overshadowing and loss of privacy for current residents. 10) Overall it appears to Kivitykes Ltd. That this is a retrospective grab from the developer. The sections were sold at 5000m2 and a change to 2000m2 can only be seen as a cash grab to sell more sections at a similar price while packaging up the submission to the WAIDC as increased efficient use of land and an increase of rate retrieval. It should also be noted that the developer is still selling sections at 5000m2 telling prospective buyers that this is what they are buying into. This is clearly deceitful and misleading. The overall net effects of the decision would be negative to all properties and owners on Vineyard Road. That this area has already been re-zoned once and given a formal status for sub-division and should not be done again.</p>		
FS1133.3	Dave Roebeck	Oppose	Same reasons as point 626.1	Same reasons as point 626.1.	Rejected	24.4
FS1387.23	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<p>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</p>	Rejected	24.4

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>		
382.1	Brent Trail for Surveying Services Ltd	Oppose	No specific decision sought, but submission opposes Rule 24.4.1 Subdivision - General.	No reasons provided.	Rejected	24.4
FS1132.5	Z & Z Developments Limited Partnership	Oppose	Reject submission point and retain Rule 24.4.1 Subdivision- General.	Subdivision should be provided for in every rural zone so long as it is sufficiently regulated.	Accepted	24.4
FS1388.78	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.	Accepted	24.4
371.4	Kitty Burton	Not Stated	Add a new restricted discretionary rule (RDI (c)) for reticulated service lots of 1000m2 for Matangi within the the Village Zone.		Rejected	24.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1305.5	Andrew Mowbray	Support	Seek that the whole submission be allowed.	It is very important for the future sensible growth of Matangi there is one community plan in place to cater for the development of the area and it surrounds.	Rejected	24.4
296.6	Richard Falconer for Terra Consultants (CNI) Ltd	Support	Retain Rule 24.4.1 - RDI (a) Subdivision - General, that has a minimum lot size of 3000m2.	Supports the 3,000m2 minimum lot size as it is a reasonable sized rural-residential holding with it being large enough to retain the character of Te Kowhai while avoiding maintenance issues for future owners that has occurred in the Operative District Plan Country Living Zone.	Accepted in Part	24.4
FS1127.14	Vineyard Road Properties Limited	Oppose	The submission appears to relate to Te Kowhai only. However, a minimum size of 3,000m2 is not appropriate in the village zone because it is an inefficient use of resources and does not achieve the necessary character.		Accepted in Part	24.4
FS1386.306	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	Accepted in Part	24.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
438.2	Wendy Oliver	Neutral/Amended	Add Rule 24.4.1 RD1 (c) Subdivision, which allows a reticulated service option of 3,000m2 lots for 50C Cedar Park Road, Tamahere.	<p>Subdividing the 1.0237 ha block into two 5000m2 blocks is inefficient on the counts of land use, and sustainability. The section at 50C Cedar Park Road is also adjacent to the Waikato Expressway, and is on the Hamilton City side of the Waikato Expressway where more urban intensification is envisaged. It is now timely that Waikato District Council (WDC) also considers the draft Futureproof Strategy 2017 - 2018 (DFPS) which this submission is aligned with. To prioritize growth of the District in the best sustainable manner Tamahere should be the highest priority to be investigated for future growth and servicing. There is proximity to Hamilton, strong transport linkages in very close proximity, latent demand for prime rural land for country living opportunities, protection of prime rural production land, infrastructure provision potential, and improved development, planning and social outcomes going forward for the Waikato District. This will provide for social, economic and cultural wellbeing by restraining rapid change of the rural character and a high - quality rural land resource. To address population growth pressure in the best manner possible and to continue the close-knit feel of the community To enable growth in a way that makes it sustainable and does not adversely impact on the highly productive farm and horticulture land surrounding the area, see submission for section taken from the</p>	Rejected	24.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>draft Future Proof Strategy Update 2017. This will provide an efficient economy of scale for the provision of reticulated infrastructure. The vibrant and commercially successful community would benefit from more sustainable residential development without affecting the rural surrounding land use. Transport links have played a key role in the growth of the Tamahere area and this is becoming more predominant in recent times with new roading infrastructure. Tamahere is only a few minutes' drive by car from Hamilton city. Along with the development of the Waikato Expressway and SH25B, provide state highway linkages to the local road network. This proves that it is inevitable that there will continue to be a high latent demand for land in the Tamahere area for development.</p> <p>Waikato District population is projected to be 105,770 by 2048. Hamilton fringe areas are continuing to increase significantly due to high demand for properties and increased subdivision in the country living and urban areas with 20km of Hamilton. Some of the highest growth is currently being experienced and is predicted to continue in the Tamahere Country Living Zone (source Waikato District projected population). This proves that it is inevitable that there will continue to be a high latent demand for land in the Tamahere area for development. It will provide development, commercial, transport sustainability through economies of scale, development density and numbers of residents in a managed</p>		

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>and coordinated manner. Thought now needs to turn to protecting the rural productive land and encouraging urban serviced lots in the surrounding areas. The addressing of serviced infrastructure best addresses sustainable management of natural and physical resources as distinct from sprawling 5,000m² minimum Country Living Zone sized allotments. Section 6.5 of the Future Proof Strategy November 2017 supports the view that creating large non-reticulated lots will not assist integrated growth with Hamilton City's likely expansion into the future where such uses could be better accommodated with 2,000m² service lots, than either 3,000m² Village Zone or 5,000m² Country Living Zone sized lots.</p>		
FS1388.266	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	<p>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.</p>	Accepted	24.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
436.1	Gerard Willis	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 24.4.1 RD1 (a) Subdivision - General, so the minimum site area is 2500m2 as in the Operative District Plan.	The existing minimum area is 2500m2 and the Proposed Plan would effectively down-zone the land, reducing development opportunities	Accepted	24.4
FS1091.14	GD Jones	Support	Consistent with relief sought by GD Jones (110.2)	The submission is allowed	Accepted	24.4
FS1127.16	Vineyard Road Properties Limited	Support	Reduction in the minimum lot size is supported so long as a distinction between the CLZ and Village Zone is achieved. The distinction between the two zones is unclear in the Proposed District Plan.		Accepted	24.4
FS1388.261	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.	Rejected	24.4
389.6	Jonathan Quigley for J and T Quigley Ltd	Support	No specific decision sought, but submission supports in part Rule 24.4.1 Subdivision - General.	If the JTQL site is not zoned Countryside Living Zone then it should be zoned Village Zone which will allow for appropriate subdivision of the site where there is demand, yet retain the rural character.	Rejected	24.4
FS1388.94	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor	Accepted	24.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				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.		
345.23	Brent Trail	Oppose	Amend Rule 24.4.1 Subdivision - General to reduce the minimum lot size to 2500m2.	2500m2 is adequate to provide for 'on site' wastewater treatment and disposal. Existing rule in Franklin has been in place for many years and significant planning has gone into some sites. Reduced size will lead to a reduced yield on land already zoned for development, which will not help with availability and affordability of land and therefore is not sustainable.	Accepted	24.4
FS1091.7	GD Jones	Support	The submission is allowed.	Consistent with relief sought by GD Jones (110.2).	Accepted	24.4
FS1127.15	Julian Dawson on behalf of Vineyard Road Properties Limited	Support	Allow in part.	In part. Site size should be 2000m2, though rationale is supported.	Accepted	24.4
FS1386.491	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	Rejected	24.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure.</p> <p>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.</p>		
378.51	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Oppose	<p>Retain Rule 24.4.1 Subdivision - General, as subdivision is a restricted discretionary activity, except for the amendments sought below AND</p> <p>Amend Rule 24.4.1 Subdivision - General, as follows: (a) Subdivision must comply with all of the following conditions:... (x) <u>Proposed lots must be connected to water supply sufficient for firefighting purposes.</u> (b) Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters:... (x) <u>Provisions of infrastructure, including water supply for firefighting purposes.</u> AND</p> <p>Amend the Proposed District Plan to make further or consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>	Fire and Emergency New Zealand requires that proposed lots to be connected to public-reticulated water supply or water supply sufficient for firefighting purposes. Subdivision that does not comply is a Discretionary Activity. The changes sought promote consistency across all zones in the District Plan.	Accepted in Part	24.4
FS1035.157	Pareoranga Te Kata	Support	Obtain statement of performance expectation (SPE) to allow submission to be accepted.	Fire safety and fire prevention to undertake training activities for fire fighters within the region.	Accepted in Part	24.4
FS1134.93	Bridget Murdoch on behalf of	Support	Seeks that the submission point be allowed.	The provision of existing infrastructure should	Accepted in Part	24.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
	Counties Power			be considered.		
FS1388.45	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	Accepted in Part	24.4
405.81	Counties Power Limited	Neutral/Amended	Add a matter of discretion to Rule 24.4.1 RD1 (b) Subdivision - General, as follows: <u>The subdivision layout and design in regard to how this may impact on the operation, maintenance, upgrading and development of existing infrastructure assets;</u>	To prevent assets becoming landlocked. Similar to Transpower rules.	Accepted in Part	24.4
697.1000	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amended	Amend Rule 24.4 Subdivision, as follows: (1) Rule 24.4.1 provides for subdivision density and applies across in the Village Zone <u>outside of the Te Kowhai and Tuakau area.</u> (2) The following rules apply to specific areas and/or activities: (a) Rule 24.4.2 – Subdivision in Te Kowhai and Tuakau, applies to the Village Zone in these two areas. (b) Rules 24.4.1 and 24.4.2 are also subject	Additional words in this rule provide clarity as to where these rules apply.	Accepted	24.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			to <u>compliance with</u> the following subdivision controls:...			
FS1091.35	GD Jones	Support	The submission is allowed.	The proposed amendments clarify that Rule 24.4.1 does not apply in combination with Rule 24.4.2 for sites in the Village Zone in Te Kowhai and Tuakau.	Accepted	24.4
FS1387.764	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	Rejected	24.4
697.1002	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	<p>Amend title of 24.4.1 Subdivision – General, as follows: 24.4.1 Subdivision – General (<u>outside Te Kowhai and Tuakau</u>)</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend Rule 24.4.1 RDI (a) Subdivision - General as follows: (a) Proposed lots <u>outside of Te Kowhai and Tuakau</u> must have a minimum net site area of 3000m², except where the proposed lot is an access allotment, utility allotment or reserve to vest.</p>	Words included to provide clarity to the rule.	Accepted	24.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1091.36	GD Jones	Support	The submission is allowed.	The proposed amendments clarify that Rule 24.4.1 does not apply in combination with Rule 24.4.2 for sites in the Village Zone in Te Kowhai and Tuakau.	Accepted	24.4
FS1387.766	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	Rejected	24.4
746.131	The Surveying Company	Neutral/Amended	Amend Rule 24.4.1 RD1 (a) (i)- Subdivision-General as follows: (i) Proposed lots not connected to public water and wastewater infrastructure must have a minimum net site area of 2500m ² and an average net site area of 3000m ² , except where the proposed lot is an access allotment or reserve lot. (ii) <u>Proposed lots connected to public water and wastewater infrastructure must have a minimum net site area of 1,000m² except where the proposed lot is an access allotment or reserve lot.</u>	Should reticulation become available in other locations (other than Te Kowhai and Tuakau), then the minimum lot size should reflect this. A blanket minimum lot size can present challenges when designing a subdivision where there are different parent lot shapes, sizes and topographical/vegetative/other constraints. Incorporating a minimum net size area and average net size area for the subdivision will provide for greater flexibility in the instances where physical constraints exist.	Accepted in Part	24.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1091.42	GD Jones	Support	The submission is allowed if submission 110.2 is not allowed.	Generally consistent with relief sought by GD Jones (110.2).	Accepted in Part	24.4
FS1127.17	Vineyard Road Properties Limited	Support	Null	Reduced lot sizes and rationale supported. 2,000m ² is appropriate, and achievable as a minimum lot size where public reticulation not available. in part as to minimum lot size where public reticulation available.	Accepted in Part	24.4
FS1132.6	Z & Z Developments Limited Partnership	Support	Accept submission point and add in sought provision (ii).	All proposed lots in the Village Zone that can be serviced should have a reduced minimum lot size regardless of their location.	Accepted in Part	24.4
FS1387.982	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.	Accepted in Part	24.4
923.162	Waikato District Health Board	Neutral/Amended	Amend Rule 24.4.1- Subdivision- General to allow for more intensive subdivision in Village Zone areas directly adjacent to the commercial zones.	Submitter is concerned that applying this minimum lot size to areas within the Village Zone that are directly adjacent to commercial areas will not enable the achievement of a range of the Plan's	Rejected	24.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				objectives and policies for the villages, such as those relating to housing choice; density aligned with the Future Proof strategy; and promotion of subdivision, land use and development that encourages thriving, sustainable town centres, and integrates with and is supportive of provision of public transport and other infrastructure. This is considered inconsistent with WRPS Policies 6.1, Policy 6.3 and Policy 6.16 and Section 6A.		
FS1387.1545	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p>	Accepted	24.4
943.57	McCracken Surveys Limited	Oppose	Retain Rule 24.4.1 RDI (a) Subdivision – General, as notified.	No reason provided.	Accepted in Part	24.4
FS1127.18	Vineyard Road Properties Limited	Support	Null	Null	Accepted in Part	24.4
FS1387.1590	Mercury NZ Limited for	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission,	Accepted in Part	24.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
	<i>Mercury D</i>			<p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p>		
943.59	McCracken Surveys Limited	Support	Retain the restricted discretionary 2000m2 minimum net lot area in Rule 24.4.1 RDI (a) Subdivision – General and discretionary activity status criteria in Rule 24.4.1 RDI(b) as notified.	No reason provided.	Accepted in Part	24.4
<i>FS1091.64</i>	<i>GD Jones</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>The submission is disallowed.</i>	<i>Inconsistent with relief sought by GD Jones (110.2).</i>	Accepted in Part	24.4
<i>FS1387.1591</i>	<i>Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Null</i>	<p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy</i></p>	Accepted in Part	24.4

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>		
947.7	Stuart Quigley	Support	No specific decision sought, but the submitter supports in part Rule 24.4.1 Subdivision - General; AND Amend the Proposed District Plan as necessary including provisions, consequential additions and cross references.	If the property at 233 Wilton Collieries Road, Glen Massey is not rezoned due to the proximity of 700-3000 acre commercial farming, then it should be zoned Village Zone given its proximity to Glen Massey School and the small village. This will allow for appropriate subdivision of the site where there is demand while retaining the rural character.	Rejected	24.4
<i>FS1278.7</i>	<i>Stuart Quigley and Quigley Family Trust</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>General support of submission.</i>	<i>If the property at 233 Wilton Collieries Road, Glen Massey is not rezoned due to the proximity of 700-3000 acre commercial farming, then it should be zoned Village Zone given its proximity to Glen Massey School and the small village. This will allow for appropriate subdivision of the site.</i>	Rejected	24.4
<i>FS1387.1602</i>	<i>Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>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</i>	Accepted	24.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>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>		
986.89	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	Neutral/Amended	Add a new matter of discretion to Rule 24.4.1 RDI Subdivision – General as follows (or similar amendments to achieve the requested relief): <u>Reverse sensitivity effects, including on land transport networks</u> AND Any consequential amendments to link and/or accommodate the requested changes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The design, location and service arrangements for new development carried out in the subdivision process cannot be separated from the future use of the subdivided sites. New buildings, including those containing sensitive or noise sensitive activities, their location and the design and location of access ways may all have an influence on the ultimate impact development has on existing and planned infrastructure. The potential for reverse sensitivity effects is therefore a relevant consideration at this point in the development process. KiwiRail seeks the addition of matters of discretion relating to reverse sensitivity effects on land transport networks to the subdivision consent criteria in the listed zones. 	Accepted	24.4
624.3	Glenn Soroka & Louise Meredith for Trustees of the Pakau Trust	Neutral/Amended	Add new Village Zone subdivision rules in 24.4 Subdivision, to recognise Pakau Trust's residual entitlement of 35 Environmental Lots which can be used as transferable rural title rights, such rules shown in underlined italics as follows: <u>Rule 24.4.XX Pakau Trust Entitlement Rule For the purpose of Rule 24.4.XX, 35 transferable rural lot rights exist, that were secured by the protection of 204 hectares of significant indigenous vegetation at Klondyke Road, Port Waikato. Those transferable rural</u>	The Proposed District Plan fails to provide an appropriate opportunity for, and recognition of, the protection in perpetuity of significant indigenous vegetation. The cost to a property owner of protecting and maintaining, in perpetuity, significant stands of indigenous vegetation are substantial, in real financial terms. The property owner foregoes development potential, and subdivision of that property, where a	Accepted in Part	24.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p>lot rights may be utilised under Rule 24.4.XXX where: (i) The number of transferable rural lot rights available, will reduce by the number utilised at each receiving property when a survey plan is lodged for the subdivision approved at that receiving property; (ii) A subdivision plan is only required for the receiver property; (iii) Transferable rural lot rights cannot be generated on any other donor property. Rule 24.4.XXX Transferable Rural Lot Right Subdivision RDI (a) Transferable Rural Lot Right Subdivisions utilising transferable rural lot rights under Rule 24.4.XX [Pakau Trust Entitlement Rule] must comply with all of the following conditions: (i) All proposed lots must have a net site area of at least 2000m²; (ii) Two additional lots can be created on the receiver property for every one transferable lot right originating under Rule 24.4.XX [Pakau Trust Entitlement Rule]. (b) For the purposes of this rule a subdivision plan is required only for the receiver property and not the donor property. (c) Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters at the receiving property: (i) Shape, location and orientation of proposed lots; (ii) Matters referred to in the Infrastructure chapter; (iii) Consistency with the matters, and outcomes sought, in Appendix 3.1 (Residential Subdivision Guidelines); (iv) Impacts on stormwater and wastewater disposal; (v) Impacts on Significant Natural Areas; (vi) Impacts on identified Maaori Sites of Significance; and (vii) Roads and pedestrian networks. D1 Transferable rural lot right subdivision that does not comply with Rule 24.4.XXX RDI.</p> <p>AND</p>	<p>significant environmental and community benefit is achieved by the protection of significant indigenous vegetation. In effect, the legal protection of significant indigenous vegetation provides a public benefit, at the expense of the private property owner. This should be recognised and compensated for. The subdivision application lodged in April 2012 secured Pakau Trust's entitlement to 64 Environmental Lots - 29 of which have been used and 35 remain to be used as transferable rural lot rights. Transferable rural lot rights enable an environmental feature to be protected while relocating the development potential elsewhere on appropriate receiver properties. Pakau Trust's position is unique.</p>		

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			Amend the Proposed District Plan further with any necessary consequential or other relief that addresses Pakau Trust's concerns.			
FS1387.18	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.	Accepted in Part	24.4
945.28	First Gas Limited	Neutral/Amended	Add a new subdivision rule to Rule 24.4 Subdivision as follows: <u>Subdivision-Site containing a gas transmission pipeline: (a) The subdivision of land containing a gas transmission pipeline is a restricted discretionary activity. (b) Council's discretion shall be restricted to the following matters: (i) The extent to which the subdivision design avoids or mitigates conflict with the gas infrastructure and activities. (ii) The ability for maintenance and inspection of pipelines including ensuring access to the pipelines. (iii) Consent notices on titles to ensure on-going compliance with AS2885 Pipelines-Gas and Liquid Petroleum-Parts 1 to 3. (iv) The</u>	To address reverse sensitivity effects, the submitter seeks the inclusion of a new rule under the Subdivision rules within the Country Living Zone. The addition of a new rule would make subdivision of a site containing the gas network a restricted discretionary activity.	Accepted in Part	24.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p>outcome of any consultation with First Gas Limited.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments and other relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.</p>			
Policy 4.3.3 and Rule 24.4.2 Subdivision – Te Kowhai and Tauakau						
923.54	Waikato District Health Board	Neutral/Amend	<p>Amend Policy 4.3.3- Future Development- Tuakau and Te Kowhai to provide greater clarity about the urban outcomes sought for the Village Zone, including anticipated development density</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Remove reference to "semi-rural character"; and make a stronger correlation between infrastructure provision and the outcome sought for the zone.</p>	<p>In respect of the Future Proof Strategy, clarity is required as to whether the villages are considered urban 'settlements' or part of the rural environment, with the Plan being ambiguous on this point. Given the plan's approach of consolidating development around existing towns and villages, it is not considered suitable that villages are described as being semi-rural.</p>	Accepted	4.2
FS1091.60	GD Jones	Support	The submission is allowed.	The Village zone's purpose is unclear, particularly due to its dual use as the single residential zone in smaller townships and as a lower-density residential zone in larger townships.		4.2
602.5	Greig Metcalfe	Support	<p>Amend Rule 24.4.2 RD1 and RD2 Subdivision, as follows: RD1 (a) Subdivision in Te Kowhai and Tuakau must comply with all of the following conditions: (i) Proposed lots not connected to public water and reticulated wastewater infrastructure must have a minimum net area of 3000m², except where the proposed lot is an access allotment, utility allotment or reserve lot. RD2 (a) Subdivision in Te Kowhai and Tuakau must comply with all of the following conditions: (i) Proposed lots connected to public water</p>	<p>It is feasible for development in the Village Zone to be serviced by reticulated services that are privately owned (i.e. community scale) and therefore this provision should not be limited to publicly owned infrastructure network.</p>	Accepted in Part	4.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			and <u>reticulated</u> wastewater infrastructure must have a minimum net site area of 1000m ² , except where the proposed lot is an access allotment, <u>utility allotment</u> or reserve lot. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.			
689.23	Greig Developments No 2 Limited	Support	Retain Rule 24.4.2 RD2 (a) (i) Subdivision – Te Kowhai and Tuakau.	No reasons provided.	Accepted in Part	4.2
110.2	GD Jones	Neutral/Amend	Retain all elements of the Village Zone including Section 4.3 Village Zone except for the amendments sought below. AND Amend Rule 24.4.2 RD1 (a) Subdivision - Te Kowhai and Tuakau, to reduce the minimum net site area from 3000m ² to 2500m ² . AND Amend Rule 24.4.2 RD2 (a) Subdivision - Te Kowhai and Tuakau, to reduce the minimum net site area from 1,000m ² to 800m ² .	2500m ² is sufficient to enable an environmentally safe on-site wastewater solution and the site reduction allows for more flexibility in subdivision design. 2500m ² is in line with the non-serviced single lot zone minimum size requirements in the Auckland Unitary plan. Reducing the minimum size will allow more flexible design while keeping the larger residential lot objective of the zone. 800m ² is in line with the non-serviced single lot zone minimum size requirements in the Auckland Unitary plan.	Accepted	4.2
FS1386.91	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		4.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>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.</i>		
FS1335.13	Greig Metcalfe for CKL	Support	Null	The submitter would support an increase in density for serviced and un-serviced sites in the Village Zone.	Accepted	4.2
604.1	Lee Slomp	Oppose	Amend Rule 24.4.2 RDI Subdivision - Te Kowhai and Tuakau to ensure that subdivision in Te Kowhai does not proceed until wastewater infrastructure is available to every property in Te Kowhai (existing, new and proposed capacity).	Wastewater infrastructure would enable better utilization of the land resource by enabling subdivision down to smaller lots. Current minimum lot size of 3000m ² means Te Kowhai will not achieve good growth, land utilization, and future optional sizes of properties (for less than 3000m ²). With options for smaller property sizes the village can maintain its tone and not sprawl.	Rejected	4.2
FS1335.9	Greig Metcalfe for CKL	Oppose	Null	Council maintains discretion on the position of proposed building platforms and driveways to ensure future subdivision is not compromised should reticulated wastewater become available at Te Kowhai.	Accepted	4.2
732.3	Lucy Smith for Terra Firma Resources Ltd	Neutral/Amended	Amend Rule 24.4.2 Subdivision - Te Kowhai and Tuakau, so that it also applies to the requested Village zoned land at Puketirini, as follows: 24.4.2 Subdivision - Te Kowhai, and Tuakau and Puketirini RDI (a) Subdivision in Te Kowhai, and Tuakau and Puketirini must comply with all of the following conditions: ... RD2 (a) Subdivision in Te	Rule 24.4.1 for the Village Zone allows subdivision to a minimum net site area of 3000m ² . Rule 24.4.2 provides for subdivision in Te Kowhai and Tuakau with a minimum net site area of 3000m ² for unserviced lots and 1000m ² for serviced lots. Such lot sizes allow flexibility and will enable more intensive	Rejected	4.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			Kowhai, and Tuakau and Puketirini must comply with the following conditions: ...	residential development on the submitter's land.		
382.2	Brent Trail for Surveying Services Ltd	Oppose	Amend Rule 24.4.2 RD1 (a) (i) Subdivision -Te Kowhai and Tuakau, by reducing the net site area from 3000m2 to 2500m2.	For the reasons relating to sustainability and 2500m2 being adequate for wastewater disposal.	Rejected	4.2
296.2	Richard Falconer for Terra Consultants (CNI) Ltd	Support	Retain the subdivision and activity provisions and development controls of Chapter 24 - Village Zone as notified.	Supports in particular the 3,000m2 minimum lot size as it is a reasonable sized rural-residential holding with it being large enough to retain the character of Te Kowhai while avoiding maintenance issues for future owners that has occurred in the Operative District Plan Country Living Zone.	Accepted in Part	4.2
FS1091.3	GD Jones	Oppose	Inconsistent with relief sought by GD Jones (110.2)	The submission is disallowed	Accepted in Part	4.2
FS1386.303	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	Accepted in Part	4.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
397.3	Horotiu Properties Limited	Oppose	Amend Policy 4.3.3 Future Development - Tuakau and Te Kowhai, as follows: 4.3.3 Policy - Future Development- Tuakau and Te Kowhai Village Zone. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any consequential amendments necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.	Policy wording should be relevant to the Village Zone direction, not area specific. The Village Zone could apply in areas beyond Tuakau and Te Kowhai where this policy should be relevant.	Rejected	4.2
535.23	Lance Vervoort for Hamilton City Council	Oppose	No specific decision sought, but submission opposes further growth in Te Kowhai and Policy 4.3.3 Future development Tuakau and Te Kowhai.	Growth is not opposed per se, just the type and amount included in the current proposal. The policy encourages future development in Te Kowhai when services are available, however the submitter questions if further growth as identified is appropriate at Te Kowhai.	Accepted in Part	4.2
<i>FS1286.8</i>	<i>Horotiu Properties Limited</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>For the reasons set out in HPL's submission.</i>	Accepted in Part	4.2
<i>FS1335.3</i>	<i>Greig Metcalfe for CKL</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>Te Kowhai is identified in Future Proof and the Hamilton-Auckland Corridor Plan as a growth area. This policy ensures development occurs in a way that does not constrain future densification should services become available.</i>	Accepted in Part	4.2
378.52	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Oppose	Retain Rule 24.4.2 Subdivision - Te Kowhai and Tuakau, as subdivision is a restricted discretionary activity, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Rule 24.4.2 Subdivision - Te Kowhai and Tuakau, as follows: (a) Subdivision must comply with all of the following conditions:... <u>x</u> . Proposed lots must be connected to public-	Fire and Emergency New Zealand requires proposed lots be connected to public-reticulated water supply or water supply sufficient for firefighting purposes. Subdivision that does not comply is a Discretionary Activity. The changes sought promote consistency across all zones in the District Plan.	Accepted in Part	4.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p>reticulated water supply or water supply sufficient for firefighting purposes. (b) Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters:... (x) Provision of infrastructure, including water supply for firefighting purposes.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend the Proposed District Plan to make further or consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>			
FS1035.158	Pareoranga Te Kata	Support	Obtain statement of performance expectation (SPE) to allow submission to be accepted.	Fire safety and fire prevention to undertake training activities for fire fighters within the region.	Accepted in Part	4.2
FS1134.94	Bridget Murdoch on behalf of Counties Power	Support	Seek that the submission point be allowed.	The provision of existing infrastructure should be considered.	Accepted in Part	4.2
397.14	Horotiu Properties Limited	Oppose	<p>Amend Rule 24.4.2 Subdivision - Te Kowhai and Tuakau, as follows: Rule 24.4.2 Subdivision- Te Kowhai and Tuakau <u>Village Zone</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend Rule 24.4.2 RD1 Subdivision - Te Kowhai and Tuakau, as follows: Rule 24.4.2 RD1 Subdivision - Te Kowhai and Tuakau <u>Village Zone</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend Rule 24.4.2 RD2 Subdivision - Te Kowhai and Tuakau, as follows: Rule 24.4.2 RD2 D2 Subdivision Te Kowhai and Tuakau <u>Village Zone</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any consequential amendments necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>	Current rule wording is exclusive to the notified village zone areas only which is subject to change.	Rejected	4.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
419.109	Jordyn Landers for Horticulture New Zealand	Neutral/Amended	<p>Add a new clause (ii) to Rule 24.4.2 RD1 (a) Subdivision - Te Kowhai and Tuakau, as follows: (a) Subdivision in Te Kowhai and Tuakau must comply with all of the following conditions: ... (ii) <u>Where a subdivision adjoins Rural Zone land, a buffer strip no less than 10m wide must be provided along the adjoining boundary.</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Add a new matter of discretion to Rule 24.4.2 RD1 (b) Subdivision - Te Kowhai and Tuakau, as follows: (ix) <u>reverse sensitivity effects on land identified as high class soil, on land with rural production potential and on permitted farming activities.</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential or additional amendments as a result of changes sought in the submission.</p>	<p>The submitter is concerned at the extent of rural land proposed to be rezoned for residential/urban purposes in Tuakau. The area north of the Waikato River is critical to New Zealand's domestic food supply. Any further development in this area needs to be appropriately located to avoid high class soil and versatile land, and to be managed appropriately to avoid reverse sensitivity effects. It is appropriate that additional standards be provided to support on-going operation and development of horticulture in this district. This aligns with the proposed policies.</p>	Accepted in Part	4.2
419.110	Jordyn Landers for Horticulture New Zealand	Neutral/Amended	<p>Add a new clause (ii) to Rule 24.4.2 RD2 (a) Subdivision - Te Kowhai and Tuakau, as follows: (a) Subdivision in Te Kowhai and Tuakau must comply with all of the following conditions: ... (ii) <u>Where a subdivision adjoins Rural Zone land, a buffer strip no less than 8m wide must be provided along the adjoining boundary.</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Add a new matter of discretion to Rule 24.4.2 RD2 (b) Subdivision - Te Kowhai and Tuakau, as follows: (ix) <u>reverse sensitivity effects on land identified as high class soil, on land with rural production potential and on permitted farming activities.</u></p> <p>AND</p>	<p>It is appropriate that additional standards be provided to ensure reverse sensitivity effects are avoided or mitigated.</p>	Accepted in Part	4.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			Any consequential or additional amendments as a result of changes sought in the submission.			
FS1171.53	T&G Global	Support	Allow the submission.	This submission is supported as this will address potential reverse sensitivity issues between rural land use and future development in the areas of Tuakau and Te Kowhai.	Accepted in Part	4.2
419.86	Jordyn Landers for Horticulture New Zealand	Oppose	Amend Policy 4.3.3 Future development - Tuakau and Te Kowhai, by expanding the policy to recognise the unique situation of Tuakau to the Pukekohe 'hub' of nationally significant rural production land. AND Amend Policy 4.3.3 Future development - Tuakau and Te Kowhai, to address the actual and potential effects of reverse sensitivity for rural production activities at the rural/urban interface. AND Any consequential or additional amendments as a result of changes sought in the submission.	The submitter opposes the lack of recognition of the unique situation of Tuakau to the Pukekohe 'hub' of nationally significant rural production land.	Rejected	4.2
FS1171.44	T&G Global	Support	Allow the submission.	Support this submission as this will address potential reverse sensitivity issues between rural activities and subdivision.	Rejected	4.2
FS1268.8	Jennie Hayman	Support	Support in part. Relocate proposed residential development away from the rural production in the west area and also away from the key transport routes on which the rural sector relies, i.e. Buckland Road, George Street, River Road and Whangarata Road.	The submitter identifies the tension in providing for urban development, in an area of high-class soils around Tuakau. It should not be a surprise that towns develop in areas of productivity, or in proximity to transport infrastructure. The proposed Tuakau growth area fails to acknowledge the surrounding production activities, but worse still fails to provide for the integration of transport for the rural sector, i.e. residential development will cross the key transport routes within the	Rejected	4.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				"Pukekohe hub" referred to by this submitter.		
466.36	Brendan Balle on behalf of Balles Bros Group Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 4.3.3 Future development – Tuakau and Te Kowhai by expanding policy to protect high-class soils for commercial vegetable production, taking into account the viability of commercial vegetable production activities in this location. Specific regard should be given to: Topography Productivity Sustainability (specifically avoidance of soil pests and diseases, suitably consented irrigation water) Reverse sensitivity Economic viability AND Amend Policy 4.3.3 Future development – Tuakau and Te Kowhai to ensure that reverse sensitivity matters are acknowledged and addressed through the Plan.	The submitter supports the consolidation of future settlement in and around towns and villages, if the rezoning protects high-class soils where it is appropriate to do so, for reasons outlined elsewhere in this submission in relation to viable commercial vegetable production operations. It is noted that the rezoned land in and around Tuakau is predominantly located on high-class soils, which is inconsistent with the objectives and policies of the Plan and is likely to lead to reverse sensitivity issues. Specific regard should be given to: Topography, Productivity, Sustainability (specifically avoidance of soil pests and diseases; suitably consented irrigation water), Reverse sensitivity, and Economic viability.	Accepted in Part	4.2
FS1091.17	GD Jones	Support	The submissions are allowed, alongside any consequential relief, including the potential rezoning of the land at 221 Dominion Road to Residential.	Sites within close proximity to Tuakau that do not include high class soils (including 221 Dominion Road) should be prioritised for residential development over those that do.	Accepted in Part	4.2
FS1168.40	T&G Global	Support	Allow the submission.	The submitter seeks to amend Policy 4.3.3 Future development – Tuakau and Te Kowhai by expanding policy to protect high-class soils for commercial vegetable production, taking into account the viability of commercial vegetable production activities in this location. The submission supports HortNZs position on urban growth and the need to avoid loss of rural production land.	Accepted in Part	4.2
535.80	Lance Vervoort for	Oppose	No specific decision sought, but submission	The uncertainty about the servicing of	Accepted in	4.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
	Hamilton City Council		opposes the subdivision provisions for Te Kowhai in Rule 24.4.2 Subdivision Te Kowhai and Tuakau.	these areas makes quantifying and understanding the effects of the proposals on Hamilton's own infrastructure and the sub-regional land use pattern, difficult. The proposed low densities of the area, may make meeting the District's growth projections difficult. New areas have been included within the Village Zone which were previously zoned Rural or Country living without sufficient justification or comfort that the impacts of such development can be managed; or that the built form will deliver best results for delivering sustainable growth with a compact built urban form. Issues have been created in the past for Hamilton City, by the creation of rural residential enclaves on the City boundary - while this particular zone has a different name (i.e. Village Zone), it will still have the same, if not greater impacts across the boundary.	Part	
FS1335.4	Greig Metcalfe for CKL	Oppose	Null	<i>The subdivision provisions give effect to the objectives and policies relating to development in the Village Zone. Te Kowhai specifically is identified as a growth area and Future Proof anticipates different densities depending on whether reticulated wastewater is available. The Village Zone is different from the Country Living Zone in that growth is centred on existing communities and amenities and there is the potential for reticulated services being provided.</i>	Accepted in Part	4.2
602.36	Greig Metcalfe	Oppose	Amend Policy 4.3.2(a) (iii) - Character, as follows: (iii) Recognises lower levels of infrastructure and in some locations the absence of Council <u>reticulated</u> wastewater	Reticulated wastewater services are anticipated in the future for Te Kowhai and Tuakau.	Rejected	4.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			services. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.			
FS1091.22	GD Jones	Support	The submission is allowed.	The amendments recognise that wastewater reticulation can still be provided in the Village zone.	Accepted	4.2
695.138	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amended	Amend Rule 24.4.2 RD1(a)(i) Subdivision – Te Kowhai and Tuakau to allow provision for 1000m ² sized serviced lots on the outskirts of towns and villages; AND Add a rule to Rule 24.4.2 RD1 Subdivision – Te Kowhai and Tuakau that enables 2,500m ² lots for non-reticulated serviced lots, consistent with the Regional Council net lot area requirement.	3000m ² is a waste of soil resource.	Rejected	4.2
FS1379.256	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Null	HCC opposes the relief sought to change the subdivision provisions to allow for 1000 sqm serviced lots on the outskirts of towns providing they are reticulated and 2,500 sqm lots for non-reticulated lots in Te Kowhai. This relief is likely to result in ad hoc, unchecked growth in a large number of locations, contrary to the principles of the Future Proof Strategy and WRPS, which seek to manage growth and infrastructure provision, and to concentrate growth to identified towns. HCC seeks urban development to locate within existing towns and other areas identified for growth, avoiding urban sprawl and the inefficient use of land and infrastructure.	Rejected	4.2
695.26	Sharp Planning Solutions	Neutral/Amended	Amend Policy 4.3.3(a) Future development -	This statement is back to front and does	Rejected	4.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
	Ltd	d	Tuakau and Te Kowhai by replacing with the following wording: <u>Enable infrastructure and service availability so that future subdivision and development in Tuakau and Te Kowhai provides for suitable building and access locations to be identified.</u>	not make sense. Buildings and access cannot be located to enable future development as development would be current when that occurs.		
746.132	The Surveying Company	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 24.4.2 RD2 (a)-Subdivision - Te Kowhai and Tuakau as notified.	No reasons provided.	Accepted in Part	4.2
81.131	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 4.3.3 Future development – Tuakau and Te Kowhai, to provide greater clarity about the urban outcomes sought for the Village Zone, including anticipated development density; to make a stronger correlation between infrastructure provision and the outcomes sought for the zone; and to remove reference to 'semi-rural character'	The submitter questions the extent to which it will achieve Objective 4.3.1 Village Zone character, to which it relates. The submitter submits that the policy should be amended to provide greater clarity about the Village Zone character that is to be maintained, including anticipated density of development, and to make a stronger correlation between subdivision, infrastructure provision and the outcomes sought in terms of the Village zone. In addition changes resulting from the Auckland-Hamilton Corridor Spatial Plan and Future Proof Strategy Phase 2 Review may influence whether this zoning is appropriate in these locations (Note: WRPS Policies 6.1, 6.3 and Section 6A).	Accepted	4.2
<i>FS1091.54</i>	<i>GD Jones</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>The submission is allowed.</i>	<i>The Village zone's purpose is unclear, particularly due to its dual use as the single residential zone in smaller townships and as a lower-density residential zone in larger townships.</i>	Accepted	4.2
<i>FS1176.11</i>	<i>Watercare</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>Watercare supports this submission point as clear guidance is required as to the</i>	Accepted	4.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				sequencing of development in areas zoned/learmarked for growth and the necessity for infrastructure capacity to be planned/available to service development in an efficient and cost effective manner.		
FS1335.6	Greig Metcalfe for CKL	Support	Null	Inevitably the character of the Village zone will change as a result of development. Reference to "semi-rural character" should be in relation to the close interplay between the village and rural area surrounding it.	Accepted	4.2
FS1379.11	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Null	HCC opposes the relief sought by the submitter to amend Policy 4.3.3 Future Development- Tuakau and Te Kowhai because HCC, as highlighted in its own submission, opposes the introduction of a Village Zone in Te Kowhai.	Rejected	4.2
923.163	Waikato District Health Board	Neutral/Amended	Amend Rule 24.4.2- Subdivision Te Kowhai and Tuakau to allow for more intensive subdivision in Village Zone areas directly adjacent to the commercial zones.	Submitter is concerned that applying this minimum lot size to areas within the Village Zone that are directly adjacent to commercial areas will not enable the achievement of a range of the Plan's objectives and policies for the villages, such as those relating to housing choice; density aligned with the Future Proof strategy; and promotion of subdivision, land use and development that encourages thriving, sustainable town centres, and integrates with and is supportive of provision of public transport and other infrastructure. This is considered inconsistent with WRPS Policies 6.1, Policy 6.3 and Policy 6.16 and Section 6A.	Rejected	4.2
24.4.3 Subdivision – Boundary adjustments						

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
405.82	Counties Power Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 24.4.3 C1 (b) Subdivision - Boundary adjustments so adjustments do not prevent access to existing electricity infrastructure.	Adjustments must not prevent access to existing electricity infrastructure.	Accepted	5
24.4.4 Subdivision – Amendments to cross lease and flats plan and conversions						
602.6	Greig Metcalfe	Oppose	Amend Rule 24.4.4 C2 (a) Subdivision - Amendments to cross lease and flats plans and conversions, as follows: (a) Amendment or update to a cross lease flats plan including additions or alterations to any buildings, and areas for exclusive use by an owner or owners. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	Changing an exclusive area is not deemed to be a subdivision under section 218 of the Resource Management Act as it is a private covenant matter which is not able to be controlled by Council.	Rejected	6
382.3	Brent Trail for Surveying Services Ltd	Support	No specific decision sought, but submission states support for Rule 24.4.4 Subdivision - Amendments to cross lease and flats plans and conversions.	No reasons provided.	Accepted in Part	6
397.15	Horotiu Properties Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 24.4.4 C2 Subdivision - Amendments to cross lease and flats plans and conversions, as follows: (a) Amendment or update to a cross lease flats plan including additions or alterations to any buildings and any areas for exclusive by an owner or owners. AND	A change to an exclusive use area is not deemed to be a subdivision under s218 of the RMA and is not able to be controlled by Council as it is a private covenant.	Rejected	6

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 any consequential amendments necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.			
697.1003	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend rule 24.4.4 C1 (b) Subdivision - Amendments to cross lease and flats plans and conversions, as follows: (b) Council's control is reserved to <u>over</u> the following matters: (i) Effect on existing buildings; (ii) Site layout and design; (iii) Compliance with building rules.	Words included to provide clarity to the rule.	Accepted	6
697.1004	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 24.4.4 C2(b) Subdivision - Amendments to cross lease and flats plans and conversions, as follows: (b) The Council's control shall be reserved over limited to <u>reserved over</u> the following matters: (i) Purpose of the boundary adjustment; (ii) Effect on existing buildings; (iii) Site layout and design of a cross lease or flats plan; (iv) Compliance with permitted building rules.	Words included to provide clarity to the rule.	Accepted	6
697.1005	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 24.4.4 D1 Subdivision - Amendments to cross lease and flats plans and conversions.	These should all be controlled activities, and there is no instance where a boundary adjustment would cascade beyond a controlled activity.	Accepted	6
943.61	McCracken Surveys Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 24.4.4 C1 (a) Subdivision - Amendments to cross lease and flats plans and conversions, to be a Permitted activity subject to Certificate of Compliance. AND Add criteria to Rule 24.4.4 - Subdivision - Amendments to cross lease and flats plans and	Lots are usually fully developed without additional adverse effects. Will avoid unnecessary consent applications and streamline the process that has no adverse impacts. The Certificate of Compliance could be declined and	Rejected	6

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			conversions, as follows; Amendments shall be for the purpose of showing alterations to existing buildings or additional lawfully established buildings. The alteration shall be either permitted or otherwise lawfully established.	controlled resource consent required.		
24.4.5 Subdivision – Title boundaries – Natural hazard area, contaminated land, Significant Amenity Landscape – Dune, notable trees and intensive farming activities						
382.4	Brent Trail for Surveying Services Ltd	Oppose	Delete Rule 24.4.5 RD1 (a)(ii) Title boundaries.	Submission states explanation covered in rural section containing this rule.	Accepted in Part	7
<i>FS1388.79</i>	<i>Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>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.</i>	Accepted in Part	7
697.1006	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amended	Amend Rule 24.4.5 Titles boundaries - Natural hazard area, contaminated land, Significant Amenity Landscape - Dune, notable trees, and intensive farming activities heading, as follows: Title boundaries – Existing Buildings natural hazard area, contaminated land, Significant Amenity Landscape, notable trees, intensive	This rule heading needs amending to reflect the changes being made to RD1.	Accepted	7

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			farming activities, aggregate extraction areas			
FS1387.767	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	Rejected	7
697.1007	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amended	Amend Rule 24.4.5 RDI Natural hazard area, contaminated land, Significant Amenity Landscape - Dune, notable trees, and intensive farming activities, as follows: (a) Subdivision of land containing contaminated land, notable trees and intensive farming activities and aggregate extraction areas must comply with all of the following conditions: (i) (a) The boundaries of every proposed lot with existing buildings must demonstrate compliance with the following building rules (other than where any non-compliance existed lawfully prior to the subdivision) relating to: —A (i) Daylight admission (Rule 24.3.4); B (ii) Building coverage (Rule 24.3.5); C (iii) Building setbacks (Rule 24.3.6); (ii) The boundaries of every proposed lot must not divide the	Rule needs amending to provide clarity as to its purpose. Consequential changes to be made in other rules as set out in this table below.	Accepted	7

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p>following: A. A natural hazard area; B. Contaminated land; C. Significant Amenity Landscape; or D. Notable tree. (iii) The boundaries of every proposed lot must be setback by 300m from any area operating an intensive farming activity. (b) Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters: (i) Landscape values; (ii) Amenity values and character; (iii) Reverse sensitivity; (iv) Effects on existing buildings; (v) Effects on natural hazard areas; (vi) Effects on contaminated land; (vii) Effects on any notable tree; (viii) Effects on an intensive farming activity.</p>			
FS1387.768	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	Rejected	7
697.1014	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amended	<p>Add new title as follows: <u>24.4.14 Subdivision within identified areas</u> AND Add new rule as follows: <u>24.4.14 DI (a)</u></p>	Introduce a new rule to address subdivision within identified areas and provide consistency between zones.	Accepted	7

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			Subdivision of any land containing any of the following areas: (i) Significant Amenity Landscape; (ii) A natural hazard area			
FS1091.37	GD Jones	Oppose	The submission is disallowed.	This provision does not apply in the Residential Zone, which the Village zone is considered to be most similar to and Rule 24.4.6 already manages subdivision of sites containing Significant Natural Areas.	Rejected	7
FS1387.769	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	Rejected	7
24.4.6 Subdivision – Title boundaries – Significant Natural Areas, heritage items, archaeological sites, sites of significance to Maori						
559.265	Sherry Reynolds on behalf of Heritage New Zealand Lower Northern Office	Support	<p>Retain Rule 24.4.6 RDI Title boundaries – Significant Natural Areas, Heritage Items and Archaeological sites, sites of Significance to Maaori, except for the amendments sought below.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend Rule 24.4.6 RDI Title boundaries -</p>	The submitter supports Rule 24.4.6 RDI Title boundaries – Significant Natural Areas, Maaori sites and Maaori areas of Significance. This rule will give effect to Part 2, section 6 Matters of national Importance, in particular s6(e) and 6(f).	Accepted in Part	7

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			Significant Natural Areas, Maaori sites and Maaori areas of Significance to Maaori to be consistent with other zone chapters, including sites and areas not being divided by a proposed lot boundary line.			
559.270	Sherry Reynolds on behalf of Heritage New Zealand Lower Northern Office	Support	Retain Rule 24.4.6 NCI Title boundaries – Significant Natural Areas, Heritage items, archaeological sites, sites of significance to Maaori, except for the amendments sought below. AND Amend Rule 24.4.6 NCI Title boundaries - Significant Natural Areas, Heritage items, archaeological sites, sites of significance to Maaori to be consistent with the equivalent rules in other zone chapters, including the retention of heritage items.	The submitter supports Rule 24.4.6 NCI Title boundaries – Significant Natural Areas, Maaori sites and Maaori areas of Significance. This rule and the more stringent activity status will give effect to Part 2, section 6 Matters of national Importance, in particular s6(e) and 6(f).	Rejected	7
697.1008	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend the heading of 24.4.6 Significant Natural Areas, heritage items, archaeological sites, sites of significance to Maaori, as follows: Title boundaries – Significant Natural Areas, heritage items, archaeological sites, sites of significance to Maaori, <u>notable trees</u>	Amend the title of rule 24.4.6 to protect notable trees.	Accepted	7
697.1009	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 24.4.6 RDI(b) Title boundaries - Significant Natural Areas, heritage items, archaeological sites, sites of significance to Maaori, as follows: (b) Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters: (i) Effects on Significant Natural Areas and (iii) Effects on any Maaori Sites of Significance.; and (iv)	Amend to protect notable trees. Matter of discretion required to work with rule.	Accepted	7

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			Effects on notable trees.			
697.1010	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amended	Amend Rule 24.4.6 NCI Title boundaries - Significant Natural Areas, heritage items, archaeological sites, sites of significance to Maaori, to be a Discretionary Activity rather than a non-complying activity.	Non-complying activity status too restrictive for the effects of this rule.	Accepted	7
FS1323.31	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	That the amendments sought is declined.	HNZPT has concerns that the proposed new rule, where non-compliance with the restricted discretionary activity will be discretionary, rather than non-complying, could cause adverse effects to historic heritage. HNZPT is concerned that the proposed amendments will cause adverse effect to historic heritage.	Rejected	7
24.4.7 Subdivision - Title boundaries – Maori sites and Maori areas of significance to Maori						
382.5	Brent Trail for Surveying Services Ltd	Oppose	Delete Rule 24.4.7 Title boundaries - Maori sites and Maaori areas of significance to Maaori.	Submission states reasons given under rural rules.	Rejected	7
FS1323.32	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	That the amendments sought are declined.	HNZPT is concerned that the proposed amendments will cause adverse effect to historic heritage.		7
697.1011	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amended	Amend Rule 24.4.7 NCI Title boundaries - Maaori sites and Maaori areas of significance to Maaori to be a Discretionary Activity rather than a Non Complying activity.	Non-complying activity status is too restrictive for the effects of this rule.	Accepted	7
24.4.8 Subdivision of land containing heritage items						
559.250	Sherry Reynolds on behalf of Heritage New		Retain Rule 24.4.8 RDI Subdivision – land containing heritage items except for the	The submitter supports in part the restricted discretionary activity status of	Accepted in Part	7

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
	Zealand Lower Northern Office		<p>amendments sought below.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend Rule 24.4.8 RDI Subdivision – land containing heritage items as follows: (a) Subdivision of land containing a heritage item listed in Schedule 30.1 (Historic Heritage Items) (b) Council’s discretion is restricted to the following matters: (i) Effects on heritage values; (ii) Context and setting of the heritage item; (iii) The extent to which the relationship of the heritage item with its setting is maintained <u>within one lot</u>.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend Rule 24.4.8 RDI Subdivision – land containing heritage items to be consistent with the equivalent rules in other zone chapters, including heritage items being retained in one lot.</p>	<p>the rule relating to the subdivision of land containing heritage items and the associated matters of discretion, as these assessment criteria will assist to give effect to the related policy. An amendment is required to the assessment criteria to recognise that the retention of a heritage item and its setting is best achieved when they are located within the same lot. The inclusion of threshold creates a clear distinction for those administering the Plan as to when the activity becomes a non-complying activity.</p>		
559.257	Sherry Reynolds on behalf of Heritage New Zealand Lower Northern Office	Support	<p>Amend Rule 24.4.8 DI Subdivision – land containing heritage items to reflect a non-complying activity status for proposals that cannot achieve compliance with Rule 24.4.8 RDI.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend Rule 24.4.8 DI Subdivision – land containing heritage items to be consistent with the equivalent rules in other zone chapters.</p>	<p>The submitter supports the non-complying status of the rule relating to the subdivision of land containing heritage items, when the restricted discretionary activity status of the rule is not achieved. This stringent assessment will assist to ensure that the heritage values of the heritage item with its setting are maintained.</p>	Rejected	7
24.4.9 Road frontage						
602.7	Greig Metcalfe	Oppose	<p>Amend Rule 24.4.9 RDI (a) Road frontage, by deleting RDI(a) and replacing with the following: (a) <u>Every proposed lot must have at least 20m frontage to a road boundary, except</u></p>	<p>The requested replacement wording for RDI (a) is an improvement to the notified version.</p>	Accepted	8

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p>where the proposed lot is an access allotment, utility allotment or a right of way or access leg is provided.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>			
397.16	Horotiu Properties Limited	Oppose	<p>Amend Rule 24.4.9 RDI Road Frontage, by replacing with the following wording: (a) <u>Every proposed lot must have at least 20m frontage to a road boundary, except where the proposed lot is an access allotment, utility allotment or a right of way or access leg is provided.</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any consequential amendments necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>	Improves wording.	Accepted	8
689.24	Greig Developments No 2 Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 24.4.9 RDI (a) Road frontage to adopt the provisions in the Operative District Plan – Franklin Section 26.6.4 Frontage to Road (Vehicular Access Requirement).	Every proposed lot as part of the subdivision with a road boundary, other than a proposed lot containing an access allotment, utility allotment, right of way or access leg must have a width along the road boundary of at least 20m. The layout of a development is dependent on the size and shape of the site as well as its topography (amongst other constraints). While a 20m minimum width along a road boundary can generally work in many developments that have the ability to follow a grid design, the reality is that not every site is	Accepted	8

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				flat with no topographical or size/shape constraints Sites with topographical natural or physical constraints may be unable to practically implement a layout that achieves 20m road frontage for all lots with the road. There may also be sites where the lay of the land is best suited to an alternative roading design There is no analysis in Section 32 regarding this relevance or practicality of this rule.		
695.139	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Support	Retain the 20m frontage as proposed in Rule 24.4.9 RD1 (a) Road frontage.	This is only 15m in the Country Living Zone at 23.4.7 RD1 (a) but has larger proposed lots.	Accepted	8
FS1187.17	Greig Developments No 2 Limited	Oppose	Oppose the submission point 695.139.	The layout of development is dependent on the size and shape of the site as well as its topography (amongst other constraints). While a 20m minimum width along a road boundary can generally work in many developments that have the ability to follow a grid design, not every site is flat with no size or shape constraints. Sites with topographical natural or physical constraints may be unable to practically implement a layout that achieves 20m road frontage for all lots with the road. There may also be sites where the lay of the land is best suited to an alternative roading design. There is no analysis in the s32 regarding this relevance or practicality of this rule.	Rejected	8
FS1286.15	Horotiu Properties Limited	Support	Rule 24.4.9 RD1 (a) Road frontage. Retain the 20m frontage as proposed.	As consistent with HPL submission.	Accepted	8
FS1308.105	Leigh Shaw on behalf of The	Oppose	Null	The layout of development is dependent on	Rejected	8

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
	Surveying Company			the size and shape of the site as well as its topography (amongst other constraints). While a 20m minimum width along a road boundary can generally work in many developments that have the ability to follow a grid design, not every site is flat with no size or shape constraints. Sites with topographical natural or physical constraints may be unable to practically implement a layout that achieves 20m road frontage for all lots with the road. There may also be sites where the lay of the land is best suited to an alternative roading design. There is no analysis in the s32 regarding this relevance or practicality of this rule.		
697.1012	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amended	Amend Rule 24.4.9 Road frontage, as follows: (a) Every proposed lot as part of the subdivision with a road boundary, other than a proposed lot containing other than any access allotment, utility allotment, right of way or access leg, must have a width along the road boundary of at least 20m. (b) Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters: (i) Safety and efficiency of vehicle access and road network; and (ii) Amenity values and rural character.	Rule needs amending to provide clarity. In respect to (b) (ii) rural character is not relevant in the village zone.	Accepted in Part	8
742.155	NZTA	Neutral/Amended	Retain Rule 24.4.9 RD1 Road frontage, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Rule 24.4.9 RD1 Road frontage matter of discretion (b)(i), as follows: Safety and efficiency of vehicle access and road <u>transport</u> network; AND Request any consequential changes necessary	The submitter supports a 20m minimum width for lots with a road boundary as this will enable safe separation distance between vehicle entrances. Retaining discretion over safety and efficiency of the road network is also supported with minor amendment.	Rejected	8

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			to give effect to the relief sought in the submission.			
746.133	The Surveying Company	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 24.4.9 RDI (a)-Subdivision - Road Frontage. AND Amend 24.4.9 RDI (a)-Subdivision-Road Frontage to adopt the Vehicular Access Requirements of the Operative Waikato District Plan- Franklin Section.	The layout of a development is dependent on the size and shape of the site as well as its topography (amongst other constraints). While a 20m minimum width along a road boundary can generally work in many developments that have the ability to follow a grid design, not every site is flat with no size/shape constraints. Sites with topographical natural or physical constraints may be unable to practically implement a layout that achieves 20m road frontage for all lots with the road. There may also be sites where the lay of the land is best suited to an alternative roading design. There is no analysis in the s32 regarding this relevance or practicality of this rule.	Rejected	8
24.4.10 Subdivision – Building platform						
602.8	Greig Metcalfe	Oppose	Amend Rule 24.4.10 (a) RDI Subdivision - Building platform, as follows: (a) Every proposed lot, other than a new lot specifically for access, utility allotment & an access allotment, utility allotment or reserve allotment, must be capable of containing a building platform upon which a dwelling could be sited as a permitted activity, with the building platform being contained within either of the following dimensions: ... AND Any consequential amendments and/or	The requested wording for RDI (a) is an improvement to the notified version and reserve allotments need to be included.	Accepted	9

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.			
FS1388.1028	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.	Rejected	9
382.6	Brent Trail for Surveying Services Ltd	Support	No specific decision sought, but submission states support for Rule 24.4.10 Subdivision - Building Platform.	No reason provided.	Accepted in Part	9
FS1388.80	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.	Accepted in Part	9

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>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>		
397.10	Horotiu Properties Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 24.4.10 RDI Subdivision - Building Platform, as follows: (a) Every proposed lot, other than a new lot specifically for access, utility allotment & access allotment an access allotment, utility allotment or reserve allotment, must be capable of containing a building platform. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any consequential amendments necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.	Improves wording and includes reserve allotments.	Accepted	9
943.60	McCracken Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 24.4.10 RDI (a) (i) Subdivision - Building platform, to be inclusive of yards. OR Amend Rule 24.4.10 RDI (a) (i) - Subdivision - Building platform, as follows; (i) A circle with a diameter of at least 18 15m exclusive of yards; or AND Any consequential amendments to other residential zones.	The 18m diameter is not achievable where a road frontage is 20m (Rule 24.4.9) and side yards (Rule 24.3.6.1) which equates to a 17m maximum diameter circle exclusive of yards. The 18m circle exclusive of yards is too restrictive for many sites. The requirement would be difficult to achieve or many sites typically being 20m in length. There is no obvious planning outcome or support for an 18m standard.	Accepted	9
24.4.11 Subdivision Creating Reserves						
382.7	Brent Trail for Surveying Services Ltd	Oppose	Amend Rule 24.4.11 RDI (a) Subdivision Creating Reserves, by replacing 50% with 20%.	This rule is not helpful to sustainable development and cost of housing unless	Accepted	10

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				Council is doing the development or reimbursing the developer for additional roading requirements due to this rule. 205 is reasonable.		
FS1308.30	The Surveying Company	Oppose	Null	Rule 24.4.11 RD1(a)-Subdivision Creating Reserves should be deleted and made into a matter of discretion. Roading infrastructure is expensive and the rule will result in additional costs for developers which may not be justifiable from an economic perspective. The enforcement of the rule may increase the cost of development which could be passed onto purchasers. This is an arbitrary standard which may not be relevant for all reserve types of developments. Safety and surveillance of reserves may be achieved with less road frontage. There is no analysis in the s32 stating why the 50% road frontage rule has been applied. While this may be a principle to follow it should not be forced through a rule.	Rejected	10
FS1187.16	Greig Developments No 2 Limited	Oppose	Oppose submission point 382.7.	Rule 24.4.11 RD1 (a) - Subdivision Creating Reserves should be deleted and made into a matter of discretion. Roading infrastructure is expensive and the rule will result in additional costs for developers which may not be justifiable from an economic perspective. The enforcement of the rule may increase the cost of development which could be passed onto purchasers. This is an arbitrary standard which may not be relevant for all reserve types of developments. Safety and surveillance of reserves may be achieved with less road frontage. There is no analysis in the s32 stating why the 50% road frontage rule has been applied. While this may be a principle to follow it should not be	Rejected	10

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>enforced through a rule.</i>		
405.83	Counties Power Limited	Neutral/Amend	Add a matter of discretion to Rule 24.4.11 RDI(b) Subdivision Creating Reserves as follows: <u>The subdivision layout and design in regard to how this may impact on the operation, maintenance, upgrading and development of existing infrastructure assets;</u>	To prevent assets becoming landlocked. Similar to Transpower rules.	Accepted	10
<i>FS1211.56</i>	<i>First Gas</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Amend Rule 24.4.11 as requested under submission point 405.83.</i>	<i>First Gas supports the proposed amendment to Rule 23.4.11 to add the following matter of discretion for Subdivision to create an esplanade reserve: The subdivision, layout and design in regard to how this may impact on the operation, maintenance, upgrading and development of existing infrastructure.</i>	Accepted	10
689.25	Greig Developments No 2 Limited	Oppose	Delete Rule 24.4.11(a) Subdivision Creating Reserves and make it a matter of discretion.	Roading infrastructure is expensive and the rule will result in additional costs for developers, which may not be justifiable from an economic perspective. The enforcement of the rule may increase the costs of development, which could be passed onto purchasers. This is an arbitrary standard which may not be relevant for all reserve types or developments. Safety and surveillance of reserves may be achieved with less road frontage. There is no analysis in Section 32 stating why the 50% rule was applied.	Rejected	10
746.134	The Surveying Company	Oppose	Delete Rule 24.4.11 RDI (a)-Subdivision Creating Reserves and make it a matter of discretion.	Roading infrastructure is expensive and the rule will result in additional costs for developers which may not be justifiable from an economic perspective. The	Rejected	10

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				enforcement of the rule may increase the cost of development which could be passed onto purchasers. This is an arbitrary standard which may not be relevant for all reserve types or developments. Safety and surveillance of reserves may be achieved with less road frontage. There is no analysis in the s32 stating why the 50% road frontage rule has been applied. While this may be a principle to follow it should not be enforced through a rule.		
24.4.12 Subdivision of Esplanade Reserves and Esplanade Strips						
405.84	Counties Power Limited	Neutral/Amend	Add a matter of discretion to Rule 24.4.12 RDI (b) Subdivision of Esplanade Reserves and Esplanade Strips, as follows: <u>The subdivision layout and design in regard to how this may impact on the operation, maintenance, upgrading and development of existing infrastructure assets;</u>	To prevent assets becoming landlocked. Similar to Transpower rules.	Accepted	11
689.26	Greig Developments No 2 Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 24.4.12 Subdivision of Esplanade Reserves and Esplanade Strips to adopt the provisions in the Operative District Plan – Franklin Section Rule 11.5 – Esplanade Reserves and Strips.	Accept that esplanade reserves and strips enable public access and recreation. This needs to be assessed on a case-by-case basis and Council should allow a waiver or reduction in width in certain circumstances	Accepted in Part	11
746.135	The Surveying Company	Oppose	Amend Rule 24.4.12-Subdivision of esplanade reserves and esplanade strips by adopting Operative Waikato District Plan- Franklin Section Rule 11.5 - Esplanade Reserves and	The submitter accepts that esplanade reserves and esplanade strips enable public access and recreation. However, this needs to be assessed on a case by	Accepted in Part	11

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			Strips.	case basis and Council should allow a waiver or reduction in width in certain circumstances.		
24.4.13 Subdivision of land containing mapped off-road walkways						
697.1013	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amended	<p>Amend Rule 24.4.13 Subdivision of land containing mapped off-road walkways, as follows: 24.4.13 Subdivision of land containing mapped off-road walkways, <u>cycleways</u>, <u>bridleways</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend Rule 24.4.13 D1 Subdivision of land containing mapped off-road walkways as follows: (a) Subdivision where walkways shown on the planning maps are to be provided as part of the subdivision must comply with all of the following conditions: (i) The walkway, <u>cycleway or bridleway</u> is at least 3 metres wide and is designed and constructed for shared pedestrian, an cycle use or riding, as per Rule 14.12.1 P8 (Transportation); (ii) The walkway, <u>cycleway or bridleway</u> is generally in accordance with the walkway, <u>cycleway or bridleway</u> route shown on the planning maps; (iii) The walkway, <u>cycleway or bridleway</u> is shown on the plan of subdivision and vested in Council. (b) Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters: (i) Alignment of the walkway, <u>cycleway or bridleway</u>; (ii) Drainage in relation to the walkway, <u>cycleway or bridleway</u>; (iii) Standard of design and construction of the walkway, <u>cycleway or bridleway</u>; (iv) Land stability; (v) Amenity matters including batter slopes; (vi) Connection to reserves.</p>	Rule needs amending to provide clarity.	Accepted	12

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
New Rule Suggestions						
697.1001	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amended	<p>Add to Rule 24.4(2) Subdivision a new clause, as follows: <u>(vii) Rule 24.4.8A – subdivision within the National Grid Corridor</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Undertake consequential renumbering;</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Add new rule after Rule 24.4.8A: <u>24.4.8A Subdivision of land within the National Grid Corridor RDI</u> (a) The subdivision of land within the National Grid Corridor must comply with all of the following conditions: (i) <u>All allotments intended to contain a sensitive land use must provide a building platform for the likely principal building(s) and any building(s) for a sensitive land use located outside of the National Grid Yard, other than where the allotments are for roads, access ways or infrastructure; and</u> (ii) <u>The layout of allotments and any enabling earthworks must ensure that physical access is maintained to any National Grid support structures located on the allotments, including any balance area.</u> (b) <u>Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters: (i) The subdivision layout and design in regard to how this may impact on the operation, maintenance, upgrading and development of the National Grid; (ii) The ability to provide a complying building platform outside of the National Grid Yard; (iii) The risk of electrical hazards affecting public or individual safety, and the risk of property damage; (iv) The nature and location of any vegetation to be planted in the vicinity of National Grid transmission lines. NCI</u> Any</p>	Replicate the subdivision rule within the National Grid Corridor from Chapter 14 into Chapter 24 (where this is relevant to the Village Zone) for increased clarity and usability of the Plan.	Accepted	13

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			subdivision of land within the National Grid Corridor that does not comply with one or more of the conditions of Rule 24.4.8A RDI.			
FS1350.130	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Oppose	Disallow in terms of sought relocation of National Grid provisions. Notwithstanding the location of the provisions, Transpower seeks that all amendments sought in its original submission be included.	<p>Related to the original submission by Waikato District Council seeking relocation/replicating of the National Grid provisions into the respective chapters, Transpower supports and prefers a standalone set of provisions (for the reason it avoids duplication and provides a coherent set of rules which submitters can refer to, noting that the planning maps clearly identify land that is subject to the National Grid provisions).</p> <p>A standalone set of provisions as provided in the notified plan is also consistent with the National Planning Standards. Irrespective that the proposed plan has not been drafted to align with the National Planning Standards, it would be counterproductive to amend the layout contrary to the intent of the Standards. Standard 7. District wide Matters Standard provides, as a mandatory direction, that 'provisions relating to energy, infrastructure and transport that are not specific to the Special purpose zones chapter or sections must be located in one or more chapters under the Energy, Infrastructure and Transport heading'. Clause 5.(c) makes specific reference to reverse sensitivity effects between infrastructure and other activities.</p> <p>If council wish to pursue splitting the National Grid provisions into the respective chapters, supply of a revised full set of provisions would be beneficial to enable Transpower to fully assess the implications and workability of the requested changes. Notwithstanding the location of National Grid</p>	Rejected	13

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p><i>provisions within the proposed plan, Transpower seeks the specific changes to provisions as sought in its original submission.</i></p>		
FS1387.765	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p>	Rejected	13