

Submitter Number	1	Submitter Names	Hiria Hetet
Point Number	1.1		
Plan Chapter	Maps		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Amend MRZ2 to include: 5 McDiarmid Crescent, Huntly; AND Amend MRZ2 to include: 19 Blundell Place, Huntly.		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This gives the submitter the opportunity to build on site and within the boundaries and house family in the future. • It allows the submitter to be close to their whanau. 		

Submitter Number	2	Submitter Names	Brent & Kym Cooper
Point Number	2.1		
Plan Chapter	Generic Topic		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Amend Variation 3 to include public notification.		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The council should always consult the public when making decisions. • The council should not be making decisions without public consultation. 		

Point Number	2.2		
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Delete MRZ2-P1 Housing Typology.		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The medium density standards will detract from the rural outlooks in rural towns. • Three story housing is impractical and more suited to cities. 		

Submitter Number	3	Submitter Names	Daniel Randall
Point Number	3.1		
Plan Chapter	Subdivision		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Delete Pookeno from SUB-P14.		

Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pookeno should not be subject to high density housing. • Pookeno does not have the infrastructure capacity. • High density housing should occur in large cities close to public transport hubs not Pookeno. • High density housing will adversely affect existing residents.
------------------------	---

Submitter Number	4	Submitter Names	Summerset Group Holdings Limited
Point number	4.1		
Plan Chapter	Generic topic		
Support / Oppose / Amend	Not stated		
Summary of Decision Requested	No specific decision requested, but submission supports the submission from The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand [refer to submission 107].		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No reasons provided. 		
Point Number	4.2		
Plan Chapter	Generic topic		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Support		
Summary of Decision Requested	No specific decision requested, but submission supports the inclusion of changes that are provided by the MDRS provision of the Enabling Housing Supply Act.		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No reasons provided. 		
Point number	4.3		
Plan Chapter	General		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Not stated		
Summary of Decision Requested	Requests the Council engages constructively with the Retirement Villages Association in relation to Council's housing intensification Variation.		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No reasons provided. 		

Submitter Number	5	Submitter Names	Max Robitzsch
Point Number	5.1		
Plan Chapter	All of Variation		

Support/Oppose/Amend	Support
Summary of Decision Requested:	Retain all changes of Variation 3, OR Amend to further strengthen intensification opportunities.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Without intensification housing will remain unaffordable. • Without intensification traffic congestion will get worse. • Without intensification rural areas will change more than otherwise necessary.

Submitter Number	6	Submitter Names	Tania Nepe
Point Number	6.1		
Plan Chapter	Generic Topic		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose		
Summary of Decision Requested:	No specific decision requested, but decision opposes SUB-R and considers that subdivision should not be allowed for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Te Kauwhata does not have the population density to justify high rise buildings. • Te Kauwhata is struggling to maintain and upkeep current infrastructure for its growing community as it is. • Te Kauwhata is not Auckland or a major city that this type of subdivision requires. 		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Te Kauwhata does not have the population density to justify high rise buildings. • Te Kauwhata is struggling to maintain and upkeep current infrastructure for its growing community as it is. • Te Kauwhata is not Auckland or a major city that this type of subdivision requires. 		

Submitter Number	7	Submitter Names	Dave Honiss
Point Number	7.1		
Plan Chapter	All of Variation		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Amend Variation 3 so it applies to selected parts of Tuakau, not the whole town.		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter has lived in the area for 14-years and there has been little input from the Council during this time. • High density housing leads to crime and anti-social behaviour. • Tuakau is the only town (of the four) with the majority of the town being rezoned. 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter believes that the changes Council is making (such as the library and skatepark) only benefits a small percent of Tuakau's residents. Waikato District Council needs to focus on developing the town like it has with Te Kauwhata.
--	--

Submitter Number	8	Submitter Names	Stanley JoanEdward
Point Number	8.1		
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Support		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Retain MRZ2 in Tuakau.		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter thinks subdivision and development will benefit Tuakau. Subdivision and development will bring more business to Tuakau. 		

Submitter Number	9	Submitter Names	Ruth Williams
Point Number	9.1		
Plan Chapter	All of Variation		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Amend and leave the same.		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Having three-story homes will obscure the submitters view of the area's natural beauty. Parking on the streets will become more difficult. It is a family friendly neighbourhood where children play in the street. With so many homes in the area, there will be much more traffic. Single level homes preferred to avoid losing the green surroundings and open space for families. 		

Submitter Number	10	Submitter Names	Paulia Amoroa
Point Number	10.1		
Plan Chapter	Maps		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Delete the Ngaaruawaahia map from Variation 3.		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Questions why we have to be like the bigger towns and have townhouses. Considers there is enough land here so keep building houses not 3 story ones. Seeks to keep their little town [Ngaaruawaahia] townhouse free. 		

Submitter Number	11	Submitter Names	Jan Sedgwick
Point Number	11.1		
Plan Chapter	All of Variation		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Amend Variation 3 to include Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design CPTED provisions and provisions for neighbourhood and pocket parks.		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter supports in principle Variation 3 on the basis it is limited to the four larger communities as shown on the maps. The submitter would like amendments to include Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design provisions, and neighbourhood parks, pocket parts to provide green spaces for passive recreation and community spaces. 		

Submitter Number	11	Submitter Names	Jan Sedgwick
Point Number	11.2		
Plan Chapter	All of Variation		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Support		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Support the Variation applying to the 4 larger communities.		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter supports in principle Variation 3 on the basis it is limited to the four larger communities as shown on the maps. 		

Submitter Number	12	Submitter Names	Donald Matheson
Point Number	12.1		
Plan Chapter	Generic Topic		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Support		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Retain the proposed zoning and provisions for Ngaaruawaahia as set out in Variation 3.		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter supports the amendment to the district plan Variation 3 to help encourage development on existing residential land. 		

Submitter Number	13	Submitter Names	Halm Fan Kong
Point Number	13.1		
Plan Chapter	Maps		

Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested:	Amend MRZ to include 145 Park Road, Horotiu.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitter requests the rezoning of 145 Park Road from General Rural Zone to Medium Residential Zone to allow for more housing in Horotiu.

Submitter Number	14	Submitter Names	Wayne Bishop and Cameron Smith
Point Number	14.1		
Plan Chapter	Generic Topic		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend		
Summary of Decision Requested	Amend Variation 3 to include retirement village/ elderly housing to occur in land where there is a connection with existing urban areas, where land supply is sufficient and the ability to provide suitable infrastructure and connectivity is achievable.		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter feels there has been a missed opportunity by Council to identify new urban areas to provide for elderly care/ retirement villages as these are more bespoke and difficult to accommodate within the existing land parcels which are often smaller and harder to amalgamate. • The existing residential zone vacant land is not large enough to cater for a 'cluster' type development. • The ability to develop elderly care/ retirement villages within existing urban areas is an arduous task as there is limited/ no land in the form of individual titles or ownership within existing urban areas to the size and scale required to deliver a quality elderly care facility or retirement village (this being some 20-60 hectares needed). • Census data shows an increasing older population. • The ability to provide suitable housing and lifestyle options for the older population demographic, so that they may remain within the district is extremely limited. 		
Point Number	14.2		
Plan Chapter	Generic Topic		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend		
Summary of Decision Requested	Council to look at the options of providing residential zoning contiguous with Gordonton area to enable a bespoke retirement village development. AND		

	Amend to rezone land holding contiguous with Gordonton as a bespoke Settlement Zone that aligns with the description of the zone in the National Planning Standards.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Missed opportunity by Council to identify new urban areas to provide for elderly care/ retirement villages as these are more bespoke and difficult to accommodate within the existing land parcels which are often smaller and harder to amalgamate. • The existing residential zone vacant land is not large enough to cater for a 'cluster' type development. • The ability to develop elderly care/ retirement villages within existing urban areas is an arduous task as there is limited/ no land in the form of individual titles or ownership within existing urban areas to the size and scale required to deliver a quality elderly care facility or retirement village (this being some 20-60 hectares needed). • Census data shows an increasing older population. • The ability to provide suitable housing and lifestyle options for the older population demographic, so that they may remain within the district is extremely limited. • The provision of independent elderly housing is sparse within the Waikato District and to assist in achieving the objectives of 3 d. to enable a variety of housing choice, the submission seeks that Council look at the ability to rezone additional land for residential purposes for the specific purpose of enabling elderly persons housing i.e., retirement villages. • The submitter has the opportunity to develop such a proposal on a land holding contiguous with the township of Gordonton and seeks Council to look at the options of providing additional residential zoning within this area to enable a bespoke retirement village development.
Point Number	14.3
Plan Chapter	Generic Topic
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Amend to meet / identify housing opportunities for the expected demand for housing among other areas. The submission considers this opportunity has been missed as part of Variation 3, and comments on the provision of enabling elderly person's housing such as retirement villages.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Missed opportunity by Council to identify new urban areas to provide for elderly care/ retirement villages as these are more bespoke and difficult to accommodate within the existing land parcels which are often smaller and harder to amalgamate.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The existing residential zone vacant land is not large enough to cater for a 'cluster' type development. • The ability to develop elderly care/ retirement villages within existing urban areas is an arduous task as there is limited/ no land in the form of individual titles or ownership within existing urban areas to the size and scale required to deliver a quality elderly care facility or retirement village (this being some 20-60 hectares needed). • Census data shows an increasing older population. • The ability to provide suitable housing and lifestyle options for the older population demographic, so that they may remain within the district is extremely limited. • The provision of independent elderly housing is sparse within the Waikato District and to assist in achieving the objectives of 3 d. to enable a variety of housing choice, the submission seeks that Council look at the ability to rezone additional land for residential purposes for the specific purpose of enabling elderly persons housing i.e., retirement villages. • The submitter has the opportunity to develop such a proposal on a land holding contiguous with the township of Gordonton and seeks Council to look at the options of providing additional residential zoning within this area to enable a bespoke retirement village development.
--	--

Submitter Number	15	Submitter Names	Graciela Edith Eidelman Di Denia
Point Number	15.1		
Plan Chapter	Maps		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Delete William Street, Huntly and surrounding area.		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter states there will be negative impacts because of increased traffic, noise, and pollution. • The submitter is against Variation 3 because consent should be required for 3 homes up to 11m high. • The submitter states permission from neighbours is also required. 		
Point Number	15.2		
Plan Chapter	All of Variation		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Delete MDRS provisions.		

Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposes the development for up to 3 homes & up to 11 m. high without needing resource consent & permission from neighbours.
------------------------	---

Submitter Number	16	Submitter Names	Roberto Denia
Point Number	16.1		
Plan Chapter	Maps		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Delete William Street, Huntly and surrounding area.		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter thinks it will be a negative impact because it will increase traffic, noise, and pollution. 		
Point Number	16.2		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Delete MDRS provisions.		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposes the development for up to 3 homes and up to 11 m high without needing resource consent and permission from neighbours. 		

Submitter Number	17	Submitter Names	Douglas W Rowe
Point Number	17.1		
Plan Chapter	All of Variation		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Delete GRZ to MRZ2.		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter states that additional infrastructure would be needed and questions who will pay for the additional infrastructure. Oppose demolishing single storey and replacing with a three-storey building without consent. Pookeno does not need three storey housing. The submitter is a ratepayer who strongly opposes Variation 3. 		
Point Number	17.2		
Plan Chapter	All of Variation		

Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose
Summary of Decision Requested:	Delete MRZ to MRZ2.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter states that additional infrastructure would be needed and questions who will pay for the additional infrastructure. • Oppose demolishing single storey and replacing with a three-storey building without consent. • Pookeno does not need three storey housing. • The submitter is a ratepayer who strongly opposes Variation 3.

Submitter Number	18	Submitter Names	Transpower NZ Ltd
Point Number	18.1		
Plan Chapter	Generic topic		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Amend Variation 3 to give effect to the National Policy Statement on Electricity Transmission 2008		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No reasons provided. 		
Point Number	18.2		
Plan Chapter	Generic Topic		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Amend Variation 3 to recognise the National Grid as a qualifying matter in the implementation of the RMA.		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No reasons provided. 		
Point Number	18.3		
Plan Chapter	Generic Topic		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Support		
Summary of Decision Requested:	No specific decision requested, but submission supports Variation 3, in particular: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The identification of the National Grid as a qualifying matter; and • The inclusion of the PDP National Grid corridor provisions within the IPI and ISPP process. 		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No reasons provided. 		
Point Number	18.4		

Plan Chapter	Generic Topic
Support/Oppose/Amend	Support
Summary of Decision Requested:	No specific decision requested, but submission supports the inclusion of existing provisions relating to the National Grid within MRZ2.
Decision Reasons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transpower supports the approach taken by the Council in Variation 3, as this future proofs the provisions, ensuring that should the zone be expanded in future (or through this process), the National Grid provisions are appropriately applied as a qualifying matter.
Point Number	18.5
Plan Chapter	Generic Topic
Support/Oppose/Amend	Support
Summary of Decision Requested:	No specific decision requested, but submission supports the retention of the National Grid provisions within the GRZ.
Decision Reasons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Because of this the MDRS standards are not applied within this zone and no changes are proposed to the National Grid provisions applying within this retained zone.
Point Number	18.6
Plan Chapter	Definitions
Support / Oppose / Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested:	<p>Amend definition of “Qualifying Matters” as follows: <i>Has the same meaning as in section 2 of the Resource Management Act 1991 (as set out in the box below).</i> <i>Means a matter referred to in section 771 or 770 of the Resource Management Act.</i></p> <p><u>Qualifying matters include:</u> <u>(a)The National Grid Yard</u> <u>(b)The National Grid Subdivision Corridor</u> <u>(c)..... (other qualifying matters to be listed)</u></p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter supports the inclusion of a definition of ‘qualifying matters,’ as it highlights to plan users the existence of the matters. • Given the role and importance of qualifying matters to the implementation of the RMA, and reference to them in the Variation 3 framework, the submitter considers it necessary, and beneficial for future users, for the definition to provide a clear list as to what the qualifying matters within this District Plan are.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is particularly important given the provisions which implement the qualifying matters which sit outside the MDRZ2 provisions (e.g., subdivision rules).
Point Number	18.7
Plan Chapter	Strategic Directions
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support
Summary of Decision Requested	Retain Objective SD-O14 Well-functioning urban environment.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter supports the objective, and in particular the recognition of wellbeing, health, and safety. The objective reflects Schedule 3A, Part 1, clause (6)(1)(a) of the RMA.
Point Number	18.8
Plan Chapter	Strategic Directions
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Amend Policy SD-P2 Medium Density Residential Standards as follows: <i>Apply the MDRS across all relevant residential zones in the district plan except in circumstances where the a qualifying matter is relevant...</i>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter supports the policy noting that it reflects schedule 3a part 1, clause (6)(2)(b) of the RMA. A minor correction is sought.
Point Number	18.9
Plan Chapter	Subdivision
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support
Summary of Decision Requested	Retain SUB-P23 Subdivision in the MRZ2 – Medium Density Residential Zone 2.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter supports the clear reference to how qualifying matters affect development in the MRZ2. The submitter supports the clear direction that subdivision must not compromise any qualifying matters applying to the site. In the case of the National Grid, subdivision provides the framework for future land use, and if poorly configured, can prevent access to the National Grid for maintenance and result in new allotments that cannot be safely built on, thus potentially compromising the effective operation, maintenance and upgrading of the National Grid
Point Number	18.10

Plan Chapter	Subdivision
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support
Summary of Decision Requested	Retain SUB-R162 Subdivision within the National Grid Corridor.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter supports the application of the National Grid corridors as a qualifying matter within the provisions applying to the MRZ2. • The submitter supports the inclusion of this rule within the subdivision rules applying to the MRZ2, noting that the rule itself replicates, and is therefore consistent with, those applying within other zones.
Point Number	18.11
Plan Chapter	Medium Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Retain table outlining qualifying matters, by adding it to the ‘Purpose’ section of the MRZ2 chapter, with the following (or similar) introductory wording:</p> <p><i>... Co-ordinate delivery of infrastructure and services.</i></p> <p><i>The following qualifying matters also apply within the zone, which limit development within the areas to which a qualifying matter applies:</i></p> <p><i>[Insert table as outlined in the submission, but without references to GRZ-R14 and SUB-R26, and noting that MRZ2-R10 and SUB-R162 are also matters required for the purpose of ensuring the safe or efficient operation of nationally significant infrastructure.]</i></p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter supports clear identification at the start of the MRZ2 chapter as to what qualifying matters apply. This provides clarity for Plan users. • The submitter notes that this part of the chapter is intended to be explanatory note for the purpose of the IPI, (which is to be removed upon completion of the process), Transpower considers that there is merit in the table being retained so that it is clear to plan users in future what qualifying matters have been applied. This can be achieved by adding the table to the end of the ‘Purpose’ section. • The submitter queries why the table includes references to rules within or relating to the GRZ chapter (GRZ-R14 and SUB-R26), given the GRZ does not adopt the MDRS, and is a qualifying matter.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter notes that the table only identifies the National Grid provisions as being those required under s77(b). However, as noted in the s32 report (page 68 of Section 32 Report – Volume 2) and confirmed within this submission, the National Grid is also a “Matter required for the purpose of ensuring the safe or efficient operation of nationally significant infrastructure” under s77I(e), and this should be included in the table.
Point Number	18.12
Plan Chapter	Medium Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support
Summary of Decision Requested	Retain MRZ2-O1 Housing typology.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter supports the objective, noting it reflects Schedule 3A, Part 1, clause (6)(1)(b) of the RMA.
Point Number	18.13
Plan Chapter	Medium Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support
Summary of Decision Requested	Retain MRZ2-O3 Residential amenity.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter supports the objective, on the basis that while qualifying matters may limit the density or scale of development possible within certain parts of the zone, this is addressed in Objective MRZ2-O5.
Point Number	18.14
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support
Summary of Decision Requested	Retain MRZ2-O5 Qualifying matters.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter supports explicit recognition at the objective level of the implications that qualifying matters may have on medium density residential development.
Point Number	18.15
Plan Chapter	Medium Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support
Summary of Decision Requested	Retain MRZ2-O6 Reverse sensitivity.

Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transpower supports the objective, as it assists in giving effect to Policy 10 of the NPSET.
Point Number	18.16
Plan Chapter	Medium Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support
Summary of Decision Requested	Retain MRZ2-P1 Housing typology.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally supports the policy, noting that it reflects Schedule 3A Part 1, clause (6)(2)(a) of the RMA. • While existing qualifying matters may limit the amount of permitted development possible on an allotment and therefore directly influence the capacity for intensification and residential development, this is recognised through the inclusion of Policy MRZ2-P6, which is to be read in conjunction with this policy.
Point Number	18.17
Plan Chapter	Medium Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support
Summary of Decision Requested	Retain MRZ2-P6 Qualifying matters.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports the policy, noting that it provides appropriate direction on how qualifying matters affect residential development.
Point Number	18.18
Plan Chapter	Medium Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support
Summary of Decision Requested	Retain MRZ2-P11 Reverse sensitivity.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter supports the objective, as it assists in giving effect to Policy 10 of the NPSET.
Point Number	18.19
Plan Chapter	Medium Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Retain MRZ2-R10 Buildings, structures and sensitive land uses within the National Grid Yard in sites existing as of 18 July 2018, except for the amendments outlined below.

	<p>AND</p> <p>Amend MRZ2-R10(1)(b) as follows:</p> <p><i>(b) All buildings or structures permitted by Rule GMMRZ2-R10(1)(a) must: ...</i></p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter supports the application of the National Grid corridors as a qualifying matter within the provisions applying to the MRZ2. • The submitter supports the inclusion of this rule within the land use activities rules applying to the MRZ2, noting that the rule itself replicates, and is therefore consistent with, those applying within other zones. • The submitter seeks a minor amendment so that clause (b) correctly refers to MRZ2.
Point Number	18.20
Plan Chapter	Medium Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support
Summary of Decision Requested	Retain MRZ2-R11 The establishment of any new sensitive land use within the National Grid Yard.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter supports the application of the National Grid corridors as a qualifying matter within the provisions applying to the MRZ2. • The submitter supports the inclusion of this rule within the land use activities rules applying to the MRZ2, noting that the rule itself replicates, and is therefore consistent with, those applying within other zones.
Point Number	18.21
Plan Chapter	Qualifying Matters
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support
Summary of Decision Requested	Retain the National Grid as a qualifying matter to MRZ2 if the extent of MRZ2 changes.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter is neutral on the proposed extent of the MDRZ2 zone, on the basis that the National Grid provisions are applied within the Zone as a qualifying matter.
Point Number	18.22
Plan Chapter	Generic Topic
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support
Summary of Decision Requested	Retain the application of the National Grid provisions to development within the GRZ if the approach to the GRZ changes.

Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter is neutral on the retention of the GRZ and its application as a qualifying matter. However, should the approach taken to the GRZ change. The submitter seeks to ensure that the National Grid provisions and its status as a qualifying matter continues to apply to the zone.
Point Number	18.22
Plan Chapter	Generic Topic
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support
Summary of Decision Requested	No specific decision requested, but submission supports the assessment contained within the s32 report in relation to the identification of the National Grid as a qualifying matter.
Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No reasons provided.

Submitter Number	19	Submitter Names	WEL Networks Limited
Point Number	19.1		
Plan Chapter	Subdivision		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend		
Summary of Decision Requested:	<p>Add a new Rule SUB-R163 as follows:</p> <p><i><u>Subdivision Activities adjacent to Electricity Distribution Infrastructure</u></i></p> <p><i><u>Any subdivision in the vicinity of electricity infrastructure must demonstrate that building platforms can be in positions where a subsequent building can comply with the NZ Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safe Distances (NZECP 34:2001).</u></i></p> <p><i><u>Vegetation to be planted in the vicinity of electricity infrastructure should be selected and/or managed so that it does not breach the Electricity (Hazards from Trees) Regulations 2003.</u></i></p>		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The rule is proposed to ensure that any subdivision demonstrates that building platforms can be in positions where a subsequent building can comply with the NZECP 34:2001. The rule be amended to ensure that vegetation to be planted in the vicinity of electricity infrastructure be selected and/or managed so that it does not breach the Tree Regs. Through the intensification and the reduction of setbacks from the transport corridor, there is potential for future development to be in positions which may breach NZECP 34:2001. The proposed rule will ensure that a compliant and safe building platform can be provided. 		

Point Number	19.2
Plan Chapter	Medium Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support
Summary of Decision Requested	Retain the purpose included in the MRZ2 - Medium Density Residential Zone 2 as notified.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter supports the purpose included in the MRZ2 as it provides for the coordinated delivery of infrastructure and services.
Point Number	19.3
Plan Chapter	Medium Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Amend Rule 4.2.5.6a as follows: <i>Front – 1.5m, <u>provided the building or structure can achieve compliance with the NZ Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safe Distances (NZECP 34:2001).</u></i>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> With intensification and the reduction of setbacks from the transport corridor, there is potential for development to be in positions which may breach NZECP 34:2001.

Submitter Number	20	Submitter Names	Greig Developments
Point Number	20		
Plan Chapter	Maps		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Amend the maps to include 23A Harrisville Road and a property on Johnson/Oak Street, Tuakau as Medium Density Residential Zone 2 (see submission for map of sites).		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The subject properties are zoned Rural Residential under the ODP (Franklin) and Large Lot (which is categorised as one of the Residential zones) in the PDP decisions version. The submitter considers the subject properties to be a relevant residential zone and therefore should be included in the MDRZ 2. MDRZ Zoning is an efficient use of the urban land resource that is near the town centre of Tuakau, within walking distance of 400-450m. The site is serviced by Council's water and wastewater infrastructure. The council should consider properties suitable located areas that are able to utilise urban services. 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing the ability for the sites to develop will create residential growth within an appropriate area and directs residential growth away from rural and coastal areas in the district. • The rural areas of Tuakau contain versatile soils that are used for rural production activities. These soils contribute significantly to both regional and national food supply. • Intensification of urban land at higher densities should be encouraged within proximity of the Tuakau town centre to ensure that land supply to avoid further encroachment into the rural area past the lifetime of this plan. • Excluding the zone within the MRZ 2 underutilises the land resource where intensifying the zoning in these locations is more appropriate given their proximity to the town centre of Tuakau. • Fails to give effect to the Future Proof Strategy identified in 1.5.1 of the plans that seeks a shift in the existing pattern of land use towards accommodating growth through a more compact urban form based on concentrating growth in and around Hamilton and the larger settlements of the district. • This involves a reduction in the relative share of the population outside of the subregions existing major settlements through tighter control over rural residential development and encouraging greater urban densities in existing settlements. • The exclusion of these properties within the MDRZ 2 is considered d to be inefficient use of the residential land resource. • The qualifying matter of natural character of the waterbodies and their margins overlay is located on a portion of the Johnson/Oak Street site, a land use consent has been approved by the WDC to provide a 10-meter setback from the Wakapipi Stream for any future buildings across the property (see sub). This qualifying matter alone should not exclude the subject property from the MDRZ 2.
--	--

Submitter Number	21	Submitter Names	Brett Titchmarsh
Point Number	21.1		
Plan Chapter	Maps		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Amend Variation 3 to include all areas identified to accommodate residential growth in the Structure Plan (refer to submission) and Waikato 2070 (refer to sub).		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Growth in Tuakau has been planned for since 2014 and areas for rezoning are identified in the Structure Plan and Waikato 2070. These plans were informed by discussions with iwi, interest groups and the wider public. 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To provide for maximum choice and affordability we believe that all areas identified to accommodate growth in the Structure Plan and Waikato 2070 should be rezoned now. The Structure Plan was informed by technical analysis addressing matters relevant to growth such as infrastructure servicing requirements, urban design, ecology and traffic.
Point Number	21.2
Plan Chapter	All of Variation
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested:	Apply the medium density standards for all residential areas within Tuakau unless a valid qualifying matter applies.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tuakau has affordable housing and is supported by good infrastructure and community spaces The urban areas of Tuakau are close to major transport routes including State Highway 22. There are bus services and the potential for future connection to Te Huia along the North Island Main Trunk line. Tuakau is near other upcoming urban areas such as Pukekohe and Pookeno.

Submitter Number	22	Submitter Names	John and Priscilla Boyson
Point Number	22.1		
Plan Chapter	All of Variation		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Delete Variation 3 provisions from the proposed district plan.		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pookeno has been developed as a new township along traditional lines that reflect small town lifestyle in this country with covenants that have been created to protect these values There appears to be no consideration of infrastructure services and the required support which high density housing in any of the government plans The submitter is concerned with the decrease in property value of their property The submitter understands that high density is to accommodate population growth. However, can be more effective in major cities. 3 x 3 housing will have a negative impact on climate change. The submitter strongly objects the timing of this proposal. 		
Point Number	22.2		
Plan Chapter	Generic Topic		

Support/Oppose/Amend	Not stated
Summary of Decision Requested	Council to make a submission to the government on behalf of the community demanding that the requirements imposed on the Council to create this Variation be removed.
Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pookeno has been developed as a new township along traditional lines that reflect small town lifestyle in this country. • Covenants have been created to protect these values. • There appears to be no consideration of infrastructure services and the required support which high density housing in any of the government plans. • The submitter is concerned with the decrease in property value of their property. • The submitter understands that high density is to accommodate population growth. However, can be more effective in major cities. • 3 x 3 housing will have a negative impact on climate change. • The submitter strongly objects the timing of this proposal.

Submitter Number		Submitter Names	Jenny Kelly
Point Number	23.1		
Plan Chapter	All of Variation		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Delete the medium density provisions from the proposed district plan.		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Premium soils need to be preserved for horticulture and agriculture to feed our people. • Liveable, thriving and connected communities will become the opposite with medium density provisions, rural character of most towns will be lost. • The submitter will no longer go to shops knowing people, they will become strangers within their own town. • Growth and investment are needed in communities further south and east opposed to Te Kauwhata, to encourage growth and survival. 		

Submitter Number	24	Submitter Names	Jeremy Duncan
Point Number	24.1		
Plan Chapter	Maps		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend		

Summary of Decision Requested:	Amend the zoning of the property at 14 Herschel Street, Ngaaruawaahia to Medium Density Residential Zone 2 AND Consider amending the zoning of 16 Herschel Street, Ngaaruawaahia to Medium Density Residential Zone 2.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These properties should be included because it is near the town centre, it is some of the closest in proximity in comparison to most of the proposed properties. • The property does not require the additional privacy vehicle use as it is close to the local shops. In addition, the properties sit near day care and other services. • The existing land use of both properties is for residential purposes, both properties are well established residential properties with significant land space for more residential dwellings to fit. • The amendment proposed by the submitter is consistent with the RMA and NPS-UD. It is the submitters opinion that 14 and 16 Herschels are in a suitable position to be included in MDRZ opposed to other properties that have been included in the Variation 3 proposal

Submitter Number	25	Submitter Names	Sarath & Damayanthi Jayasinghe
Point Number	25.1		
Plan Chapter	All of Variation		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Delete Variation 3 and ask the government to look at more innovative ways to add to the housing stock.		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter moved to Pookeno from East Auckland because of its rural setting. • The submitter is concerned about the consultation and consenting process proposed in Variation 3. • Pookeno has limited green space and the proposal further reduces green space. • The submitter brought land in Pookeno because of what was presented in the district plan at the time. • Variation 3 will result decrease property values. • Variation 3 will add further stress on infrastructure. 		

Submitter Number	26	Submitter Names	Lucia Daniels
Point Number	26.1		
Plan Chapter	Generic Topic		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose		

Summary of Decision Requested:	Delete the change from three-storey housing to two-storey housing and retain two levels maximum.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal will result in loss of privacy for neighbours. • People will be vulnerable in an event of a fire and the submitter is concerned about volunteer fire brigade in the community. • The proposal will result in schools being overcrowded and parking is limited as road have narrowed over the years.
Point Number	26.2
Plan Chapter	All of Variation
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose
Summary of Decision Requested	No specific decision requested but submission opposes Variation 3 MRZ to MRZR and expresses the following concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Privacy of neighbours. • Safety in the event of fire. • Volunteer fire brigade in the community. • Overcrowding of schools. • Parking area limited as roads have narrowed over the years.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Privacy of neighbours. • Safety in the event of fire. • Volunteer fire brigade in the community. • Overcrowding of schools. • Parking area limited as roads have narrowed over the years.

Submitter Number	27	Submitter Names	Howard Lovell
Point Number	27.1		
Plan Chapter	Maps		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Amend maps to identify areas of land between Great South Road and Gordonton Road in Taupiri as MRZ1. Refer to areas identified within Attachment A of the submission.		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Taupiri can cater for the increasing catchment of commuters accessing Hamilton and Auckland. • The amendment will create consistency of built form across the Waikato District's areas. 		

Submitter Number	28	Submitter Names	Heritage New Zealand
Point Number	28.1		
Plan Chapter			
Support/Oppose/Amend	Support in part		
Summary of Decision Requested:	No specific decision requested, but submission recognises and supports the intention to acknowledge and make provisions for identified qualifying matters.		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No reason provided. 		
Point Number	28.2		
Plan Chapter	Strategic Directions		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend to improve acknowledgement of qualifying matters within the residential zone's objective, policy and assessment frameworks to provide for improved and integrated consideration of historic heritage.		
Summary of Decision Requested:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No reasons provided. 		
Point Number	28.3		
Plan Chapter	Strategic Direction		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Support		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Retain SD-P2 Medium Density Residential Standards.		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This will enable the Plan to provide the RMA matters of national importance found at s6e: the relationship of Māori and their culture traditions with their ancestral lands, water sites, waahi tapu and other taonga and s6f the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision use and development. 		
Point Number	28.4		
Plan Chapter	Subdivision		
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Oppose in part		
Summary of Decision Requested	Retain SUB-P3 Lot sizes, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend SUB-P3(3) Lot sizes as follows: (3) <i>Within the MZR2 Medium Density Residential Zone 2. subdivision enables medium density housing outcomes, <u>except in the instance of qualifying matters.</u></i>		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter considers that this policy has been amended to accommodate the MDRS. 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It should also be amended to include consideration of "qualifying" matters as a retention of qualifying matters will potentially influence subdivision design and layout. • Consideration of qualifying matters at the design stage will enable the best outcomes in terms of the most appropriate retention of the qualifying matter. • An amendment to this policy will compliment another related policy (SUB-P3) for the optimum consideration of qualifying matters in particular historic heritage and the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu and other taonga.
Point Number	28.5
Plan Chapter	Subdivision
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support
Summary of Decision Requested	Retain SUB-P23.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This will enable the Plan to provide for the RMA and national importance matters found at s6(e): the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu and other taonga and s6(f): the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.
Point Number	28.6
Plan Chapter	Medium Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support in part
Summary of Decision Requested	Retain the purpose of MRZ2 AND Add the following words to the purpose of MRZ2: <i>Except in the instances of a qualifying matter on the site.</i>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Given qualifying matters can be exceptions to intensification it is important that the users of the Plan are altered to this, enabling them to accommodate qualifying matters at the design stage of their development proposals, particularly as there are historic heritage sites-qualifying matters, within the MZR2. • The submitter considers that an additional bullet point. The proposed addition will also create a link with this section and objective and policy that address qualifying matters.
Point Number	28.7
Plan Chapter	Medium Residential Zone 2

Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support
Summary of Decision Requested	Retain MRZ2-O5 Qualifying Matters
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter considers that the suite of objectives should include references to the retention of the important values contained in qualifying matters at the time of new builds. • It is important to signal this to developers at the earliest possible stage to enable them to incorporate these aspects into their design process. • The proposed addition to the suit of objectives would enable a cascade of consideration throughout the assessment framework and will enable the Plan to provide for the RMA matters of national importance found at s6(3) the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu and other taonga an s6(f) the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.
Point Number	28.8
Plan Chapter	Medium Residential Zone 2
Support/Oppose/ Amend	Support
Summary of Decision Requested	Retain MRZ2-P6 Qualifying Matters.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitters considers that the suite of policies should include references to the retention of the important values contained in qualifying matters at the time of new builds. • It is importance to signal this to developers at the earliest possible stage to enable them to incorporate these aspects into their design process. • The proposed addition to the suite would enable the Plan to provide for the RMA matters of national importance at s6(e): the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga: and s6(f): the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.
Point Number	28.9
Plan Chapter	Medium Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support in part
Summary of Decision Requested	Retain the matters of discretion in MRZ2-S2(2) Height – building general except for the amendments sought below AND Add the following matter of discretion to MRZ2-S2(2) Height - building general as follows:

	<i>e) whether the infringement detracts from the recognised values of any qualifying matters located adjacent sites.</i>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter supports the proposed matters of discretion give regard to the potential effects that new over height buildings will have on adjacent sites. • The submitter considers that the matters of consideration should specifically advise of the need to consider the impacts on qualifying matters, including historic heritage, archaeological sites, and sites of significance to Māori, as they are matters of national importance. • The more intensive over height development results in overlooking of a culturally important site or creates dominant effect on a built heritage site or arachnological site. • The plan needs a policy rule and assessment criteria framework to acknowledge this matter, and enable appropriate mitigation as required. • This framework to acknowledge this matter and enable appropriate mitigation as required. • This framework would also enable the Plan to better provide for cultural and historic heritage landscape which is often spread across several sites.
Point Number	28.10
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Retain the matters of discretion in MRZ2-S3(2) Height in relation to boundary, except for the amendments sought below</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Add the following matter of discretion to MRZ2-S3(2) height in relation to boundary as follows: <i><u>(e) Whether the infringement detracts from the recognised values of any qualifying matters located on adjacent sites.</u></i></p>
Point Number	28.11
Plan Chapter	Support in part
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Medium Residential Zone 2
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Retain the matters of discretion in MRS2-S4(2) Setbacks, except for the amendments sought below</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Add a matter of discretion to MRZ2-S4(2) Setbacks as follows:</p>

	<i>e) Whether the infringement detracts from the recognised values of any qualifying matters located on adjacent sites.</i>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter supports that the proposed matters of discretion give regard to the potential effects that excessive building coverage on surrounding residential character. • The submitter considers that the matters of consideration should specifically advise of the need to consider the impacts on qualifying matters, including historic heritage archaeological sites and sites of significance to Māori as they are matters of national importance. • The proposals that exceed building coverage controls may result in a more dominant development resulting in overlooking of a culturally important sites or creates a dominant effect on a built heritage site or archaeological site. • The plan needs a policy, rule, and assessment criteria framework to acknowledge this matter, and enable appropriate mitigation as required. • This framework would also enable the Plan to better provide for cultural and historic heritage landscape which is often spread across several sites.
Point Number	28.12
Plan Chapter	Medium Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support in part
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Retain the matters of discretion in MRZ2-S5(2) Building coverage, except for the amendments sought below AND Add the following matter of discretion to MRZ2-S5 Building coverage as follows: <i>d) Whether the infringement detracts from recognised values of any qualifying matters located on adjacent sites.</i></p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter supports that the proposed matters of discretion give regard to the potential effects that lack of setback will have on adjacent sites. • The submitter considers that the matters of consideration should specifically advise of the need to consider the impacts on qualifying matters, including historic heritage archaeological sites and sites of cognisance to Māori as they are matters of national importance. • The more intensive development that is not suitable setback from the boundary may result in overlooking of a culturally important site or creates a dominant effect on built heritage site or archaeological site.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan needs a policy, rule, and assessment criteria framework to acknowledge this matter, and enable appropriate mitigation as required. • This framework would also enable the Plan to better provide for cultural and historic heritage landscape which is often spread across several sites.
Point Number	28.13
Plan Chapter	Qualifying Matters
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support
Summary of Decision Requested	Retain the qualifying matter found in Assessment report: PDP identifier-318-Corner of Eyre Street and Broadway-the-point
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter supports the recognition of the existing qualifying matters within Ngaaruawaahia being residential zone sites that have sites or area of significance to Māori recognises in the Planning Maps/ PDP-Identifier-318- Corner Eyre Street and Broadway-the-Point. • This will assist to give effect to enable the Plan to provide for the RMA matters of national importance found at s6(3) the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites and waahi tapu and other taonga.
Point Number	28.14
Plan Chapter	Qualifying matters
Support/ Oppose /Amend	Support
Summary of Decision Requested	Retain the historic heritage items already scheduled in the Plan that are in the 4 growth towns, and the Huntly Railway Cottages in Harris Street as part of Variation 3
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter supports the qualifying matters of the historic heritage items already scheduled in the Plan and in some instances listed with HNZPT that are in the 4 growth towns of Ngaaruawaahia, Tuakau, Pookeno and Huntly and the heritage area that includes Huntly Railway Cottages in Harris Street as this will assist the Plan to provide for the RMA s6(f) the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.
Point Number	28.15
Plan Chapter	Qualifying Matters
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support

Summary of Decision Requested	Retain the qualifying matter Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa Waikato - The vision and strategy for the Waikato River
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter supports the qualifying matters and the related setback controls for Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa Waikato - The vision and strategy for the Waikato River. This will assist to give effect to enable the Plan to provide for the RMA matters and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu and other taonga.

Submitter Number	29	Submitter Names	Waka Kotahi
Point Number	29.1		
Plan Chapter	Maps		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Support		
Summary of Decision Requested	Support the walkable catchment for the medium Density Residential 2 Zone.		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter supports the application of an 800m walkable catchment for the Medium Density Residential 2 Zone to Pookeno, Tuakau, Huntly and Ngaaruawaahia (the four towns). The extent of this Zone as defined by the walkable catchment is consistent with the national guidance provided by the Ministry for the Environment. The extent of the walkable catchment to support a medium density typology was well canvassed as part of the Proposed Waikato District Plan hearings. 		
Point Number	29.2		
Plan Chapter	Strategic Direction		
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support		
Summary of Decision Requested	No change sought.		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The application of the MDRS Objective and Policy is supported (SD-O14 and SD-P2). 		
Point Number	29.2		
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2		
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support in part		
Summary of Decision Requested	No change sought.		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The application of the MDRS objectives and policies is supported (MRZ2-O1, MRZ2-03, MRZ2). 		

Point Number	29.3
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2 and associated maps
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Evaluate the additional option of providing for increased density in the four towns and make any consequential changes.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter considers that the application of the Urban Fringe QM may be over-extending the qualifying matter exceptions contained in the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 and Policy 3(d) of the NPS UD. • The legislation would appear to provide for this approach to be considered. It is noted it is unlikely that the legislation intended to apply a QM in totality across generic residential areas. Irrespective, of the merits of this argument, we consider that at the very least, the Council needs to address the requirements of Section 77L (c) (iii). • This clause requires the Council (as part of assessing any other matter as a qualifying matter under section 77I (j)) to evaluate an appropriate range of options to achieve the greatest heights and densities permitted by the MDRS or as provided for by policy 3. • The submitters consider that the Council needs to evaluate an additional option of whether greater density (through the application of greater heights) is required within the walkable catchment areas of these four towns to balance out the potential loss in additional capacity that arises from the application of the Urban Fringe QM. • An assessment of this additional option is required to assess the merits (or otherwise) of applying such an extensive QM across these four towns.
Point Number	29.4
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Defer any decision on MRZ2-S14 until the Environment Court mediated process assigned for Topic 5 Infrastructure OR Delete MRZ2-S14 and replace with Waka Kotahi preferred noise provisions.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter supports the outcome that the building setbacks (Section 10.1, Version 2 Section 32) QM “Safe or efficient operation of national significant infrastructure” is trying to achieve in relation to the State Highway network.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under the proposed PWDP approach (and now Rule MRZ2-S14), only the most significant adverse effects arising from road traffic noise would be addressed. • The setback distance does not address the full extent of road traffic noise that can be experienced by sensitive land uses up to 100 metres (and sometimes more) from the state highway carriageway. • This approach advocated by the submitter was not supported by the Independent Hearing Panel and is currently tracking towards Environment Court mediation in the first quarter of 2023. • Waka Kotahi strong preference is for the management of state highway traffic noise on sensitive receivers to be settled through the Court mediated process if timing allows for this. • In the alternative the preference is for Rule MRZ2-S14 to be replaced with Waka Kotahi Preferred (Noise) Provisions. 		
Point Number	29.5		
Plan Chapter	Transportation		
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend		
Summary of Decision Requested	Amend the assessment criteria under TRPT-R4(2) to include a specific requirement for traffic assessments to demonstrate how the proposal mitigates operational greenhouse gas effects.		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter supports the traffic generation standards applying to the Medium Density Residential 2 Zone. • The submitters consider that the matters of discretion need to place more direct emphasis on traffic assessments demonstrating how operational greenhouse gas effects will be mitigated. • This approach is consistent with the strategic direction of Variation 3 (plus the soon to be reintroduced RMA requirements around climate change) which places an emphasis on achieving a zoning approach for the four towns which supports reductions in greenhouse gas emissions by limiting the dependence on private vehicles (Section 32 report Volume 2, Section 11.5). 		
Submitter Number	30	Submitter Names	Ara Poutama Aotearoa
Point Number	30.1		
Plan Chapter	Generic topic		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Not stated		
Summary of Decision Requested	Provide for community corrections facilities in appropriate locations, should they be required in the future. Ara Poutama currently operates one non-custodial community corrections site in the Waikato district,		

	comprising 'Huntly Community Corrections' is located at 2 Glasgow Street, Huntly within the Commercial Zone.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-custodial community corrections sites include service centres and community work facilities and are essential social infrastructure. Non-custodial services and their associated infrastructure play a valuable role in reducing reoffending. • Ara Poutama considers that its services enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural well-being and for their health and safety, and therefore those activities and services contribute to the sustainable management purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA). • In addition to these service centres, Ara Poutama operates community work facilities. Community work is a sentence where offenders are required to undertake unpaid work for non-profit organisations and community projects. • Community corrections sites support offenders living in that community. Ara Poutama therefore looks to locate its sites in areas accessible to offenders, and near other supporting government agencies.
Point Number	30.2
Plan Chapter	Generic Topic
Support/Oppose/Amend	Not stated
Summary of Decision Requested	Enable residential accommodation activities (with support) to establish and operate within appropriate areas, which is likely to include areas of housing intensification.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ara Poutama operates residential housing in the community throughout New Zealand, providing support for some people in its care to assist with their transition and/or integration in the community. • Residential accommodation (with support) provides necessary facilities, such as sleeping, cooking, bathing and toilet facilities, which encompass a typical household living scenario; and a typical residential dwelling, within a residential setting, is utilised for such purposes. • People living in this residential environment are not detained on-site, the same as anyone else living in the community, except that some people may be electronically monitored and/or supervised. • Ara Poutama is therefore responsible for a range of residential accommodation (with support), which vary in nature and scale, of all which fall within the ambit of a residential activity. • Demand for these services exist nationally, including in the Waikato district.

Point Number	30.3
Plan Chapter	Definitions
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested:	<p>Add a definition for “Household” as follows:</p> <p><i>Means a person or group of people who live together as a unit whether or not:</i></p> <p><i>(a) any or all of them are members of the same family; or</i></p> <p><i>(b) one or more members of the group (whether or not they are paid) provides day-to-day care, support and supervision to any other member(s) of the group.</i></p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The National Planning Standards includes definitions for “residential activity” and “residential unit” that must be used when a local authority includes definitions for such in its plan. The PDP includes both of these definitions, which is supported. • However, the definition of “residential unit” refers to a “household” which is not defined in the PDP, nor in Variation 3. Ara Poutama seeks that a new definition be added, to clarify that a household is not necessarily limited to a family unit or a flatting arrangement (which are more commonly perceived household situations).
Point Number	30.4
Plan Chapter	Definitions
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested:	<p>Amend the definition of Supported residential accommodation as follows:</p> <p><i>Means, in the Corrections Zone, the use of a residential unit(s) by a person or persons who reside within such unit(s) on a short- or long-term basis and receives supervision, assistance, care and/or support from, or on behalf of, Ara Poutama Aotearoa – The Department of Corrections. It includes the provision of non-custodial rehabilitation activities.</i></p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The PDP includes a definition of “supported residential accommodation,” which applies specifically to residential accommodation (with support) activities provided by Ara Poutama, as follows: Supported residential accommodation Means the use of a residential unit(s) by a person or persons who reside within such unit(s) on a short- or long-term basis and receives supervision, assistance, care and/or support from, or on behalf of, Ara Poutama Aotearoa – The Department of Corrections. • It includes the provision of non-custodial rehabilitation activities. The intent of including this definition in the PDP was to capture noncustodial residential activities undertaken within the

	<p>Spring Hill Corrections Facility site (i.e., the Corrections Zone), including the associated rehabilitation activities associated with such</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is apparent in that the only zone within the PDP within which there is a reference to “supported residential accommodation” is in the Corrections Zone chapter; as a permitted activity under Rule CORZ-R4. • The submitter seeks a clarification to the “supported residential accommodation” definition to ensure that there is no potential for misinterpretation with other residential activities undertaken by Ara Poutama in other zones outside of the Corrections Zone within the PDP, within the zones where residential activities are provided for as a permitted activity (i.e., under both the operative PDP rules and the rules proposed under Variation 3).
--	--

Submitter Number	31	Submitter Names	Tara Kingi-Christiston
Point Number	31.1		
Plan Chapter	Maps		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Amend MDRZ zoning to include 12 Lower Waikato Esplanade, Ngaaruawaahia		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amending the proposal will allow the submitter and their children to have their own home one day. • They will be able to build more homes on their property. 		

Submitter Number	32	Submitter Names	S Upton and B Miller
Point Number	32.1		
Plan Chapter	Maps		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Support (conditional on appeal outcome)		
Summary of Decision Requested:	<p>No specific decision requested, but submission supports the application of MRZ2 zone to the extent proposed in Ngaaruawaahia as shown on the planning maps of the decision version of the PWDP. AND Review the extent of greenfields residential zoning at the existing urban / rural boundary of Ngaaruawaahia (as per the Decisions Version of the Proposed Waikato District Plan)</p>		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a need to review the provision of Greenfields zoning in Ngaaruawahia given that the MZRZ2 zoning changes proposed under Variation 3. 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is causal nexus between the perceived need for the extend of greenfield zoning accepted in the Decisions version of the PWDP and the plan enabled densities that Variation 3 will generate, especially in light of the rationale that underpinned the greenfields zoning in the as-notified PWDP and subsequent approvals by the commissioners in the PWDP Decisions version. • The extent of Greenfields can be addressed by further Variation to reflect a strong linkage between additional housing to be provided through Variation 3. • Council has recently announced the provision of up to 200 affordable houses on a greenfields development site within Ngaaruawaahia. The provision of this housing, in combination with the plan enabled capacity that will be generated by the application of the MRZ2 zone in Ngaaruawaahia in the manner proposed by Variation 3, provides further justification to review the extent of greenfields residential zoning in the town.
--	---

Submitter Number	33	Submitter Names	Lisa and Michael Garth
Point Number	33.1		
Plan Chapter	Maps		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Retain General Residential Zone in Pookeno		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pookeno has already been extensively subdivided under current rules, it is a pleasant and attractive place to live. • Allowing three houses to each property will change the type of residents that would be attracted to living at Pookeno. • Variation 3 will cause a change to the way development would occur in Pookeno. • The outer boundary of the neighbouring property is included in the rezone and is more than 800m from the town centre as stated in the proposal. • Pookeno does not have the infrastructure capacity to sustain high density living and with the current zone there is no space for the town to grow. • The primary school has developed to its maximum capacity for the land they have available. 		

Submitter Number	34	Submitter Names	Nathan Harvey
Point Number	34.1		
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Support		

Summary of Decision Requested:	Retain new MRZ2 zone for its intended purposes.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enables more residential housing supply within walking distance of town and local centres. • Comply with legislation.
Point Number	35.2
Plan Chapter	General Residential Zone
Support	Support
Summary of Decision Requested	Retain GRZ zone for its intended purposes.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No reasons provided.
Point Number	35.3
Plan Chapter	Maps
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested:	Amend the zoning of the sites at 40 and 45 Harrisville Road, Barnaby Road, Percy Graham Road and Gordon Paul Place, Tuakau from MRZ2 to GRZ.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DC online maps PDP Appeals Version show previous MRZ up to 38 & 41 Harrisville Rd, then GRZ north of this including Barnaby Rd, Percy Graham Dr, and Gordon Paul Pl. Page 29 of section-32-evaluation-volume-1-final-19-september-2022.pdf says of previous MRZ "The zone was applied to sites within a walkable catchment of the Town centre zone in each of the towns and varied between 400m and 800m depending on the physical characteristics such as slope, natural hazards, connectivity and location of cadastral boundaries." • The current proposal makes no mention of slope or hills, Harrisville Rd has a long upward hill between Dominion & Barnaby Roads which my elderly neighbours have stated they do not walk up. • WDC online maps show that north of Ryders & Dominion Roads there is no town centre (TCZ, LCZ), or open space zone (OSZ). • There is not any public transport, community facility or neighbourhood centres, or publicly accessible open space north of Ryders & Dominion Roads. The only potential exception is Harrisville School which is over 800m from all but 2 of the properties proposed to be zoned MRZ2. North of the railway line is valuation 03920/383.03 - 0.5 hectare of OSZ that looks inaccessible. • Much of proposed MRZ2 north of the top of the hill up Harrisville Rd is outside of 800m from the closest town centre (TCZ, LCZ) or open space zone (OSZ).

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From the area sought to be zoned GRZ it is not walkable to a town centre (TCZ, LCZ), public transport, community facility or neighbourhood centre, or publicly accessible open space. • This proposed amendment will not impact the proposed Retirement village rules. • The previous MRZ northern boundary of 38 & 41 Harrisville Rd appears to be well founded.
--	---

Submitter Number	35	Submitter Names	Tuurangawaewae Marae
Point Number	35.1		
Plan Chapter	Generic topic		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Amend Section 6E and 6F (historic heritage qualifying matters) to include the surrounding areas of Tuurangawaewae Marae.		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The area includes significant cultural and historic areas. 		
Point Number	35.2		
Plan Chapter	Maps		
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Oppose		
Summary of Decision Requested	Delete the surrounding area of Tuurangawaewae Marae from MDRS zoning maps including River Road, Regent Street, Kent Street, George Street, Edwards Street, and King and Queen Street.		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The surrounding area of Tuurangawaewae Marae should not be included in MRZ2 zone. • It will affect the natural character, historic landscape, heritage, and well-being of the area. • The traffic congestion around the marae will increase and affect whanau and majority of cultural events. • This includes annual events such as Regatta, Koroneihana or Coronation for the Maaori King and many tangihanga hosted by the marae. Parking for these events is already limited, it is also anticipated that noise levels may increase and affect cultural practices. • Three-storey housing and 11m high buildings will diminish the cultural significance of the Marae. • The buildings would also pose as distraction and blight on the aesthetic landscape of the area. • The area chosen for the Marae were based on its location to the Waikato River, confluence with the Waipaa River and cultural view shafts to Taupiri Maunga and Hakarimata Range. • These important attributes should be diminished by property developers who will not appropriately consider our views. 		

Submitter Number	36	Submitter Names	Anita Jacobsen
Point Number	36.1		
Plan Chapter	All of Variation		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Delete Variation 3.		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The housing supply will enable three-storey housing which will eradicate the beautiful country views locals enjoy and will also encroach upon the privacy of existing residential properties. 		

Submitter Number	37	Submitter Names	Peter Nicholas and Ann Nicholas
Point Number	37.1		
Plan Chapter	All of Variation		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Reject Variation 3 in its entirety (as is stated in submission #41).		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter does not support Variation 3 and does not consider it should proceed. Submitter supports the submission by the Pookeno Community Committee (#41). Submitter is concerned about construction effects associated with redevelopment of the area directly behind them. Submitter is unhappy about the timing of this Variation in relation to local elections and the inability to question candidates on their position. Refer also to reasons in submission #41. 		

Submitter Number	38	Submitter Names	Chris Annadale
Point Number	38.1		
Plan Chapter	All of Variation		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Assurance that if the proposal goes ahead, it will not impact on existing residents. The submission expresses the following concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shade, privacy and noise. Parking. The quality of life and wellbeing of residents. 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential for slum style living. • Safety.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter is concerned that the proposal will have on the existing residents. • Three-storey housing and 11m high buildings will change shade, privacy, parking, and noise. This will adversely affect the quality of life and wellbeing of residents impacted by this proposal. • The submitter understands more housing is needed but not at the expense of current residents who have worked hard to have a safe environment to live. • The council should have community meetings to address this earlier and help with the submission process as it is not designed for the average person.
Point Number	38.2
Plan Chapter	Consultation
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose
Summary of Decision Requested	Council should have had community meetings to address this earlier and help with the submission process as it is not designed for the average person to feel comfortable navigating the process.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No reasons provided.

Submitter Number	39	Submitter Names	Hayley and Jarrod Taylor
Point Number	39.1		
Plan Chapter	All of Variation		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Delete Variation 3 from the Proposed District Plan		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The council should not relax the planning rules to allow for 3 x 3 housing as this is not what the Waikato District wants. • The towns will be affected by this will suffer greatly. • Variation 3 will result in more people crammed into a shoe box type house will cause knock on effects on other resources, water supply, stormwater supply, electricity supply, parking, schools – the list is endless. • Only developers will benefit from Variation 3. Developers will lease properties at unreasonable prices which may result difficult tenancies. 		

Submitter Number	40	Submitter Names	Gurjeet Singh Sainy
-------------------------	----	------------------------	---------------------

Point Number	40.1
Plan Chapter	All of Variation
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose
Summary of Decision Requested:	Delete Variation 3
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter does not want Pookeno overpopulated like other suburbs in Auckland. • People move out towards to Pookeno to enjoy country life. • The submitter does not want three storey housing in Pookeno.

Submitter Number	41	Submitter Names	Pookeno Community Committee
Point Number	41.1		
Plan Chapter	All of Variation		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Delete Variation 3 from the proposed district plan.		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter has concerns that the growth of medium density housing changes will have significant impacts on resources such as electricity, telephone, roading, and internet. • The submitter is concerned about amount of green space. Medium density will have no open space within their boundary. • The submitters' view is that this approach to housing demand is blunt when a much-nuanced approach is required for housing. • This approach only benefits a small number of people. • The submitter has concerns that no consultation is required, consultation should be required. • Having a change of rules imposed with little or no consultation with those affected is unjust and undemocratic. 		

Point Number	41.2
Plan Chapter	Qualifying Matters
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Add Pookeno Special Character as a Qualifying matter in MRZ2-P6.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Homeowners brought into Pookeno for its character, a village in a rural setting. • The submitter is determined to retain Pookeno's character. • The submitter is genuinely concerned that if the proposed Variation were to proceed, the character of Pookeno will be forever irreversibly changed.

Point Number	41.3
Plan Chapter	All of Variation
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Oppose
Summary of Decision Requested	Add more strict measures to protect current homeowners who may be adjacent to future medium density housing.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Having multi-story dwellings constructed close to boundaries of existing houses will cause significant loss of light and outlook. • The submitter is concerned about the impact it will have on property owners adjoining medium density housing.
Point Number	41.4
Plan Chapter	All of Variation
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose
Summary of Decision Requested	At the least, apply these changes to newly created sections that have not yet been sold to homeowners
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Medium density housing will not have the same impact on the special character of Pookeno if it is applied to new areas of residential development.

Submitter Number	42	Submitter Names	Waikato Regional Council
Point Number	42.1		
Plan Chapter	All of Variation		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Support		
Summary of Decision Requested	No specific decision requested, but submission is supportive of the Variation and acknowledges the scope of the change is directed by central government requirements.		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No reasons provided. 		
Point Number	42.2		
Plan Chapter	All of Variation		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend		
Summary of Decision Requested	Amend provisions to make consequential amendments that have not been included in Variation 3 in order to support the creation of well-functioning urban environments. The submission draws particular attention		

	to provisions relating to transport and considers they have not been updated to reflect the likely outcomes of implementing the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD) and the Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS).
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The operative WRPS contains direction for the built environment, particularly within Topic UFD – Urban Form and Development. A general development principle is to promote compact urban form, design, and location to support climate change and transport outcomes.
Point Number	42.3
Plan Chapter	Generic Topic
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	No specific decision requested, but submission considers there is scope to strengthen policy wording around emissions in the Variation, especially in relation to transport provisions.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Every opportunity to avoid short car trips and encourage walking or cycling to activities and services within a local area should be prioritised. This will reduce transport emissions and assist in meeting national and regional transport emission targets. Objective UFD-O1 and Policy UFD-P1 of the WRPS refer specifically to transport and require regard to be had to the General Development Principles in APP11.
Point Number	42.4
Plan Chapter	Generic Topic
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Amend to strengthen objectives and policies to address the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Enabling and prioritising walking, cycling, micro-mobility, and public transport over private vehicles (with pedestrian-oriented town centres). Integration with land use to reduce the need to travel and vehicle kilometres travelled. Prioritisation of climate change adaptation and reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. Multi-modal connections. End-of-journey facilities. Cycle and micro-mobility parking and electric charging facilities. Growing public transport patronage and supporting the transition to a rapid and frequent public transport network (also consistent with the Regional Public Transport Plan (RPTP)).

	<p>(h) Providing for travel choices.</p> <p>(i) Reconfiguring transport corridor space and requiring public transport provision for new transport corridors (including in this instance needing to consult with WRC).</p> <p>(j) Enhancing public and personal safety throughout the towns through the use of Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles. These principles, when implemented provide actual and perceived safety outcomes, and therefore encourage walking and cycling.</p> <p>(k) Ensuring Land Transport Management Act and Government Policy Statement on Land Transport concepts are embedded – efficient, safe, accessible, sustainable and affordable.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> WDC should take this opportunity with this Variation to be consistent with regional transport priorities.
Point Number	42.5
Plan Chapter	Qualifying Matters
Support/Oppose/Amend	Not stated
Summary of Decision Requested	Clarify whether the need for additional provisions to restore and protect the health and wellbeing of the Waikato River has been investigated given the additional intensification enabled by the Variation.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Acknowledges that WDC has recognised Te Ture Whaimana as a qualifying matter within Variation 3 and has carried over existing provisions to protect the health and wellbeing of the river to the new Medium Density Residential Zone 2 as a result. It is critical Te Ture Whaimana is expressly recognised as a qualifying matter. Increased urban densities will exceed the capacity of existing wastewater and stormwater systems which discharge into the sensitive environment of the awa. These systems are already at capacity and cannot function in a manner which gives effect to Te Ture Whaimana without substantial ongoing investment. It's not clear if WDC has investigated whether additional provisions not already present in other zone chapters are needed to protect and improve the health and wellbeing of the awa with the additional intensification proposed by this Variation. For example, provisions relating to infrastructure capacity constraints affecting residential intensification on existing lots (i.e., intensification that does not trigger subdivision rule SUB-R153) or whether financial contributions could be used to address increased infrastructure costs associated with intensification or betterment activities to give effect to Te Ture Whaimana.

Point Number	42.6
Plan Chapter	Qualifying Matters
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Amend objectives, policies, and rules to better give effect to Te Ture Whaimana, if required.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acknowledges that WDC has recognised Te Ture Whaimana as a qualifying matter within Variation 3 and has carried over existing provisions to protect the health and wellbeing of the river to the new Medium Density Residential Zone 2 as a result. • It is critical Te Ture Whaimana is expressly recognised as a qualifying matter. Increased urban densities will exceed the capacity of existing wastewater and stormwater systems which discharge into the sensitive environment of the awa. These systems are already at capacity and cannot function in a manner which gives effect to Te Ture Whaimana without substantial ongoing investment. • It's not clear if WDC has investigated whether additional provisions not already present in other zone chapters are needed to protect and improve the health and wellbeing of the awa with the additional intensification proposed by this Variation. For example, provisions relating to infrastructure capacity constraints affecting residential intensification on existing lots (i.e., intensification that does not trigger subdivision rule SUB-R153) or whether financial contributions could be used to address increased infrastructure costs associated with intensification or betterment activities to give effect to Te Ture Whaimana.
Point Number	42.7
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Add a new section that identifies and discusses the qualifying matters that have resulted in the modification of the MDRS. This could be added under the 'Purpose' section or the objectives and policies of the MRZ2 chapter.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Variation adds a definition for the term "qualifying matters" and new objective and policy MRZ2-O5 and MRZ2-P6 recognise that medium density residential development may be restricted to recognise and/or protect one or more qualifying matters. • The qualifying matters applied in the Variation have been discussed in the explanatory note to the MRZ2 chapter and in the section 32 report, however these are not listed anywhere within the proposed plan text.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Acknowledges that Policy MRZ2-P6 has been added to ensure that any qualifying matters are considered when assessing resource consent applications, including those given effect to within district-wide chapters. However, to provide clarity to users and make the plan more efficient to navigate, we consider a discussion of the relevant qualifying matters and how these have been used to modify the MDRS should be included within the plan.
Point Number	42.8
Plan Chapter	Maps
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support in part
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Consider enabling an intermediary density within the areas of the four towns outside of the 800m walkable catchment, for example by providing for two residential units per site as a Permitted Activity.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend the objectives, policies, and rules within the areas of the four towns outside of the 800m walkable catchments subsequently.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter supports the benefits of providing for the highest density of residential development near local and town centres. The large areas of land within each of the four towns proposed to remain zoned General Residential could result in an inefficient use of urban land. If most of these areas are developed to the proposed permitted density of one residential unit plus one minor residential unit on a minimum lot size of 450m², this could lock in a land use pattern that makes future densification of these areas difficult. The promotion of an increasingly compact urban form is a key principle of the WRPS. Development Principle APP11c. promotes that new development should make use of opportunities for urban intensification and redevelopment to minimise the need for urban development in greenfield areas. A more compact form that avoids the need to use private cars for most daily needs can help to resolve both housing affordability and transport issues, especially those relating to emissions and climate change. To better reflect the Future Proof Strategy and meet density targets, we recommend WDC considers Option 3 presented in Section 11.13 of the Section 32 Report (Volume 2) - to modify the MDRS outside the 800m walkable catchment around the Town Centre Zone to result in an intermediary density somewhere between what the Medium Density Residential Zone will enable

	and General Residential Zone. This could be achieved by providing for two residential units per site as a Permitted Activity within these areas.
Point Number	42.9
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support
Summary of Decision Requested	Retain MRZ2-O3 Residential amenity AND Retain MZR2 P8 Changes to amenity values
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter supports this objective and policy which recognise that amenity values may change over time and seek a level of amenity commensurate with a medium density environment comprised primarily of three-storey buildings. • This is consistent with NPS-UD Policy 6(b) which recognises that planning documents prepared to give effect to the NPS-UD may result in changes to amenity values, and these changes are not an adverse effect.
Point Number	42.10
Plan Chapter	Generic Topic
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support in part
Summary of Decision Requested	Add new OR Amend objectives, policies, rules, and standards to address climate change and carbon emissions reduction goals in the context of housing intensification, including consequential amendments to Part 2: District-wide matters.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Added intensification across each of the four towns is likely to have an impact on the transport network. • There are no amendments to the district-wide chapters to align integrated transport and emissions reduction policies with housing intensification and the objectives of Variation 3, despite the Resource Management Amendment Act (Enabling Housing Supply) allowing for the inclusion of objectives and policies in addition to those specified to support the MDRS. • Considers that to support the creation of well-functioning urban environments, consequential amendments need to be made to Part 2: District-wide matters.

Point Number	42.11
Plan Chapter	Transport
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support in part
Summary of Decision Requested	Add new policies that seek to avoid, minimise, or reduce the adverse effects of the transport network on adjoining land uses and the wider environment, such as those caused by transport emissions.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no policies that seek to avoid, minimise, or reduce the adverse effects of the transport network on adjoining land uses and the wider environment, such as those caused by transport emissions
Point Number	42.12
Plan Chapter	Transport
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support in part
Summary of Decision	Add a new policy that gives higher priority to making best use of existing transport corridors before widening corridors
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Making the best use of existing corridors rather than continued expansion of the road network can encourage more walking and cycling.
Point Number	42.13
Plan Chapter	Transport
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support in part
Summary of Decision	Amend objectives and policies to protect and promote the development of the regional rail network for the transportation of passengers, as well as freight.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A regional commitment to inter-regional passenger rail is embedded in the operative Regional Land Transport Plan and the RPTP. • Passenger rail is an important enabler for future growth and an important contributor to meet our emissions reductions and mode shift targets and is a critical component of the overall transformative change that is necessary to address climate change.
Point Number	42.14
Plan Chapter	Generic Topic
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support in part

Summary of Decision Requested	Amend the objectives and policies to ensure that structures and other features are located and designed to avoid conflicts between road users.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improving safety for all users of the transport network by minimising conflict between different types of road uses encourages walking and cycling.
Point Number	42.15
Plan Chapter	Generic Topic
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support
Summary of Decision Requested	Retain references to CPTED principles
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The support for the inclusion of CPTED principles, such as designing for passive surveillance. These principles when implemented provide actual and perceived safety outcomes and therefore encourage walking and cycling.
Point Number	42.16
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support in part
Summary of Decision Requested	Retain MRZ2-O4 Activities AND Retain MRZ2-P10 Non-residential activities AND Amend OR Add new rules to enable more, or expansion of existing, commercial and mixed uses where intensification will be occurring.
Decision reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Intensification across the Medium Density Residential Zone 2 will result in more people living in those areas of the district. Allowing mixed use areas, and expansion of existing commercial zones helps avoid continued reliance on a car as the main mode of travel. Intensification may solve housing issues but will create transport issues if easy access to day-to-day needs by active or public transport is not provided for. The submitter supports the provisions but suggest that the rules be better aligned with this objective and policy to enable more, or expansion of existing commercial and mixed uses in neighbourhoods where intensification will be occurring.

Point Number	42.17
Plan Chapter	Transport
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support in part
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Amend objectives and policies to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Require adverse effects from the construction of the transport network, including embodied and operational greenhouse gas emissions, to be avoided, remedied, or mitigated; and - Minimise the need to travel and the total distance travelled.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Waikato District accounts for 15% of transport emissions in Waikato Region. There are no objectives or policies that explicitly address this.
Point Number	42.18
Plan Chapter	Transport
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support in part
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Amend objectives and policies to require the resilience of the transport network to natural hazard risk and climate change disruptions to be improved.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Subdivision and development should not occur in locations where the risk of climate change cannot be mitigated, or the resulting land use activity cannot adapt or be resilient to the effects of climate change. This is consistent with the definition of well-functioning urban environment under the NPS-UD.
Point Number	42.19
Plan Chapter	Generic Topic
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support in part
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Amend OR Add objectives, policies, rules and/or matters of discretion which promote the retention of existing vegetation, particularly mature trees, wherever possible during development.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As urban areas intensify it is important that urban tree cover is provided for. Trees mitigate the urban heat island effect resulting from climate change, and provide a range of other benefits for amenity, urban biodiversity, and air quality.
Point Number	42.20

Plan Chapter	Subdivision
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support in part
Summary of Decision Requested	Consider adding a new matter of discretion relating to stormwater management
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The requirement under SUB-R153 (1)(ii) that proposed vacant lots must be able to connect to public-reticulated water supply and wastewater is identified in the Section 32 Report as a provision which gives effect to the qualifying matter of Te Ture Whaimana. • The submitter queries whether further amendments to SUB-R153, including matters of discretion, are needed to give effect to Te Ture Whaimana in relation to managing stormwater effects associated with intensification.
Point Number	42.21
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support
Summary of Decision Requested	Retain MRZ2-S10(1) Impervious surfaces
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter supports the retention of the maximum impervious surface standard to reduce adverse effects of additional stormwater run-off associated with intensification.
Point Number	42.22
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Add a new matter of discretion to MRZ2-S10(2) Impervious surfaces relating to effects on waterways and/or the use of low-impact design technologies
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggest adding a new matter of discretion to ensure that effects on the health and wellbeing of waterways are appropriately mitigated if the maximum impervious surface area is exceeded, such as through use of low-impact design technologies for stormwater management.
Point Number	42.23
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Amend MRZ2-S13(1)(a)(iv) Building setbacks – waterbodies to 26.5m from the margin of the Waikato River and the Waipa River.

Decision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Section 32 Report (Volume 1) states that the amended building setbacks from waterbodies “are based on the approach of 25m + the normal setback for a building for the Waikato and Waipa Rivers, and 20m + the normal zone setback for other rivers.” Using this approach, the minimum building setback from the margins of the Waikato and Waipa Rivers should be 26.5m, however this rule specifies a setback of 25.5m.
-----------------	--

Submitter Number	43	Submitter Names	Tineka Wymer
Point Number	43.1		
Plan Chapter	All of Variation		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Support		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Retain Variation 3.		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter supports the proposal because they can build an additional small building. 		

Submitter Number	44	Submitter Names	Anna Noakes and MSBCA Fruhling Trustee's Company Ltd
Point Number	44.1		
Plan Chapter	Maps		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Support		
Summary of Decision Requested:	<p>No specific decision requested, but submission supports the proposal to not allow further intensification by retaining the General Residential Zone in Pookeno to address qualifying matters.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments to other parts of the PDP to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>		
Decision Reason	<p>To the extent that the changes enable more intense development beyond that required to give effect to central government direction or would generate adverse stormwater effects, then the Plan Changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Are contrary to the sustainable management of natural and physical resources, do not amount to or promote the efficient use and development of resources, and are otherwise contrary to the purpose and principles in Part 2 of the Resource Management Act 1991 (the Act). (b) Are inconsistent with objectives, policies and other provisions in the PDP and other relevant planning instruments. (c) Do not warrant approval in terms of section 32 of the Act. 		

	<p>(d) Are unnecessary and counterproductive to the sustainable management of the Pookeno area.</p> <p>(e) Will generate significant adverse effects on the environment, in particular in terms of adverse stormwater effects and effects on rural productivity in adjacent rural area.</p>
Point Number	44.2
Plan Chapter	Generic topic
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose in part
Summary of Decision Requested:	<p>No specific decision requested, but submission opposes Variation 3 to the extent that increased housing density enabled by the Variation would generate adverse stormwater effects on downstream catchments.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments to other parts of the PDP to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>
Decision Reason	<p>To the extent that the changes enable more intense development beyond that required to give effect to central government direction or would generate adverse stormwater effects, then the Plan Changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are contrary to the sustainable management of natural and physical resources, do not amount to or promote the efficient use and development of resources, and are otherwise contrary to the purpose and principles in Part 2 of the Resource Management Act 1991 (the Act). • Are inconsistent with objectives, policies and other provisions in the PDP and other relevant planning instruments. • Do not warrant approval in terms of section 32 of the Act. • Are unnecessary and counterproductive to the sustainable management of the Pookeno area. • Will generate significant adverse effects on the environment, in particular in terms of adverse stormwater effects and effects on rural productivity in adjacent rural area.
Point Number	44.3
Plan Chapter	General
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose in part

Summary of Decision Requested:	<p>No specific decision requested, but submission opposes Variation 3 to the extent that the Variation goes beyond the central Government directions to promulgate plan changes to incorporate the MDRS and give effect to the NPS-UD and would enable more intense development.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments to other parts of the PDP to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>
Decision Reason	<p>To the extent that the Changes enable more intense development beyond that required to give effect to central government direction or would generate adverse stormwater effects, then the Plan Changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are contrary to the sustainable management of natural and physical resources, do not amount to or promote the efficient use and development of resources, and are otherwise contrary to the purpose and principles in Part 2 of the Resource Management Act 1991 (the Act). • Are inconsistent with objectives, policies and other provisions in the PDP and other relevant planning instruments. • Do not warrant approval in terms of section 32 of the Act. • Are unnecessary and counterproductive to the sustainable management of the Pookeno area. • Will generate significant adverse effects on the environment, in particular in terms of adverse stormwater effects and effects on rural productivity in adjacent rural area.
Point Number	44.4
Plan Chapter	Generic Topic
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested:	<p>Amend the stormwater management provisions throughout the PDP to ensure that such adverse stormwater effects on properties downstream of proposed development are appropriately, avoided remedied or mitigated, in the event that Variation 3 is approved.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments to other parts of the PDP to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>

Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The area to the west of the Property (157 Potter Road, Tuakau) is being developed for residential purposes and discharges urban stormwater from a large catchment to the Property. • Although existing discharges were consented by the Waikato Regional Council on the basis of attenuation to predevelopment peak flows, the discharges have altered the hydrological conditions on the Submitters' property, including the volume, frequency and duration of discharges, the extent of inundation on her property, and the amount of sediment and water quality and that this has resulted in loss of productive land, downstream erosion and damage to farm infrastructure. • The cumulative effects of more intense urban development and increased impervious surface area in the district, which will be enabled by the Variation, will generate adverse stormwater and runoff effects (both on the Appellants' property and more generally across the district).
Point Number	44.5
Plan Chapter	Generic Topic
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested:	<p>Amend the stormwater provisions of the PDP and Variation 3 to address the adverse stormwater effects of more intense development in terms of altered natural flow paths, and altered hydrological conditions, including the volume, frequency and duration of discharges, and the extent of inundation on downstream properties.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments to other parts of the PDP to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The area to the west of the Property is being developed for residential purposes and discharges urban stormwater from a large catchment to the Property. • Although existing discharges were consented by the Waikato Regional Council on the basis of attenuation to predevelopment peak flows, the discharges have altered the hydrological conditions on the Submitters' property, including the volume, frequency and duration of discharges, the extent of inundation on her property, and the amount of sediment and water quality and that this has resulted in loss of productive land, downstream erosion and damage to farm infrastructure.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The cumulative effects of more intense urban development and increased impervious surface area in the district, which will be enabled by the Variation, will generate adverse stormwater and runoff effects (both on the Appellants' property and more generally across the district).
Point Number	44.6
Plan Chapter	Generic Topic
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested:	<p>Amend the PDP to take a consistent approach to stormwater management across the entire plan, with the stormwater management provisions in all chapters amended accordingly. The submission notes that there are provisions governing stormwater management in urban areas throughout the PDP including in the Definitions, Strategic Direction, Water Wastewater and Stormwater, All Infrastructure, Natural Hazards and Climate Change, Subdivision, Earthworks and all Residential Zone chapters of the PDP.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments to other parts of the PDP to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The area to the west of the Property is being developed for residential purposes and discharges urban stormwater from a large catchment to the Property. Although existing discharges were consented by the Waikato Regional Council on the basis of attenuation to predevelopment peak flows, the discharges have altered the hydrological conditions on the Submitters' property, including the volume, frequency and duration of discharges, the extent of inundation on her property, and the amount of sediment and water quality and that this has resulted in loss of productive land, downstream erosion and damage to farm infrastructure. The cumulative effects of more intense urban development and increased impervious surface area in the district, which will be enabled by the Variation, will generate adverse stormwater and runoff effects (both on the Appellants' property and more generally across the district).
Point Number	44.7
Plan Chapter	Generic Topic
Support/Oppose/Amend	Support

Summary of Decision Requested:	<p>Retain the proposal not to allow further intensification of residential land at Pookeno to address qualifying matters</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments to other parts of the PDP to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The area to the west of the Property is being developed for residential purposes and discharges urban stormwater from a large catchment to the Property. • Although existing discharges were consented by the Waikato Regional Council on the basis of attenuation to predevelopment peak flows, the discharges have altered the hydrological conditions on the Submitters' property, including the volume, frequency and duration of discharges, the extent of inundation on her property, and the amount of sediment and water quality and that this has resulted in loss of productive land, downstream erosion and damage to farm infrastructure. • The cumulative effects of more intense urban development and increased impervious surface area in the district, which will be enabled by the Variation, will generate adverse stormwater and runoff effects (both on the Appellants' property and more generally across the district).

Submitter Number	45	Submitter Names	David Jones
Point Number	45.1		
Plan Chapter	General Residential Zone		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Amend GRZ05 and GRZ06 to have clear requirements and definitions. Specifically "complementary", "sufficient" and "appropriate".		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There needs to be clarity for the requirements and definitions as they are broad terms and could be interpreted differently by different developers. 		
Point Number	45.2		
Plan Chapter	General Residential Zone		
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend		
Summary of Decision Requested	Amend and re-evaluate GRZ-P11.		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a large variety of houses that could be built for simple reasons such as being connected to the public reticulation. 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All three-storey housing is inconsistent with the character of small towns such as Pookeno.
Point Number	45.3
Plan Chapter	Town Centre Zone
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Oppose
Summary of Decision Requested	Delete TCZ-O3.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no physical and financial obligations of developers and there is no clarity on how they are being met. How amenity values being measured and monitored. There has been too much farmland and open grazing land has changed to MRZ2.
Point Number	45.4
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Zone 1
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Oppose
Summary of Decision Requested	Delete MRZ1-S1.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 11m height standard is too high, it should be the same as the GRZ (general residential zone)The structures would be highly disproportionate to other pre-existing structures in the area. This height significantly contradicts the original character of buildings in the area.
Point Number	45.5
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Zone 1
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support
Summary of Decision Requested	Retain MRZ1-S7
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The impervious surfaces of a site which should not exceed 70% and is highly suitable in most cases.
Point Number	45.6
Plan Chapter	Maps
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Reduce the extent of farmland and open grazing land which is proposed to be zoned to MRZ2.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Too much open farmland and grazing land has been identified as MRZ2.

Submitter Number	46	Submitter Names	Synlait Milk Ltd
Point Number	46.1		
Plan Chapter	Maps		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Support		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Retain the Pookeno planning map as notified, in particular the retention of the General Residential Zoning as shown on the Planning Map. Submission opposes any change from General Residential to Medium Residential Zone 1 or Medium Residential Zone 2 on land adjoining or in proximity of the Heavy Industrial Zone.		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No reasons provided. 		
Point Number	46.2		
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2		
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend		
Summary of Decision Requested	Amend MRZ2-O6 Reverse sensitivity as follows: <i>Avoid or minimise the potential for reverse sensitivity by managing the location ...</i>		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is appropriate to have an objective to avoid reverse sensitivity by ensuring that the location of medium density housing has sufficient separation distances from land zoned Heavy Industrial. 		
Point Number	46.3		
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone		
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support		
Summary of Decision Requested	Retain MRZ-P6 Qualifying matters as notified.		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development should be restricted in those areas where qualifying matters apply, acknowledging that reverse sensitivity effects on heavy industry are identified and discussed as a qualifying matter in the s32 Evaluation Volume 2, Section 12.7 Specific characteristics that make MDRS inappropriate. 		
Point Number	46.4		
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone		
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support		
Summary of Decision Requested	Retain MRZ-P11 Reverse Sensitivity as notified.		

	AND Retain existing mitigation such as the Pookeno Industry Buffer to avoid any erosion of the existing development rights and opportunities of the Heavy Industrial Zone.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No reasons provided.

Submitter Number	47	Submitter Names	Pookeno Village Holdings Ltd
Point Number	47.1		
Plan Chapter	All of Variation		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Delete Variation 3 from the Proposed District Plan		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter is fundamentally opposed to the RMA intensification requirements. The submitter considers that the medium density residential standards will result in adverse urban design and urban amenity effects, which are completely out of step with Pookeno and will not accord with the outcomes of the Pookeno Structure Plan. The submitter considers that the intensification requirements are unnecessary, and the proposal has been rushed through legislation change. The submitter also considers there is a significant supply of housing stock coming available, particularly multi-unit developments. 		
Point Number	47.2		
Plan Chapter	Maps		
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend		
Summary of Decision Requested	That the Council review all land zoned General Residential Zone in the Proposed Waikato District Plan decision, reducing General Residential Zone to give effect to the NPS-UD in a manner that reflects the true residential demand capacity.		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The current proposal does not clearly identify precinct overlays and restrictions. The GRZ mapping is consistent with the decision on the PDP, the submitter considers that notifying GRZ without precincts and acknowledging the scope of appeals is disingenuous, leading confusion and uncertainty with respect to the scope of Variation 3. The submitter further considers that this undermines the appeal process and predetermines the appeal outcome. 		

Submitter Number	48	Submitter Names	Megan Martin
Point Number	48.1		
Plan Chapter	All of Variation		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose		
Summary of Decision Requested:	No specific decision requested, but submission opposes Variation 3. Submitter considers that areas for future planning should be set out for townhouses with commune style living and facilities to support this, ie coffee shops, gardens, central areas.		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports built up areas i.e. town houses built together in a set out area. • Considers it is ludicrous to enable town houses to be built without neighbouring consent adjacent to flat roofline level housing. • Devalues the neighbouring property. • Invades privacy. • Forces communities into townhouse style living. • By enabling no consent to have a townhouse put up anywhere, it leaves no room to for council planning and leaves uncertainty to property value. 		

Submitter Number	49	Submitter Names	Horotiu Farms Limited
Point Number	49.1		
Plan Chapter	Maps		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend		
Summary of Decision Requested:	<p>Amend Variation 3 zoning maps to include areas 1-10 Horotiu West as Medium Density Residential Zone (MDRZ) located between Great South Road and State Highway 1 (shown in submissions)</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Associated consequential amendments to the Proposed District Plan .</p>		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Horotiu West forms part of the wider Te Awa Lakes mater plan development at Horotiu, it has been developed by several companies that fall under the umbrella of the Perry Group of companies. • Te Awa Lakes development consists of tourism, commercial, residential community, and will be well served by associated transportation infrastructure. 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter has strong relationships with its neighbours and tangata whenua working collaboratively through the current planning phase. • The development intended by the submitter and its neighbours presents an opportunity for the council to positively respond to continued demand for housing including a large and comprehensively planned greenfield site with MRZ. • The land is well serviced by existing or planned public transport as required by the objective and there is also high demand for housing in the area relative to other areas. The submitter considers that a greenfield development site will provide an opportunity for the council to deliver further residential density quicker and more efficiently. • The rezoning of Horotiu West strongly aligns with the balance of the Te Awa lakes development and offers a strengthened and integrated approach to residential development within the locality.
--	---

Submitter Number	50	Submitter Names	Ministry of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)
Point Number	50.1		
Plan Chapter	Qualifying Matter		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose		
Summary of Decision Requested:	<p>Delete the urban fringe qualifying matter and apply the MDRS as required by the RMA across the relevant residential zones.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend to apply the MDRS to all relevant residential zones.</p>		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The RMA and the NPS-UD enable councils to identify qualifying matters in their districts/cities. The purpose of these provisions is to limit development on sites where there would be significant negative impacts from development, such as destruction of historic heritage or increased harm from natural hazards. Section 77I makes it clear the restrictions can only be for identified purposes and must be designed in the most efficient way possible – addressing the matter without unnecessarily restricting development. • WDC has not met the requirements of RMA sections 77I to 77M to establish the urban fringe qualifying matter. • Submitter considers that Council’s section 32 report provides insufficient justification to establish the urban fringe qualifying matter under 77I(j) and 77L for the following reasons: 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Limited justification is provided for why the relevant areas are incompatible with the level of development enabled by the MDRS. ○ A site-specific analysis for each site where the restrictions would apply has not been carried out. ○ Part of WDC's justification for the restrictions is that it is necessary to give effect to Policy 3(d) of the NPS-UD. This appears to be a misinterpretation of Policy 3(d) and the RMA requirements. Section 77G of the RMA requires relevant councils (including WDC) to amend their district plans to both incorporate the MDRS in every relevant residential zone and give effect to Policy 3. The RMA does not provide for Policy 3 to be used as justification for a qualifying matter. Rather, Policy 3 requires or supports enabling development beyond the MDRS in certain circumstances. ○ The restrictions have not been justified 'in light of the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD' as required by 77L(b).
Point Number	50.2
Plan Chapter	All of Variation
Support/Oppose/Amend	Support
Summary of Decision Requested:	No specific decision requested, but submission considers that Variation 3 correctly identified the residential zones in Huntly, Ngaaruawaahia, Tuakau, and Pokeno as relevant residential zones.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Section 77G(1) of the RMA requires WDC to incorporate the MDRS into every relevant residential zone in the district, and across the entirety of these zones unless a qualifying matter applies.

Submitter Number	51	Submitter Names	Allen Frabric Ltd
Point Number	51.1		
Plan Chapter	All of Variation		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Support		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Amend to limit 3x3 houses to within walking distance from town centres as per the proposed amended by Council.		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The submitter owns residential land outside the area of amendment that could gain them an advantage. ● The submitter believes that housing intensification would be bad planning if it was permitted in all parts of communities without any control. 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The community should decide through democratic process how they live.
--	---

Submitter Number	52	Submitter Names	Brian Hopkins
Point Number	52.1		
Plan Chapter	All of Variation		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Delete Variation 3. Submission expresses concern about the character of Pookeno being changed from a country village to a multi-storey subdivision and the lack of public notification for permitted buildings.		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Purchased in Pookeno on the basis of a country village estate, not a multi-storey subdivision. Considers that proceeding without public notification in permitting buildings is unfair and dictatorial. 		

Submitter Number	53	Submitter Names	Fire and Emergency NZ
Point Number	53.1		
Plan Chapter	Strategic Direction		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Support		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Retain SD-O14		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter supports SD-O14 insofar that it requires the provision for a well-functioning urban environment and enables all people and communities to provide for their health and safety, now and into the future. This would include consideration of, and the requirement to provide a water supply sufficient for firefighting and adequate emergency access and egress in the event of an emergency. 		

Point Number	53.2		
Plan Chapter	Transport		
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support		
Summary of Decision Requested	Retain Table 12 - access and road standards		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter supports the amendments to Table 12 which include the addition of MRZ1 –Medium Density Residential Zone 1 and MRZ2 –Medium Density Residential Zone to the access and road standards. The minimum seal widths are specifically supported as these minimum requirements align with those set out in F5-02 GD Designers’ guide to firefighting operations Emergency vehicle access 		

	<p>which will allow fire and emergency vehicles to get through them easily and to allow for the submitter to carry out emergency operations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitters note that TRPT-R1(1)(a)(ii) (Vehicle access for all activities) requires compliance with Table 12 in all zones and appropriate matters are discretion are in place where compliance is not achieved.
Point Number	53.3
Plan Chapter	Subdivision
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support
Summary of Decision Requested	Retain SUB-P23
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter supports SUB-P23 insofar that subdivision that supports the development of medium density residential development is provided for except where the proposed subdivision does not comply with the relevant subdivision standards. It is important to the submitter that subdivision and subsequent medium density developments is not enabled where there is insufficient infrastructure capacity, particularly in relation to the water supply and transport network.
Point Number	53.4
Plan Chapter	Subdivision
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support
Summary of Decision Requested	Retain SUB-R31
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter supports the performance standard SUB-R31(1)(a)(ii) that requires proposed vacant lots in the MRZ1 to be able to connect to public-reticulated water supply. The submitter supports the matters of discretion set out in SUB-R31 (a) Subdivision layout; (g) Vehicle and pedestrian networks and (i) Provision of infrastructure (which by proposed district plan definition includes a water supply distribution system and roads) These matters of discretion should provide Council the ability to impose suitable conditions of consent relating to the water supply infrastructure and to address effects on the transportation network when issuing subdivision consents. The submitters consider that all subdivision and development in MRZ1 should be subject to infrastructure capacity checks as part of the consenting process.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If this does not become part of the consenting regime, there will be development with inadequate firefighting water supply with potential consequences for life and property. • It is recognised that Watercare, as the water supply operator and Council (under the water supply bylaw) will have a role here in ensuring new connections are not granted where there is insufficient capacity to service a subdivision or development. This approval process should inform the resource consent process or be required to occur prior to applications being made for resource consent.
Point Number	53.5
Plan Chapter	Subdivision
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support
Summary of Decision Requested	Retain SUB-R153
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter supports the performance standard SUB-R153(1)(a)(ii) that requires proposed vacant lots in the MRZ2 to be able to connect to public-reticulated water supply. • The submitter supports the matters of discretion set out in SUB-R153 (a) Subdivision layout; (g) Vehicle and pedestrian networks and (i) Provision of infrastructure (which by proposed district plan definition includes a water supply distribution system and roads). These matters of discretion should provide Council the ability to impose suitable conditions of consent relating to the water supply infrastructure and to address effects on the transportation network when issuing subdivision consents. To manage the cumulative effects on the water supply network. • The submitter considers that all subdivision and development in MRZ2 should be subject to infrastructure capacity checks as part of the consenting process. • If this does not become part of the consenting regime, there will be development with inadequate firefighting water supply with potential consequences for life and property. It is recognised that Watercare, as the water supply operator and Council (under the water supply bylaw) will have a role here in ensuring new connections are not granted where there is insufficient capacity to service a subdivision or development. This approval process should inform the resource consent process or be required to occur prior to applications being made for resource consent.
Point Number	53.6
Plan Chapter	Subdivision
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support in part

Summary of Decision Requested	Add new matters of control to SUB-R154 to include <i>(f) Vehicle and pedestrian networks.</i>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter requests an additional matter of control that considers the impacts on the vehicle and pedestrian network. • This is consistent with SUB-R31 and will provide Council the ability to impose suitable conditions of consent to address any effects on the transportation network when issuing a controlled activity residential subdivision consent.
Point Number	53.7
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support
Summary of Decision Requested	Retain MRZ-P3
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitters support MRZ2-P3 insofar that it requires housing to be designed to meet the day-to-day needs of residents. • This policy would include consideration of, and the requirement to provide an adequate firefighting water supply and adequate emergency access and egress in the event of an emergency.
Point Number	53.8
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support in part
Summary of Decision Requested	Amend matter of discretion in MRZ2-S1: <i>(b) Design, scale and layout of buildings and outdoor living spaces in relation to the planned urban character of the zone, the efficient movement of residents and the provision for the health and safety of residents in meeting their day-to-day needs.</i>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter supports the matters of discretion in MRZ2-S1 that apply to proposals that seek more than three residential units per site in the MDZ2. • The submitters consider that specific consideration should be given to the build form as it relates to the functionality of the site and the efficient movement of residents and emergency services and the provision for the health and safety of residents in meeting their day-to-day needs. • It is recommended that MRZ2-S1(2)(b) be amended to incorporate this consideration.

Point Number	53.9
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support in part
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Add advice note to MR22-S4 as follows: <u><i>Advice note: Building setback requirements are further controlled by the Building Code. Plan users should refer to the applicable controls within the Building Code to ensure compliance can be achieved at the building consent stage. Issuance of a resource consent does not imply that waivers of Building Code requirements will be considered/granted.</i></u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Add new matter of discretion as follows: <u><i>4. The extent to which the non-compliance compromises the efficient movement of residents and emergency services and the provision for the health and safety of residents in meeting their day-to-day needs.</i></u></p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter acknowledges that MR22-S4 incorporates the density standards required by Part 2 of Schedule 3A of the RMA.As set out in section 1.2.4 of this submission. • There are concerns around the increased risk of fire spreading because of reduced boundary setbacks. Reduced setbacks can inhibit Fire and Emergency personnel from getting to the fire source or other emergency. The difficulty of access may also increase the time for fire to burn, thereby increasing the heat radiation in a confined area. • The submitters acknowledge that firefighting access requirements and building setback controls are managed through the New Zealand Building Code (NZBC) however consider it important that these controls are brought to the attention of plan users (i.e., developers) early in the resource consent process so that they can incorporate the NZBC requirements early on in their building design. • It is requested that, as a minimum, an advice note is included with MR22-S4 directing plan users to the requirements of the NZBC. • An additional matter of discretion is sought where minimum setback requirements are not met, to address the potential adverse effects on the efficient movement of people in a fire or other emergency.
Point Number	53.10
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2

Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support in part
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Add advice note within MRZ2-S6 :</p> <p><i><u>Advice note: Access requirements are further controlled by the Building Code. This includes the provision for firefighter access to buildings and egress from buildings. Plan users should refer to the applicable controls within the Building Code to ensure compliance can be achieved at the building consent stage. Issuance of a resource consent does not imply that waivers of Building Code requirements will be considered/granted.</u></i></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Add new matter of discretion (new text shown as bold underlining):</p> <p><i><u>4. The extent to which the non-compliance compromises the provision for the health and safety of residents in meeting their day-to-day needs.</u></i></p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter support MRZ2-S6 insofar that it requires all residential developments in MRZ2to have an outdoor living space free of buildings, parking spaces, and servicing and manoeuvring areas. While not directly associated, this will go some way in providing efficient emergency service personnel access to buildings. • The submitter acknowledge that firefighting access requirements are managed through the NZBC however consider it important that these controls are brought to the attention of plan users (i.e., developers) in the resource consent process so that they can incorporate the NZBC requirements early on in their building design. • The NZBC requirements will have an influence over how a site is designed and consequential site layout therefore it is considered it important that developers incorporate these requirements into their site layout at resource consent stage so that Council can assess this design to ensure compliance with the RMA. • Therefore, it is requested that, as a minimum, an advice note is included with MRZ2-S6 directing plan users to the requirements of the NZBC. • An additional matter of discretion is sought where minimum setback requirements are not met, to address the potential adverse effects on the efficient movement of people in a fire or other emergency.

Submitter Number	54	Submitter Names	Kiwi Rail
Point Number	54.1		
Plan Chapter	Generic Topic		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Support		

Summary of Decision Requested:	Retain rail as a qualifying matter pursuant to s771(e) and s770(e) of the Resource Management Act 1991
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promotes sustainable management of resources, achieve the purpose of the RMA, and are not contrary to Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA; • Meets the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; • Enables the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the community in the Waikato district; • Provides and promotes the greatest health, safety and amenity outcomes and preserve operational and developmental capacity and efficiency for nationally significant infrastructure; and • In terms of section 32 of the RMA, the most appropriate way to give effect to the purpose of the RMA and the Amendment Act and the objectives of the Proposed Plan.
Point Number	54.2
Plan Chapter	Generic Topic
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Amend Variation 3 to ensure development near the rail corridor does not adversely affect the safe or efficient operation of the rail corridor as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a 5m setback apply to all buildings, not just buildings containing sensitive land uses; and • acoustic insulation and ventilation standards be applied to all (new and altered) noise sensitive activities within 100m of the railway corridor; and • a vibration standard be applied to all (new and altered) noise sensitive activities within 60m of the rail corridor. <p>AND</p> <p>Such further or other consequential relief, as may be necessary, to fully give effect to the relief sought.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is critical that Variation 3 provides for adequate management of the interface between urban development and lawfully established, critical infrastructure, such as the railway network. • This is necessary to ensure communities are built in healthy living environments, and the railway network can operate and develop in the future without constraint. • An integrated and proactive approach to planning is critical to support the overall vision of urban environments, and to ensure that the transport network can support the increasing growth and housing intensification.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The nature of railway operations means KiwiRail cannot fully internalise all its effects within the railway corridor boundaries. With a proposed increase in sensitive activities in proximity to the railway corridor as a result of the increased density enabled by Variation 3, the risk of adverse health and amenity effects impacting people locating in proximity to the railway corridor, and reverse sensitivity effects constraining its operations is significantly elevated.
Point Number	54.3
Plan Chapter	All of Variation
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support
Summary of Decision Requested	No specific decision requested, but submission supports urban development, including around transport nodes, and recognises the benefits of co-locating housing near transport corridors which provide passenger connections.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An integrated and proactive approach to planning is critical to support the overall vision of urban environments, and to ensure that the transport network can support the increasing growth and housing intensification.
Point Number	54.4
Plan Chapter	Definitions
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support
Summary of Decision Requested	Retain the definition of “Qualifying Matters”.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter considers it is appropriate to use the statutory definition set out in the Resource Management Act 1991 which includes, nationally significant infrastructure (such as the rail corridor).
Point Number	54.5
Plan Chapter	Strategic Direction
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support
Summary of Decision Requested	Retain SD-O14 Well-functioning urban environment.

Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This objective is appropriate to give effect to Objective 1 of the NPS-UD. • Providing for the health and well-being of our communities relies on having infrastructure in place to support communities and appropriate planning provisions, such as controls on development near the rail corridor.
Point Number	54.6
Plan Chapter	Strategic Direction
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support
Summary of Decision Requested	Retain SD-P2 Medium Density Residential Standards.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Policy SD-P2 which appropriately recognises restraint on intensification in areas where a qualifying matter (such as nationally significant infrastructure) is present.
Point Number	54.7
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support
Summary of Decision Requested	Retain MRZ2-O5 Qualifying matters
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports the inclusion of Objective MRZ2-O5 and the recognition that medium density residential development may need to be limited where a qualifying matter applies. • As the rail corridor is recognised as a qualifying matter under Variation 3, it is appropriate that development capacity is limited where necessary through additional controls, such as increased setbacks, in order to ensure the ongoing safety and efficiency of the rail corridor.
Point Number	54.8
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Amend MRZ2-O6 Reverse sensitivity as follows:</p> <p><i>(1) Avoid or minimise the potential for reverse sensitivity and risks to public health and safety by managing the location and design of sensitive activities through:</i></p>

	<p><i>(a) The use of building setbacks; and</i></p> <p><i>(b) The design of subdivisions and development-; <u>and</u></i></p> <p><i><u>(c) The design of buildings, including use of acoustic insulation, ventilation and vibration measures.</u></i></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Such further or other consequential relief, as may be necessary, to fully give effect to the relief sought.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Objective MR22-O6 to the extent it recognises the need to avoid and minimise the potential for reverse sensitivity effects by managing the location and design of sensitive activities, including through building setbacks. • Acoustic insulation and vibration measures are additional controls necessary to manage reverse sensitivity effects. • The objective also needs to be amended to refer to public health and safety impacts, as setbacks are also important controls to manage safety effects on built development (not just sensitive development) near nationally significant infrastructure.
Point Number	54.9
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Amend MR22-P6 Qualifying matters as follows:</p> <p><i>Restrict residential development to an appropriate level to provide for and protect any relevant qualifying matters</i></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Such further or other consequential relief, as may be necessary, to fully give effect to the relief sought.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Policy MR22-P6 which recognises that where a qualifying matter is present, residential development is to be restricted to an appropriate level to protect and provide for that qualifying matter. • Reference to "residential" within the Policy should be deleted to ensure that all development is managed to appropriate levels where a qualifying matter exists.

Point Number	54.10
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Amend MRZ2-P11 Reverse sensitivity as follows:</p> <p><i>Maintain appropriate setback distances between new <u>sensitive (and altered)</u> land uses and existing lawfully established activities <u>and require buildings to be designed with acoustic insulation and vibration measures to minimise the potential that may result in for</u> reverse sensitivity effects <u>and risks to public health and safety.</u></i></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Such further or other consequential relief, as may be necessary, to fully give effect to the relief sought.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Policy MRZ2-P11, insofar that it recognises the need to manage reverse sensitivity effects. • While adequate building setbacks are an important tool for managing development near infrastructure, they are primarily to manage impacts on health and safety. KiwiRail considers the policy needs to be amended to recognize this. • There are additional tools available for avoiding or minimising reverse sensitivity effects, including acoustic insulation and vibration controls. KiwiRail considers that to ensure consistency with Objective MRZ2-O6, express reference to other design measures should be recognised through this Policy.
Point Number	54.11
Plan Chapter	General Residential Zone
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Amend GRZ-S20 Building setback – sensitive land use as follows:</p> <p><i>(1) Activity status: PER</i></p> <p><i>Where:</i></p>

	<p>(a) Any new building or alteration to an existing building for a sensitive land use shall be set back a minimum of:</p> <p>(i) 5m from the designated boundary of the railway corridor;</p> <p>(ii)(i) 15m from the boundary of a national route or regional arterial;</p> <p>(iii)(ii) 25m from the designated boundary of the Waikato Expressway;</p> <p>(iv)(iii) 300m from the edge of oxidation ponds that are part of a municipal wastewater treatment facility on another site;</p> <p>(v)(iv) 30m from a municipal wastewater treatment facility where the treatment process is fully enclosed;</p> <p>and</p> <p>(vi)(v) 300m from the boundary of the Alstra Poultly intensive farming activities located on River Road and Great South Road, Ngaaruawaahia.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Such further or other consequential relief, as may be necessary, to fully give effect to the relief sought.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KiwiRail supports a 5m setback from the rail corridor. However, KiwiRail considers it necessary for the setback to apply consistently across all zones and to apply to all new building development (not just development containing sensitive land uses). • To that effect, KiwiRail seeks the building setbacks in the GRZ and MRZ2 are amended, and a standalone setback standard is included.
Point Number	54.12
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Amend MRZ2-S14 Building setback – sensitive land use as follows:</p> <p>(1) Activity status: PER</p> <p>Where:</p>

	<p>(a) Any new building or alteration to an existing building for a sensitive land use shall be set back a minimum of:</p> <p>(i) 5m from the designated boundary of the railway corridor;</p> <p>(ii)(i) 15m from the boundary of a national route or regional arterial;</p> <p>(iii)(ii) 25m from the designated boundary of the Waikato Expressway;</p> <p>(iv)(iii) 300m from the edge of oxidation ponds that are part of a municipal wastewater treatment facility on another site;</p> <p>(v)(iv) 30m from a municipal wastewater treatment facility where the treatment process is fully enclosed;</p> <p>and</p> <p>(vi)(v) 300m from the boundary of the Alstra Poultry intensive farming activities located on River Road and Great South Road, Ngaaruawaahia.</p> <p>(vii)(vi) 6m from the centre of a gas transmission line identified on the planning maps</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Such further or other consequential relief, as may be necessary, to fully give effect to the relief sought.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KiwiRail supports a 5m setback from the rail corridor. However, KiwiRail considers it necessary for the setback to apply consistently across all zones and to apply to all new building development (not just development containing sensitive land uses). • To that effect, KiwiRail seeks the building setbacks in the GRZ and MRZ2 are amended, and a standalone setback standard is included.
Point Number	54.13
Plan Chapter	General Residential Zone AND Medium Density Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Add a new permitted activity standard into the GRZ and MRZ2 (and all relevant zones adjoining the rail corridor affected by Variation 3) as follows:

	<p><u><i>RX- Building Setback – railway corridor</i></u></p> <p><u><i>(1) Activity status: PER</i></u></p> <p><u><i>Where:</i></u></p> <p><u><i>(a) Any new building or alteration to an existing building must be setback 5 metres from any designated railway corridor boundary.</i></u></p> <p><u><i>(2) Activity status where compliance not achieved: RDIS Council’s discretion is restricted to the following matters:</i></u></p> <p><u><i>(a) The size, nature and location of buildings the on the site;</i></u></p> <p><u><i>(b) The extent to which the safety efficiency and of rail operations will be adversely affected;</i></u></p> <p><u><i>(c) The outcome of any consultation with KiwiRail;</i></u></p> <p><u><i>(d) Any characteristics of the proposed use that will make compliance unnecessary.</i></u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Such further or other consequential relief, as may be necessary, to fully give effect to the relief sought.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The requirement for buildings and structures to be setback 5m from a boundary with a railway corridor ensures that an appropriate setback is applied for all development, rather than only applying to sensitive land uses. • This proposed standard will not prevent the establishment of new buildings or structures within 5 metres of the rail corridor. The standard sought is a permitted activity standard, and where this is infringed, resource consent can still be sought as a restricted discretionary activity. • KiwiRail seeks the insertion of a new restricted discretionary activity status where the building setback standard is not complied with and matters of discretion, with impacts on the safety and efficiency of the rail corridor listed as matters of discretion.
Point Number	54.14
Plan Chapter	General Residential Zone and Medium Density Residential Zone 2

Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Add a new rule RX- Indoor railway noise into the GRZ and MRZ2 (and all relevant zones affected by Variation 3) for sensitive land uses within 100m of the legal boundary of the rail corridor. See submission for details of new rule, which includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a permitted activity; • restricted discretionary activity where there is non-compliance with any of the standards; and • Schedule Y Construction Schedule for indoor noise control. <p>AND</p> <p>Such further or other consequential relief, as may be necessary, to fully give effect to the relief sought.</p>
Decision reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KiwiRail seeks that noise controls be included to apply to (new and altered) sensitive uses within 100m of the legal boundary of any railway boundary to manage potential reverse sensitivity effects and adverse health and amenity effects on landowners adjoining the rail corridor. • KiwiRail seeks that non-compliance with the proposed permitted activity standard be assessed as a restricted discretionary activity with appropriate matters of discretion.
Point Number	54.15
Plan Chapter	General Residential Zone and Medium Density Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Add a new rule into the GRZ and MRZ2 (and all relevant zones adjoining the rail corridor) as follows:</p> <p><u><i>R4-Rail Vibration</i></u></p> <p><u><i>(1) Activity status: PER</i></u></p> <p><u><i>(a) Any new building or alteration to an existing building for a sensitive land use within 60m of the legal boundary of any railway network</i></u></p> <p><u><i>Activity-specific standards:</i></u></p>

	<p><u>(1) Any new buildings or alterations to existing buildings containing a sensitive land use, closer than 60 metres from the boundary of a railway network must be:</u></p> <p><u>(a) designed, constructed and maintained to achieve rail vibration levels not exceeding 0.3 mm/s vw,95 or</u></p> <p><u>(b) a single-storey framed residential building with:</u></p> <p><u>i. a constant level floor slab on a full surface vibration isolation bearing with natural frequency not exceeding 10 Hz, installed in accordance with the supplier's instructions and recommendations; and</u></p> <p><u>ii. vibration isolation separating the sides of the floor slab from the ground; and</u></p> <p><u>iii. no rigid connections between the building and the ground.</u></p> <p><u>(2) Activity status where compliance is not achieved: RDIS:</u></p> <p><u>(a) location of the building;</u></p> <p><u>(b) the effects of any non-compliance with the activity specific standards;</u></p> <p><u>(c) special topographical, building features or ground conditions which will mitigate vibration impacts;</u></p> <p><u>(d) the outcome of any consultation with KiwiRail.</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Such further or other consequential relief, as may be necessary, to fully give effect to the relief sought.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KiwiRail seeks that vibration controls be included to apply to all (new and altered) sensitive uses within 60m of the legal boundary of any railway boundary. • KiwiRail seeks that non-compliance with the proposed permitted activity rule be assessed as a restricted discretionary activity with appropriate matters of discretion.

Submitter Number	55	Submitter Names	Tupeka Kani
Point Number	55.1		
Plan Chapter	All of Variation		

Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose
Summary of Decision Requested:	Delete Variation 3 from the proposed district plan
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter does not want Tuakau to be looking like all the rest of the towns. • The submitter does not think that there should be 3 storey development in Tuakau. • The submitter thinks it will detract from the rural character of the town.

Submitter Number	56	Submitter Names	Hemokai Kani
Point Number	56.1		
Plan Chapter	Generic Topic		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Delete Variation 3 from the proposed district plan		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned about looking like the rest of the towns. • Increased numbers of strangers. • Buildings are likely to be ugly. 		

Submitter Number	57	Submitter Names	Sharlene Kani
Point Number	57.1		
Plan Chapter	All of Variation		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Delete Variation 3 from the Proposed District Plan		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Medium density housing is not suitable for Tuakau and might result in undesirable social behaviours. 		

Submitter Number	58	Submitter Names	Turia Kani
Point Number	58.1		
Plan Chapter	All of Variation		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Delete Variation 3 from the proposed district plan		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that the houses are not suitable for Tuakau. • Likely to mean houses for low socio economic which brings crime, drugs and violence. 		

Submitter Number	59	Submitter Names	Wai Kani
Point Number	59.1		
Plan Chapter	All of Variation		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Delete Variation 3 from the Proposed District Plan		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Medium density housing is not suitable for Tuakau and might result in undesirable social behaviours. 		

Submitter Number	60	Submitter Names	Ministry of Education
Point Number	60.1		
Plan Chapter	Generic topic		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend		
Summary of Decision Requested:	<p>Amend Variation 3 to include provisions for educational facilities to enable the Ministry of Education to service the growth facilitated by Variation 3 in the Waikato District. This includes new objectives and amendments to existing policies and rules to specifically enable and provide for educational facilities in the residential zones.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments.</p>		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed increase in residential density will put pressure on the local school networks. • Growth as a result of the Variation will require careful planning and communication between Council and the Ministry to meet community demand for educational facilities. • The Ministry therefore has an interest in ensuring the Plan specifically acknowledges and provides for educational facilities. • This is critical given educational facilities are an essential piece of social and community infrastructure. • An absence of supportive provisions can place obstacles in the way of the establishment of education facilities in future years. 		
Point Number	60.2		
Plan Chapter	Generic topic		

Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Not stated
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Confirmation that a qualifying matter does not apply to Minister of Education designations, such that section 77M (6) of the RMA can immediately be relied upon by the Ministry in the absence of any other qualifying matters applying to Schools.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For Variation 3, Council has identified all designations as a qualifying matter. • This may unnecessarily result in section 77M (6) not being available to the Ministry until after the plan Variation becomes operative.
Point Number	60.3
Plan Chapter	Generic topic
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Not stated
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>No specific decision requested, but submission broadly supports provisions in Variation 3 that seek to put in place a framework that will deliver integrated communities that support the concepts of liveable, walkable and connected neighbourhoods. This includes a transport network that is easy and safe to use for pedestrians and cyclists and is well connected to public transport, shops, schools, employment, open spaces and other amenities.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No reasons provided.
Point Number	60.4
Plan Chapter	General Residential Zone
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Add a new objective as follows:</p> <p><i><u>GRZ-07 Educational Facilities</u></i></p>

	<p><i>Residential development is supported by educational facilities</i></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council has an obligation under the NPS-UD to ensure sufficient ‘additional infrastructure’ (which includes educational facilities) is provided in development, and local authorities must be satisfied that additional infrastructure to service the development capacity is likely to be available • Educational facilities are typically located in residential zones to support the surrounding residential catchments. • The Ministry requests that an additional objective is added to each of the residential zones (general residential zone, the Medium Density Residential Zone 1 and the Medium Density Residential Zone 2) that acknowledges that development in residential areas should be supported by educational facilities to help meet the needs and demand of local communities in the future.
Point Number	60.5
Plan Chapter	General Residential Zone
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Amend GRZ-P15(1)(iii) Non-residential activities as follows:</p> <p><i>(1) Maintain the zone for residential activities by:</i></p> <p><i>iii. Enabling non-residential activities that provide for the health, safety and wellbeing of the community, including educational facilities and that service or support an identified local need;</i></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Ministry acknowledges that Policy GRZ-P15, MRZ1-P7 and MRZ2-P10 for non-residential activities is not proposed to be amended through Variation 3 and are existing operative policies under the Plan. However, the Ministry recommends these policies are amended through Variation 3 to specifically enable educational facilities as non-residential activities to support the needs and demands of those residential communities.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed amendment is also necessary to support the Ministry's suggested new objectives.
Point Number	60.6
Plan Chapter	General Residential Zone
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested:	<p>Delete GRZ-R9 Childcare facility</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Ministry acknowledges that childcare facilities are provided for a permitted activity subject to an activity-specific standard for up to 4 children in the general residential zone under rule GRZ-R9. Most childcare facilities would exceed this limit meaning the activity status would be unnecessarily restrictive as a discretionary activity. The Ministry opposes this rule and recommends that childcare facilities are included in rule GRZ-R13 for educational facilities. This would enable childcare facilities as restricted discretionary activities to support the needs and demands of those residential communities while allowing Council to maintain discretion over the listed matters.
Point Number	60.7
Plan Chapter	General Residential Zone
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Amend GRZ-R13 Educational facilities as follows:</p> <p><i>GRZ-R13 Educational facilities</i></p> <p><i>This excludes childcare facilities.</i></p> <p><i>(1) Activity status: RDIS</i></p> <p><i>Activity-specific standards:</i></p>

	<p><i>Nil</i></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Ministry acknowledges that childcare facilities are provided for a permitted activity subject to an activity-specific standard for up to 4 children in the general residential zone under rule GRZ-R9. • Most childcare facilities would exceed this limit meaning the activity status would be unnecessarily restrictive as a discretionary activity. • The Ministry recommends that childcare facilities are included in rule GRZ-R13 for educational facilities. • This would enable childcare facilities as restricted discretionary activities to support the needs and demands of those residential communities while allowing Council to maintain discretion over the listed matters.
Point Number	60.8
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 1
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision	<p>Add the following objective:</p> <p><i><u>MRZ1-O5 Educational Facilities</u></i></p> <p><i><u>Residential development is supported by educational facilities</u></i></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council has an obligation under the NPS-UD to ensure sufficient ‘additional infrastructure’ (which includes educational facilities) is provided in development, and local authorities must be satisfied that additional infrastructure to service the development capacity is likely to be available. • Educational facilities are typically located in residential zones to support the surrounding residential catchments.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Ministry requests that an additional objective is added to each of the residential zones (general residential zone, the Medium Density Residential Zone 1 and the Medium Density Residential Zone 2) that acknowledges that development in residential areas should be supported by educational facilities to help meet the needs and demand of local communities in the future.
Point Number	60.9
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 1
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Amend MRZ1-P7(1)(a) Non-residential activities as follows:</p> <p><i>(1) Maintain the zone primarily for residential activities while also:</i></p> <p><i>a) Ensuring community facilities <u>and educational facilities</u>:</i></p> <p><i>i) Are suitably located;</i></p> <p><i>ii) Are of a limited scale and intensity that is compatible with the zone;</i></p> <p><i>iii) Contribute to the amenity of the neighbourhood; and</i></p> <p><i>iv) Support the social and economic well-being of the residential community.</i></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Ministry acknowledges that Policy GRZ-P15, MRZ1-P7 and MRZ2-P10 for non-residential activities is not proposed to be amended through Variation 3 and are existing operative policies under the Plan. However, the Ministry recommends these policies are amended through Variation 3 to specifically enable educational facilities as non-residential activities to support the needs and demands of those residential communities. The proposed amendment is also necessary to support the Ministry's suggested new objectives.
Point Number	60.10
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 1
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend

Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Amend MRZ1-R4 Community facilities to include educational facilities as follows:</p> <p><i>MRZ1-R4 Community facilities <u>and educational facilities</u></i></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Ministry notes that educational facilities are not specifically provided for in the Medium Density Residential Zone 1 and 2 rules and are discretionary under rule MRZ1-R10 and MRZ2-R12. The Ministry recommends amendments to rules MRZ1-R4 and MRZ2-R4 for community facilities to include educational facilities through Variation 3. • This will enable educational facilities as permitted (subject to meeting activity-specific standards) and Restricted Discretionary where they do not meet the activity-specific standards, to support the needs and demands of those residential communities. <p>This also aligns with the Ministry’s suggested new objectives and policy amendments.</p>
Point Number	60.11
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 1
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Add the following new objective:</p> <p><i>MRZ1-O7 Educational Facilities</i></p> <p><i>Residential development is supported by educational facilities</i></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council has an obligation under the NPS-UD to ensure sufficient ‘additional infrastructure’ (which includes educational facilities) is provided in development, and local authorities must be satisfied that additional infrastructure to service the development capacity is likely to be available. • Educational facilities are typically located in residential zones to support the surrounding residential catchments.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Ministry requests that an additional objective is added to each of the residential zones (general residential zone, the Medium Density Residential Zone 1 and the Medium Density Residential Zone 2) that acknowledges that development in residential areas should be supported by educational facilities to help meet the needs and demand of local communities in the future.
Point Number	60.12
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Amend MRZ2-P10(1)(a) Non-residential activities as follows</p> <p><i>(1) Maintain the zone primarily for residential activities while also:</i></p> <p><i>a) Ensuring community facilities and educational facilities:</i></p> <p><i>i) Are suitably located;</i></p> <p><i>ii) Are of a limited scale and intensity that is compatible with the zone;</i></p> <p><i>iii) Contribute to the amenity of the neighbourhood; and</i></p> <p><i>iv) Support the social and economic well-being of the residential community.</i></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Ministry acknowledges that Policy GRZ-P15, MRZ1-P7 and MRZ2-P10 for non-residential activities is not proposed to be amended through Variation 3 and are existing operative policies under the Plan. However, the Ministry recommends these policies are amended through Variation 3 to specifically enable educational facilities as non-residential activities to support the needs and demands of those residential communities. <p>The proposed amendment is also necessary to support the Ministry's suggested new objectives.</p>
Point Number	60.13
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend

Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Amend MRZ2-R4 Community facilities to include educational facilities as follows:</p> <p>MRZ2-R4 Community facilities <u>and educational facilities</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Ministry notes that educational facilities are not specifically provided for in the Medium Density Residential Zone 1 and 2 rules and are discretionary under rule MRZ1-R10 and MRZ2-R12. The Ministry recommends amendments to rules MRZ1-R4 and MRZ2-R4 for community facilities to include educational facilities through Variation 3. • This will enable educational facilities as permitted (subject to meeting activity-specific standards) and Restricted Discretionary where they do not meet the activity-specific standards, to support the needs and demands of those residential communities. • This also aligns with the Ministry’s suggested new objectives and policy amendments.

Submitter Number	61	Submitter Names	Teresa Wine
Point Number	61.1		
Plan Chapter	All of Variation		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Delete Variation 3		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter may have several multi-story dwellings constructed close to their boundary with all the adverse effects such as being cast in shadow, loss of outlook and claustrophobic conditions. • The submitter is concerned that the value of their property will decrease because of Variation 3. • The submitter is concerned there will be no warning of such development potentially occurring in the adjacent properties. • Pookeno does not have the infrastructure capacity to cope with intensification development. • The submitter suggests that Pookeno is not a city suburb and should not be subject to town house development. The submitter does not agree with the MDRS standards as communities may turn into slums. 		
Point Number	61.2		

Plan Chapter	Generic matter
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Add Pookeno special character as a qualifying matter
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pookeno has the character of a village in a rural setting. • The submitter is concerned that should the proposed Variation proceed the character of Pookeno will be irreversibly changed. • Pookeno has already undergone significant housing development in recent times and has caused significant changes to the village.
Point Number	61.3
Plan Chapter	All of Variation
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose
Summary of Decision Requested	At the least, apply these changes to newly created sections that have not yet been sold to homeowners
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Medium density housing will not have the same impact on the special character of Pookeno if it is applied to new areas of residential development.

Submitter Number	62	Submitter Names	Classic Group Holdings
Point Number	62.1		
Plan Chapter	Definitions		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Amend the definition of “landscaped area” as follows: <i>Means any part of the site with grass or plants, and can include the canopy of trees regardless of the ground treatment below them. that is grassed and/or planted in trees, shrubs, or ground cover and may include ancillary water, rocks, paved areas or amenity features.</i>		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The definition is not consistent with the MRDS landscaped area of a minimum of 20% of a developed site with grass or plants, and can include the canopy of trees regardless of the ground treatment below them. 		
Point Number	62.2		

Plan Chapter	Subdivision
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Oppose
Summary of Decision Requested	Delete SUB-R152 (1a) must have a minimum net site area (excluding access legs) of 200m ² except where:
Decision Reasons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove the minimum lot site design factor requirement and reliance be placed on the land use rules to ensure suitable development outcomes.

Submitter Number	63	Submitter Names	Storme Baird
Point Number	63.1		
Plan Chapter	Planning Maps		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Support in part		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Amend zoning 35 Old Taupiri Road from General Residential Zone to MRZ2		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter contends that there are areas outside the 800m walkable catchment that are appropriate to implement Variation 3 in Ngaaruawaahia. 35 Old Taupiri Road is a large residential property that can meet the objective of housing supply when developed under the MRZ 2 provisions. The submitter has the view that the urban fringe qualifying matter is for a spatial purpose and does not appreciate that better outcomes can be achieved in the urban fringe of Ngaaruawaahia. The submitter is of view that intensification beyond the 800m walkable catchment in Ngaaruawaahia is consistent with the overarching national framework. The property is across the road from the proposed edge of the 800m zone and the submitter argues it should be included. 		

Submitter Number	64	Submitter Names	Megan Ryder
Point Number	64.1		
Plan Chapter	Maps		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Delete Huntly from Variation 3		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Huntly isn't suitable for this form of development Huntly is a commuter town for people who wish to get away from the rat race The Huntly town centre currently has very limited services for the community. many of the businesses are chemists, second hand or take away food premises. 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parking. • Most families prefer to have some space including a back yard. • The dramas which come with increased intensity e.g. overcrowding, inadequate spaces, off-road parking, leaks and problematic neighbours.
Point Number	64.2
Plan Chapter	Generic topic
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose
Summary of Decision Requested:	No specific decision requested, but submission considers that if built, any medium density housing definitely needs to be regulated by rules along with permission sought from neighbours.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The dramas which come with increased intensity e.g. overcrowding, inadequate spaces, off-road parking, leaks and problematic neighbours.

Submitter Number	65	Submitter Names	Joss Annandale
Point Number	65.1		
Plan Chapter	All of Variation		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose		
Summary of Decision Requested	Assurance that if the Variation proceeds that it will not impact on existing residents.		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter is concerned with the effects the proposal will have on existing residents and questions why small communities are proposed to have dwellings designed for city living. • The submitter is concerned about the effects it will have on shade, privacy, parking, and noise. There will be a significant impact on the life and wellbeing of existing residents. The submitter considers there is the Variation may result in slum style living conditions. The submitter understands that more housing is needed however considers this should not be at the expense of existing residents. • The submitter suggest that council should have had community meetings to address this earlier and help with the submission process as it is not designed for the average person. It is difficult to navigate the process. 		

Submitter Number	66	Submitter Names	Dominion Developments Ltd
Point Number	66.1		
Plan Chapter	Maps		

Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested:	<p>Amend the zoning of the property at 26 King Street, Ngaaruawaahia (legal description Part Section 151 Suburbs of Newcastle North) and along all the properties of King Street from General Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone 2</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Add a bespoke controlled activity process in the General Residential Zone to allow medium density residential development with amendments to the following provisions [see submission for detailed amendments]:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SUB-P3 Lot sizes • SUB-P23 Medium density residential subdivision • SUB-R11 Subdivision – general • New rule SUB-R11A Medium density residential • GRZ-O1 Residential character • GRZ-P3 Setback side boundaries <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments required across the Proposed Waikato District Plan.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of the property under the proposed MDRZ 2 provisions aligns with, and will deliver on, the objective to rapidly accelerate the supply of housing, and the offering of housing choice and housing affordability. • Large residential properties that can meet the objective of housing supply when developed under the MDRZ 2 provisions, but its distinctiveness to many of the properties in the 800m walkable catchment is that it can be undertaken in a planned and urban-designed manner so as not to reduce existing local amenity in Ngaaruawaahia. • The likelihood of the currently identified MDRZ 2 properties in Ngaaruawaahia providing any immediate supply of housing is considered low, whereas the ability to intensively develop this property can contribute to the delivery of the objective to rapidly accelerate the supply of housing, including the offering of housing choice and housing affordability.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is in close proximity to Hamilton and the existing and proposed intensive residential developments in Horotiu and Te Awa Lakes. • Site is located close to existing active bus route/transport (public transport) along Great South Road between Ngaaruawaahia and Hamilton. • Site is in proximity and accessibility to the Waikato River and the Te Awa Cycle/Walkway as an urban amenity of the township, and connectivity between Ngaaruawaahia and Hamilton city, and the urban fringe of Ngaaruawaahia to the township.
Point Number	66.2
Plan Chapter	
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Amend the zoning of the property at 24 and 32A Saalbrey Road, Ngaaruawaahia (legal description Sections 158 and 159 Suburbs of Newcastle South) from General Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone 2</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Add a bespoke controlled activity process in the General Residential Zone to allow medium density residential development with amendments to the following provisions [see submission for detailed amendments]:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SUB-P3 Lot sizes • SUB-P23 Medium density residential subdivision • SUB-R11 Subdivision – general • New rule SUB-R11A Medium density residential • GRZ-O1 Residential character • GRZ-P3 Setback side boundaries <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments required across the Proposed Waikato District Plan.</p>

Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of the property under the proposed MDRZ 2 provisions aligns with, and will deliver on, the objective to rapidly accelerate the supply of housing, and the offering of housing choice and housing affordability. • Large residential properties that can meet the objective of housing supply when developed under the MDRZ 2 provisions, but its distinctiveness to many of the properties in the 800m walkable catchment is that it can be undertaken in a planned and urban-designed manner so as not to reduce existing local amenity in Ngaaruawaahia. • The likelihood of the currently identified MDRZ 2 properties in Ngaaruawaahia providing any immediate supply of housing is considered low, whereas the ability to intensively develop this property can contribute to the delivery of the objective to rapidly accelerate the supply of housing, including the offering of housing choice and housing affordability. • Site is in close proximity to Hamilton and the existing and proposed intensive residential developments in Horotiu and Te Awa Lakes. • Site is located close to existing active bus route/transport (public transport) along Great South Road between Ngaaruawaahia and Hamilton. • Site is in proximity and accessibility to the Waikato River and the Te Awa Cycle/Walkway as an urban amenity of the township, and connectivity between Ngaaruawaahia and Hamilton city, and the urban fringe of Ngaaruawaahia to the township.
------------------------	---

Submitter Number	67	Submitter Names	Christopher Els
Point Number	67.1		
Plan Chapter	All of Variation		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Delete Variation 3		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter wants the town stay rural because it is considered that that is what makes it great. • The town does not have the infrastructure capacity to cope with MDRS provisions 		

Submitter Number	68	Submitter Names	Stephen Banks
Point Number	68.1		
Plan Chapter	Maps		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend		

Summary of Decision Requested:	Amend to restrict medium density housing to areas not yet developed so people are aware, when purchasing in the future, what is allowed in that location. The submission refers to Pookeno.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing properties were purchased with full awareness and support of current covenants enforcing single level housing and should therefore not be changed. Infrastructure- water, power, sewerage needs to be carefully considered. Transport - each 3 x 3 potentially having a minimum of 6 vehicles, two per house. This will clog up roads further as existing properties already park their cars on the road as opposed to existing garaging. Also the Primary School currently adds to this issue at drop off and pick up times creating safety issues for children and parents. The potential for existing single level properties to be dwarfed by a two or more storied dwelling. This will affect property values of people's biggest asset and their ability to resell will be compromised. This would have a huge impact on people's health and wellbeing.

Submitter Number	69	Submitter Names	Simone Bylsma
Point Number	69.1		
Plan Chapter	Maps		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Remove Variation as applied in Tuakau		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter wants the rural community feel to be maintained. The submitter is concerned that if the proposal proceeds this will undermine the character and liveability of the community. The community's liveability and public health may be affected. Variation 3 will result in depriving children without a backyard to explore in, grow vegetables and have pets. The proposal will result in more crime and Tuakau becoming a slum. 		

Submitter Number	70	Submitter Names	J and A Whetu
Point Number	70.1		
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend		

Summary of Decision Requested:

Amend Variation 3 to protect the privacy and amenity of properties located in the proposed new Medium Density Residential Zone 2 but choose not to develop their properties by way of amendments to the following provisions:

- MRZ2-O6 Reverse sensitivity:

(b) Enabling properties/sites that do not develop to medium density residential to protect its privacy and amenity

- MRZ2-P11 Reverse Sensitivity:

(2) Allow structures, and/or screen planting, that protect privacy and amenity on properties/sites that adjoin medium density residential development

- **New** rule MRZ2-S9A Screening on Non-Medium Density Residential developed properties:

(1) Activity status: PER

A property/site that adjoins a property/site(s) where any land use and building under standards MRZ2-S2 to MRZ2-S7 (excluding MRSZ2-S4A) is carried out, the following is permitted:

- (a) The construction of privacy structures of 4m high within 1m of the adjoining boundary or*
- (b) The planting of trees of up to 11m in height, along the shared boundary*

(2) Activity status where compliance not achieved: RDIS

Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters:

(a) Shading

AND

	<p>Amend Variation 3 to protect the privacy and other interests of properties located in the proposed General Residential Zone that also adjoin Medium Density Residential Zone 2 properties, in a similar way to the amendments outlined above.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments in other areas of Variation 3 or the Proposed District Plan as needed.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitter acknowledges that there are benefits from enabling medium density residential development across Aotearoa New Zealand, but wishes to avoid the adverse impacts of permitted and controlled land use building activities that may occur directly next door to them. • Not every property in the zone wants to develop to the full extent permitted. • Submitter believes that there is a missed opportunity in Variation 3 for provisions to be included in the Proposed District Plan that can support property owners who choose not to develop their property to protect their own privacy and other interests.

Submitter Number	71	Submitter Names	Jodie Bell
Point Number	71.1		
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Support		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Retain the Medium Residential Zone		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To enable affordable multi/generational living and papakainga opportunities for existing residents and their families. • To provide existing residents and those without development and consents knowledge or financial means the same opportunities as developers by eliminating resource consent costs resulting in affordability. • To provide 'first homes' to residents that have been unable to enter the property market by providing opportunity for them to build on existing family land. • The submitter believes that just because people 'can' build up to three stories high does not mean that they are likely to do so. • MRZ2 zoning rules will mean more brownfield development and land utilisation without the need to change and rezone rural land which envelopes the Ngaaruwaahia catchment, keeping its amenity value of a unique, standalone urban town. 		

Point Number	71.2
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Amend MRZ2-S3 height in relation to boundary as follows): (iii) site boundaries where there is an existing common wall between 2 buildings on adjacent sites or where a common wall is proposed. AND Add a new rule as: <u>Common walls are not permitted in MDRZ2 unless the common wall adjoins non-habitable garaging at ground level.</u></p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter seeks to remove the ability to create new common walls between housing. • The rule should instead read that the standard does not apply to existing common walls and a new rule should be created requiring that new common walls can only be made between garaging. • This would be a deterrent in building tall built together block housing which is what the public are opposing (based on the pictures used in all of Waikato District Councils media releases and subsequent comments made by residents).
Point Number	71.3
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2-
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support in part
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Amend MRZ2-S4 setbacks to read as follows: as: (b) This standard does not apply to site boundaries where there is an existing common wall between 2 buildings on adjacent sites or where a common wall is proposed.AND Add a new rule as follows: <u>Common walls are not permitted in MDRZ2 unless the common wall adjoins non-habitable garaging at ground level.</u></p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter seeks to remove the ability to create new common walls between housing. • The rule should instead read that the standard does not apply to existing common walls and a new rule should be created requiring that new common walls can only be made between garaging.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This would be a deterrent in building tall built together block housing which is what the public are opposing (based on the pictures used in all of Waikato District Councils media releases and subsequent comments made by residents).
Point Number	71.4
Plan Chapter	Generic Topic
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Amend urban fringe to from 800m to 1000m (1km)
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter believes that the walking distance is too short and should be increased to 1000m (at least) as NZ Household Travel survey (2015-2018) identifies the average walking trip is 11minutes over 1000m (1km). This would in turn reduce urban fringe areas allowing more families the opportunity to create housing under the MRZ2. Ngaaruawaahia is a unique town and has geographically spaced amenities and facilities. There are factors a qualifying matter should consider is if a property is close to a recreational reserve, bus stop, supermarket, or marae as these will be accessed on foot. The walkable distance was not specifically listed as a prime reason people walk. The western view of connectivity to townships has been applied to establish qualifying matters however does not consider the importance of Tuurangawaewae Marae. Extending the urban fringe will allow more Maaori to develop their land.
Point Number	71.5
Plan Chapter	Maps
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support in part
Summary of Decision Requested	Amend MRZ2 zoning maps to include the following: From Belt Street to North Street, Ngaaruawaahia; Uenuku Street, an extended area of Havelock North; Kent Street, George Street, Queen Street and King Street (extended to the end of the road).
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Areas of the land zoned as MRZ2 in the maps will mostly likely not be developed into housing painting a skewed picture of Ngaaruawaahia development possibilities. Examples of the properties listed are: local swimming pools, primary schools, Tuurangawaewae Marae, and Nga Miro Health Centre, land that is too close to the river.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increasing the areas zoned MZR2 will mitigate the inclusion of the above as MZR2 properties in the actual intensification. These areas are near Tuurangawaewae marae, Paterson Park, schools, and the Waikato River. Majority of the property owners on this street are Māori, the streets are whanau homes, these streets should be afforded the same opportunities as many other properties in Ngaaruawaahia. Developing existing properties for engaged community members. These can help families dedicate their time to the marae for future proofing availability of kaimahi. 50-100 metres out of walkable distance' from the town centre should not prevent these whanau from utilising their land.
Point Number	71.6
Plan Chapter	Maps
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support
Summary of Decision Requested	Retain the Lower Waipa Esplanade Area being included in the MZR2 zone.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter was born and raised in Ngaaruawaahia and has experienced many changes over the years, however majority are recent. The town has grown with subdivisions created in all corners of the town. The submitter recently watched the rezoning of residential land on many streets in the town by developers. The MRZ2- will provide many existing Ngaaruawaahia whanau with opportunity to add to their properties. It could mean the beginning of generational wealth, an inheritance, or a financially healthy whanau trust. It could mean the sustainability of sports clubs where 'club whanau and are paramount in their succession planning, and the most critical factor for me is getting people out of rent-a-cabins and garages and into their very own healthy homes where money (or lack of) is not the determining factor.

Submitter Number	72	Submitter Names	Estate of Te Puea Herangi
Point Number	72.1		
Plan Chapter	Generic Topic		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Support in part		

Summary of Decision Requested:	Amend the Variation to apply Section 771(a) Section 6 matters to include the surrounding areas of Tuurangawaewae marae.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This includes significant cultural and historic areas.
Point Number	72.2
Plan Chapter	Generic Topic
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Amend the zoning of the properties surrounding Tuurangawaewae Marae, including River Road, Regent Street, Kent Street, George Street, Edward Street, King and Queen Street that were proposed to be rezoned MDRS.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It will affect the natural character, historic landscape, heritage and well-being of the area. Traffic congestion around Tuurangawaewae Marae will increase and affect whanau and major cultural events. Parking for events is already limited. Noise levels may increase and possibly affect cultural practices. 3 storey / 11 metre structures would diminish the cultural significance of Tuurangawaewae Marae and more important the Kiingitanga. The buildings would pose a distraction and blight on the landscape of the area. The area chosen for the Marae was based on the Waikato River, confluence with the Waipaa River and cultural viewshafts to Taupiri Maunga and the Hakarimata Range. These important attributes should not be diminished by property developers who will not appropriately consider those views.

Submitter Number	73	Submitter Names	Chris Parker
Point Number	73.1		
Plan Chapter	All of Variation		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Delete Variation 3		

Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter contests that the zoning in Tuakau, Pookeno, Huntly and Ngaaruawaahia should be significantly reduced because they are established commuter/rural service towns. • The towns have little potential to grow into commercial centres. • The demands on all infrastructure will increase significantly and would require significant investment (cost and disruption). • The changes do not fit the amenity value of the district plan. The effects of people travelling into the main centres will also have a worse effect on climate change through increased carbon emissions, these changes are better suited to the likes of Auckland and Hamilton.
------------------------	---

Submitter Number	74	Submitter Names	Patricia (Trish) Savage
Point Number	74.1		
Plan Chapter	Maps		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Amend the restricted area in Pookeno that the MDRS has been applied to, and focus on areas in Pookeno that are yet to be developed rather than areas that currently have housing with existing covenants.		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Undemocratic and totally dismisses existing homeowners' rights. • Enabling high density housing to be built in currently undeveloped areas allows people to fully understand what the area will be like and provides choices etc for prospective homeowners without disadvantaging or stressing out current homeowners. • House values will potentially decrease affecting our retirement future and choices. • The potential for a single level house to be dwarfed by a 2 or 3 story dwelling either side • Traffic congestion. • Strain on existing infrastructure like waterways, power, transport. • Health and safety issues for the Primary School families including traffic congestion 		
Point Number	74.2		
Plan Chapter	Generic Topic		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Not stated		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Amend the approach to look for total area equivalent spaces to the proposed area covered under the blanket 800m radius which might be made up of pockets of land in different areas. The submission describes a few undeveloped areas around Pookeno where medium density housing could be considered		

	without affecting current housing, such as east side of Helenslee Road, and the area in behind Helenslee and Hillside which are in the proposed areas to be rezoned.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Undemocratic and totally dismisses existing homeowners' rights. • Enabling high density housing to be built in currently undeveloped areas allows people to fully understand what the area will be like and provides choices etc for prospective homeowners without disadvantaging or stressing out current homeowners. • House values will potentially decrease affecting our retirement future and choices. • The potential for a single level house to be dwarfed by a 2 or 3 story dwelling either side. • Traffic congestion. • Strain on existing infrastructure like waterways, power, transport. • Health and safety issues for the Primary School families including traffic congestion.

Submitter Number	75	Submitter Names	Laura Kellaway and Bryan Windeatt
Point Number	75.1		
Plan Chapter	All of Variation		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend		
Summary of Decision Requested	Amend parts of the Variation as detailed in submission.		
Decision Reason:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While the submitters support good quality urban environments and the provision of quality housing within well planned neighbourhoods, the rushing through of this legislation is of concern, and the impacts are now at local level, with councils unable to respond to improving a poorly planned act being imposed upon the community with minimal consultation. • As architects, the submitters support the following in terms of improving housing and intensification: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It is needed across our growing cities and regions. ○ Essential in support of efficient and cost-effective infrastructure investment and climate responses. ○ It needs to be designed well to achieve to deliver the well-being outcomes for communities. ○ Architects are essential along with urban design panels, to ensure rigorous and robust review and high quality design outcomes 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Townships of Tuakau, Pookeno, Huntly and Ngaaruawaahia have strong cultural constructs and layers of histories that should be integrated in any planning rules and requires time, consultation and co-operative approaches. • Submitters consider community consultation and participation very important, but there has been insufficient time for this process in our view. • The proposed intensification of old towns requires careful design and co-ordination with the community. This includes respecting the past and the practicalities of dealing with very old 3 infrastructure. One example is Ngaaruawaahia where the MDRS rule of increased density within 400 metres includes cultural lands, historic heritage and the Waikato River. • Concern regarding no notification nor right-of-appeal for complying developments (meeting permitted activity standards)
Point Number	75.2
Plan Chapter	MDRZ1 and MDRZ2
Support/Oppose/Amend	Support
Summary of Decision Requested	In principle support the proposed MDRZ 1 and 2 Zones.
Decision Reason:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No reason stated.
Point Number	75.3
Plan Chapter	All of Variation
Support/Oppose/Amend	Support
Summary of Decision Requested	Support Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River including setback from the Waikato River.
Decision Reason:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No reason stated.
Point Number	75.4
Plan Chapter	Generic topic
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested:	<p>Include urban design rules including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MFE urban design guides • Restricted discretionary rules to include design and character, and associated rules and design guides • Use of assessment by Waikato urban design panel with associated design guidelines.

Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A lack of attention given to Part 2 RMA, including consideration under section 7 to the maintenance and enhancement of amenity values (in particular when considering residential amenity) and ‘sustainable management’ of physical resources (including existing urban buildings). It is noted the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 has not amended Part 2 RMA. • Whilst some level of intensification can be appropriate within Waikato District it needs to be well considered, evidence based, serviceable and affordable for future generations, with the communities well informed. • The ‘one size fits all’ approach of the MDRS needs to be rejected in favour of an evidenced, analysed, and strategic approach to establishing suitable locations for quality designed housing intensification and a matching increase in infrastructure investment. • The introduction of blanket ‘medium density’ planning rules to all residential areas in the four townships this will place severe limitations on WDC ability to adopt more nuanced and contextually suitable planning controls. • Quality intensification should not be traded off against a short-term gain in housing numbers and community well-being.
Point Number	75.5
Plan Chapter	Generic topic
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Add Buffer adjacent to historic heritage, with reduced heights and setbacks, along with rules that reduce heights and site coverage in terms of infill and subdivision of historic heritage</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Add include potential historic areas of the 4 towns as a qualifying matter</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More consideration is needed on how historic heritage values are to be protected within the proposed MRZ2. Submitters note that there is limited scheduling and a lack of historic areas. • A Historic heritage assessment report should be available to inform the plan change. • The long term impact on the character of the historic towns, particularly small townships, has not been included within the MDRS. For instance the effects of Infill adjacent to small 19th century cottages and historic heritage, has not been specifically addressed.
Point Number	75.6

Plan Chapter	All of Variation
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Add definition of 'character' and inclusion in residential chapter or character along with design guidelines
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No reason stated.
Point Number	75.7
Plan Chapter	All Residential Chapters
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Amend rules for residential chapter for amenity and specifically terms of proposed MRZ2. Submitter requests to add the following rules (however does not provide specifics in relation to the rule):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Privacy. North facing Daylight and overshadowing. On-site parking. Setbacks from the Waikato River and natural gullies. Setback of developments adjacent to historic heritage. Retaining established on-site trees and landscaping Retaining existing buildings that are adaptable and can be repaired.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some of the MDRS, such as the outlook space requirements, severely compromise amenity and risk creating poor quality developments and infill developments that do not improve the living environment of the neighbourhood. A minimal approach to amenity values, required under the MDRS, which impact on neighbourhoods within the proposed MDRZ2. Council needs to ensure additional mechanisms and controls are adopted to increase housing supply whilst maintaining an appropriate level of control over the amenity and urban planning impacts. This includes ensuring good urban design outcomes, and limiting overshadowing and privacy impacts for adjoining properties. It is noted Councils ability to set planning controls is limited by the MDRS.
Point Number	75.8
Plan Chapter	Generic topic
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend

Summary of Decision Requested	Include carparking rule requiring where an on-site vehicle parking area includes more than 4 parking spaces; it must be landscaped at a certain rate
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not specifically stated
Point Number	75.9
Plan Chapter	Generic Topic
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Retain rules which include character, privacy, permeable surfaces definitions, and north facing and controls on overshadowing, AND Add associated design rules and urban design guidelines for example a rule that requires modelling of overshadowing of neighbouring properties when it falls outside the permitted activity status.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some of the MDRS, such as the outlook space requirements, severely compromise amenity and risk creating poor quality developments and infill developments that do not improve the living environment of the neighbourhood. • A minimal approach to amenity values, required under the MDRS, which impact on neighbourhoods within the proposed MDRZ2. • Council needs to ensure additional mechanisms and controls are adopted to increase housing supply whilst maintaining an appropriate level of control over the amenity and urban planning impacts. This includes ensuring good urban design outcomes, and limiting overshadowing and privacy impacts for adjoining properties. It is noted Councils ability to set planning controls is limited by the MDRS.
Point Number	75.10
Plan Chapter	Generic topic
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Add rules that require landscaping assessment AND Add rule that gives benefits to developers if substantial onsite trees are retained.</p> <p>Tree sizes should be maintained, with protection of dripline as per Notable Trees to ensure trees survive.</p>

Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not specifically stated
Point Number	75.11
Plan Chapter	Generic topic
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Add a rule within the chapter if more than 10% of a street is under redevelopment there should be a neighbourhood infrastructure plan in place.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No reason stated.
Point Number	75.12
Plan Chapter	All of Variation
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Add a monitoring rule to control the degree of change and give the ability to pre plan and reduce impacts for the street or neighbourhood eg impacts on parking . The monitoring rule within the residential zones should include planning provisions, landscaping, permeable surfaces etc. tied to the CCC. In regards streets a rule in residential chapter that assesses impact of parking with introduction of 3x3 housing and requires a consultant street design for parking and trees and landscaping before substantial change in scale of developments is constructed.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Monitoring rule is required as to degree of change and to give the ability to pre plan and reduce impacts for the street or neighbourhood. • The Monitoring rule within residential zones should include planning provisions, landscaping, permeable surfaces etc. tied to the CCC. • In regards streets a rule in residential chapter that assesses impact of parking with introduction of 3x3 housing and requires a consultant street design for parking and trees and landscaping before substantial change in scale of developments is constructed.
Point Number	75.13
Plan Chapter	All of Variation
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Include a rule that only allows linking to laterals where they are less than 20 years old
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure needs to be pre-planned and be done in consultation with neighbourhoods before MDRS 3X 3 development significantly alters neighbourhoods.

Point Number	75.14
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Add a cumulative assessment rule when 3 X 3 proposals exceed 20% of street
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To improve urban design quality of neighbourhood
Point Number	75.15
Plan Chapter	All of Variation
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Add rule for accessible units and developments with MD.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A higher percent of accessible units and design within new medium density developments and sites [i.e., accessible paths and covered areas externally] would better reflect the 20% of the New Zealand's community in this category and make the places more accessible for all.

Submitter Number	76	Submitter Names	Waikato District Council
Point Number	76.1		
Plan Chapter	Generic Topic		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Support		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Amend Variation 3 to give greater consideration to the capacity within the three-waters network to accommodate the future growth that would be enabled by Variation 3.		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council has a duty to provide the required three-water infrastructure to support growth across the district. Three water infrastructure has a finite capacity which, at times, can be difficult to ascertain. Council manages new connections to infrastructure, and it is important to ensure that growth is enabled in areas where there is sufficient capacity within the network. Infrastructure within the district has not been specifically planned for the level of intensification that would be enabled by Variation 3. Existing three-water infrastructure has generally latent capacity within the town centres. But there are limitations to understanding growth and managing demand. Council has a duty to meet community requirements for infrastructure service levels. 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In order for Council to plan and manage for capacity demand in the network, Council needs to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) a. register new connections to the network in order to fully plan and manage three-water infrastructure. (b) b. be able to refuse connections of new dwellings to the existing network in areas that are at capacity. • Council considers that the risk associated with potential network capacity constraints provides a degree of uncertainty to developers and the community. Council further considers that this uncertainty could disincentivise residential development across the district and ultimately result in in an outcome that is contrary to the Enabling Housing Amendment Act. 		
Point Number	76.2		
Plan Chapter	All of Variation		
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend		
Summary of Decision Requested	Amend Variation 3 to give greater consideration to the urban design outcomes of development and growth enabled by Variation 3.		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Variation 3 enables substantial intensification of residential areas within the district with relatively minimal required design standards. The resulting outcome of this Variation will result in a significant change of our urban fabric. • In addition to enabling housing, Council has a responsibility to provide for the well-being and quality of life of its residents. This includes the ability to interact with the environment and to feel safe and healthy. These broader outcomes can be encompassed by quality urban design. • Council considers that there should be an ability to influence the urban design outcomes of the residential areas within the district through the provisions of the district plan. 		
Submitter Number	77	Submitter Names	Eden Lapwood
Point Number	77.1		
Plan Chapter	Maps		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Amend Variation 3 to exclude Tuakau.		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter is concerned that much of the area shown as MRZ2 in Tuakau is not suitable for this form of development 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tuakau is a country town for people working in Hamilton or Auckland to live in and enjoy a small-town environment. • Public transport from Tuakau to areas of employment is not suitable due to the need for multiple changes of buses to get to workplaces the major areas of employment, and it is completely inadequate for shift workers. • The Tuakau town centre currently has limited services for residents. • The existing supermarket has no space to develop, many of the other businesses are takeaway food premises. Few people will go to a supermarket and carry their groceries home. • Many households have 2 people working and a percentage will have 2 cars, either 2 private vehicles or a private vehicle and a work vehicle. Medium density creates an issue for parking. • Council needs to look at major cities worldwide, even those with particularly good public transport services. • Property prices do not drop with this type of development. • Medium density development really does not stack up in Tuakau. The reason many people have moved to the town is affordability of houses with space around them. The prices must be lower than in Hamilton and Auckland as the time and cost of commuting is to be considered. • Young people without families tend to be those living in the medium density areas in Hamilton and Auckland and choose to for the ease of socialization in larger areas with bars/restaurants to accommodate them. • Most families prefer to have some space with sections around 600msq. • If built, any medium density housing must be built in a controlled manner, not randomly at a developer's whim. It must allow for suitable leisure areas, parking and take the effects of environment into consideration.
--	---

Submitter Number	78	Submitter Names	Gaylene and Wayne Rogers
Point Number	78.1		
Plan Chapter	All of Variation		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Delete Variation 3. The submission refers particularly to Pookeno.		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Pookeno area has built multiple properties & still building/subdividing. • Farms are already sold for future subdivision / homes not running out of land. • Infrastructure would not cope. 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vehicles ending up parking on roadsides. • Pookeno needs to protect its safe town and country image, attracting families and be a nice place to live where people can be proud of their homes and area.
--	--

Submitter Number	79	Submitter Names	Elizabeth Anne Nicholas
Point Number	79.1		
Plan Chapter	All of Variation		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Remove MRZ2 from Pookeno and oppose proposals that have been imposed by central government.		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When the submitter brought the property they felt protected by the covenant applying to the land. • The hill on which these houses would be sited is steep and has subsidence on it caused by an underlying spring. • Hillpark Drive has an area beside the waterways which has been built to take any other water overflow. • There is a creek running on the south side that floods making it very unstable for housing. • The submitter understands in the past houses here were condemned due to the wet ground. 		

Submitter Number	80	Submitter Names	Michelle and Jonathan Locke
Point Number	80.1		
Plan Chapter	Maps		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Delete the renaming of Medium Density Residential Zone Tuakau to Medium Density Zone 2		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not want this to change. • Building 3 houses up to 3 stories will change the feeling in the area. • Current roading and infrastructure could not support what is proposed. 		
Point Number	80.2		
Plan Chapter	Generic topic		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Not stated		

Summary of Decision Requested:	No specific decision requested, but submission observes that Pookeno is spelt wrong through the whole document.
Decision Reason	No reasons provided.

Submitter Number	81	Submitter Names	Marlana Maru
Point Number	81.1		
Plan Chapter	Maps		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Delete medium density zoning in Ngaaruawaahia.		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ngaaruawaahia does not have the infrastructure to cope with medium density development. • The council needs to consider the social and health needs within the community and the impacts because of increased population. • The submitter questions how council will support social and health needs of the community. • Public transportation is inadequate for those working outside the 'normal' timetable • This impacts families and whanau who may move to the area (for more affordable housing) who are shift workers. 		

Submitter Number	82	Submitter Names	CSL Trust
Point Number	82.1		
Plan Chapter	Maps		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend		
Summary of Decision Requested:	<p>Amend to apply the MDRS to all residential land within urban environments of the District, subject to any legitimate qualifying matters. This would apply to Pookeno, Tuakau, Huntly and Ngaaruawaahia. If necessary, a new zone created to accommodate that amendment. This zone could be referred to as General Residential Zone 2 (GRZ2) or similar.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any other such relief, and consequential amendments (including zone and overlay maps, objectives and policies), as considered appropriate to give effect to the points raised in the submission.</p>		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports enabling development throughout the main settlements in the district especially in those areas identified as suitable for urban growth and development in the PWDP. 		

Point Number	82.2
Plan Chapter	Qualifying Matter
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Oppose
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Delete the Urban Fringe qualifying matter, which fails to meet the relevant statutory requirements and is inappropriate.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any other such relief, and consequential amendments (including zone and overlay maps, objectives and policies), as considered appropriate to give effect to the points raised in the submission (which could include the application of the MRZ2 to the full extent over the four settlements that the submitter is seeking MDRS over.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Act does not contemplate a general qualifying matter applying to multiple sites based on general planning principles. • The principle of the qualifying matter is contrary to the clear intent of the RM-EHA. • The urban fringe qualifying matter fails to meet the threshold of either national importance or national significance. • The Urban Fringe Qualifying Matter is a generalised matter and not the site-specific assessment contemplated by the RM-EHA. • The section 32 evaluation does not undertake the detailed site-by-site analysis and is based largely on general principles of walkable catchments and the ideal locations for greater density. • This is inconsistent with the intent of the RM-EMA which is providing for greater density within walkable catchments of centres and rapid transit. • The Urban Fringe qualifying matter is not a matter with sufficient merit or significance to disqualify land beyond the 800m walkable catchment from town centres from utilising the MDRS. • Fails to recognise the mobility provided by other forms active transport, along with simply that given the size and layout of the towns all land and residents in the GRZ are in close proximity to the town centres.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fails to recognise that higher density residential options are appropriate in many other areas beyond the strict 800m metric (particularly where the GRZ only now provides for one dwelling per site as a permitted activity). • There are a number of advantages to the GRZ providing for MDRS, including range of housing opportunities, supporting local neighbourhood shops and services, range of housing prices, efficient use of the land resource. • Does not provide for the restrictive covenants in place in Pookeno which demonstrates that the MDRS should go beyond the identified urban fringe. • The section 32 understates the disadvantages of limiting the application of the MDRS to an 800m walkable catchment around the Town Centre Zone
Point Number	82.3
Plan Chapter	General Residential Zone
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision	<p>Delete the relevant standards from the GRZ that are being replaced by the MDRS [see submission for untracked version of the GRZ chapter].</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any other such relief, and consequential amendments (including zone and overlay maps, objectives and policies), as considered appropriate to give effect to the points raised in the submission.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Variation 3 does not give effect to or implement the NPS-UD, RM-EMA and MDRS as it is not sufficiently enabling and fails to expand over those areas where the current rules of the GRZ already significantly restrict housing densities and opportunities for a variety of housing types and price points. • Provides for a range of housing opportunities, densities and lots sizes; • Supports local neighbourhood shops and services; • Provides for a range of house prices to the market, including affordable housing. This supports housing for a wider demographic than a monoculture of the same sized houses and lots as currently exists in Pookeno;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Utilises residential zoned land more efficiently, allowing opportunities for integrated housing developments rather than lower density vacant fee simple lots. Pookeno is an ideal location to accommodate growth, and with its growing commercial, employment and community focus can reduce vehicle kilometres travelled compared with countryside living areas and the smaller towns and villages in the District; • Avoids the unnecessary use of highly productive rural land in the future (NPS – Highly Productive Land); • Establishes densities that can support the provision of local public transport in the medium term; • Provides for the efficient use of infrastructure; • Provides greater residential population and diversity within the growing town of Pookeno, supporting the local economy through commerce and exchange; and • Manages pressure for ongoing rezoning in the Future Urban Zone and in locations with fewer locational attributes compared with efficiently using land owned by CSL and within Pookeno West and Havelock. • These benefits outweigh the costs outlined in the Council’s Section 32. • Whether the development of such land is feasible and reasonably expected to be realised is another matter (NPS-UD – Clause 3.26). Given this is uncertain, it would be inappropriate to limit the application of the MDRS as has been done in V3.
Point Number	82.4
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Standard
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Add a new rule that any infringement of the MDRS is a restricted discretionary activity [see submission for untracked version of the GRZ chapter].</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Add matters of discretion based on the equivalent of those from the MDRZ2 proposed in V3.</p> <p>AND</p>

	Any other such relief, and consequential amendments (including zone and overlay maps, objectives and policies), as considered appropriate to give effect to the points raised in the submission.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Variation 3 does not give effect to or implement the NPS-UD, RM-EMA and MDRS as it is not sufficiently enabling and fails to expand over those areas where the current rules of the GRZ already significantly restrict housing densities and opportunities for a variety of housing types and price points. • Provides for a range of housing opportunities, densities and lots sizes; • Supports local neighbourhood shops and services; • Provides for a range of house prices to the market, including affordable housing. This supports housing for a wider demographic than a monoculture of the same sized houses and lots as currently exists in Pookeno; • Utilises residential zoned land more efficiently, allowing opportunities for integrated housing developments rather than lower density vacant fee simple lots. Pookeno is an ideal location to accommodate growth, and with its growing commercial, employment and community focus can reduce vehicle kilometres travelled compared with countryside living areas and the smaller towns and villages in the District; • Avoids the unnecessary use of highly productive rural land in the future (NPS – Highly Productive Land); • Establishes densities that can support the provision of local public transport in the medium term; • Provides for the efficient use of infrastructure; • Provides greater residential population and diversity within the growing town of Pookeno, supporting the local economy through commerce and exchange; and • Manages pressure for ongoing rezoning in the Future Urban Zone and in locations with fewer locational attributes compared with efficiently using land owned by CSL and within Pookeno West and Havelock. • These benefits outweigh the costs outlined in the Council’s Section 32.
Point Number	82.5
Plan Chapter	General Residential Zone
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend

<p>Summary of Decision Requested</p>	<p>Add a new rule in the GRZ that one to three units are permitted subject to compliance with the MDRS [see submission for untracked version of the GRZ chapter].</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any other such relief, and consequential amendments (including zone and overlay maps, objectives and policies), as considered appropriate to give effect to the points raised in the submission.</p>
<p>Decision Reason</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Variation 3 does not give effect to or implement the NPS-UD, RM-EMA and MDRS as it is not sufficiently enabling and fails to expand over those areas where the current rules of the GRZ already significantly restrict housing densities and opportunities for a variety of housing types and price points. • Provides for a range of housing opportunities, densities and lots sizes; • Supports local neighbourhood shops and services; • Provides for a range of house prices to the market, including affordable housing. This supports housing for a wider demographic than a monoculture of the same sized houses and lots as currently exists in Pookeno; • Utilises residential zoned land more efficiently, allowing opportunities for integrated housing developments rather than lower density vacant fee simple lots. Pookeno is an ideal location to accommodate growth, and with its growing commercial, employment and community focus can reduce vehicle kilometres travelled compared with countryside living areas and the smaller towns and villages in the District; • Avoids the unnecessary use of highly productive rural land in the future (NPS – Highly Productive Land); • Establishes densities that can support the provision of local public transport in the medium term; • Provides for the efficient use of infrastructure; • Provides greater residential population and diversity within the growing town of Pookeno, supporting the local economy through commerce and exchange; and • Manages pressure for ongoing rezoning in the Future Urban Zone and in locations with fewer locational attributes compared with efficiently using land owned by CSL and within Pookeno West and Havelock. • These benefits outweigh the costs outlined in the Council’s Section 32.

Point Number	82.6
Plan Chapter	General Residential Zone
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Add a new rule in the GRZ that four or more units are restricted discretionary activity subject to compliance with the MDRS and the remaining standards of the GRZ [see submission for untracked version of the GRZ chapter].</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any other such relief, and consequential amendments (including zone and overlay maps, objectives and policies), as considered appropriate to give effect to the points raised in the submission.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • V3 does not give effect to or implement the NPS-UD, RM-EMA and MDRS as it is not sufficiently enabling and fails to expand over those areas where the current rules of the GRZ already significantly restrict housing densities and opportunities for a variety of housing types and price points. • Provides for a range of housing opportunities, densities and lots sizes; • Supports local neighbourhood shops and services; • Provides for a range of house prices to the market, including affordable housing. This supports housing for a wider demographic than a monoculture of the same sized houses and lots as currently exists in Pookeno; • Utilises residential zoned land more efficiently, allowing opportunities for integrated housing developments rather than lower density vacant fee simple lots. Pookeno is an ideal location to accommodate growth, and with its growing commercial, employment and community focus can reduce vehicle kilometres travelled compared with countryside living areas and the smaller towns and villages in the District; • Avoids the unnecessary use of highly productive rural land in the future (NPS – Highly Productive Land); • Establishes densities that can support the provision of local public transport in the medium term; • Provides for the efficient use of infrastructure;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides greater residential population and diversity within the growing town of Pookeno, supporting the local economy through commerce and exchange; and • Manages pressure for ongoing rezoning in the Future Urban Zone and in locations with fewer locational attributes compared with efficiently using land owned by CSL and within Pookeno West and Havelock. • These benefits outweigh the costs outlined in the Council’s Section 32.
Point Number	82.7
Plan Chapter	Generic Topic
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Add matters of discretion for four or more units based on the equivalent of those from the MDRZ2 proposed in V3 or the notified Multi-Unit Housing discretions of the Proposed District Plan [see submission for untracked version of the GRZ chapter].</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any other such relief, and consequential amendments (including zone and overlay maps, objectives and policies), as considered appropriate to give effect to the points raised in the submission.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • V3 does not give effect to or implement the NPS-UD, RM-EMA and MDRS as it is not sufficiently enabling and fails to expand over those areas where the current rules of the GRZ already significantly restrict housing densities and opportunities for a variety of housing types and price points. • Provides for a range of housing opportunities, densities and lots sizes; • Supports local neighbourhood shops and services; • Provides for a range of house prices to the market, including affordable housing. This supports housing for a wider demographic than a monoculture of the same sized houses and lots as currently exists in Pookeno; • Utilises residential zoned land more efficiently, allowing opportunities for integrated housing developments rather than lower density vacant fee simple lots. Pookeno is an ideal location to accommodate growth, and with its growing commercial, employment and community focus can

	<p>reduce vehicle kilometres travelled compared with countryside living areas and the smaller towns and villages in the District;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoids the unnecessary use of highly productive rural land in the future (NPS – Highly Productive Land); • Establishes densities that can support the provision of local public transport in the medium term; • Provides for the efficient use of infrastructure; • Provides greater residential population and diversity within the growing town of Pookeno, supporting the local economy through commerce and exchange; and • Manages pressure for ongoing rezoning in the Future Urban Zone and in locations with fewer locational attributes compared with efficiently using land owned by CSL and within Pookeno West and Havelock. • These benefits outweigh the costs outlined in the Council’s Section 32.
Point Number	82.8
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Add a rule that for four or more units that any infringement of a MDRS rule is a restricted discretionary activity [see submission for untracked version of the GRZ chapter].</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any other such relief, and consequential amendments (including zone and overlay maps, objectives and policies), as considered appropriate to give effect to the points raised in the submission.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Variation 3 does not give effect to or implement the NPS-UD, RM-EMA and MDRS as it is not sufficiently enabling and fails to expand over those areas where the current rules of the GRZ already significantly restrict housing densities and opportunities for a variety of housing types and price points. • Provides for a range of housing opportunities, densities and lots sizes; • Supports local neighbourhood shops and services;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides for a range of house prices to the market, including affordable housing. This supports housing for a wider demographic than a monoculture of the same sized houses and lots as currently exists in Pookeno; • Utilises residential zoned land more efficiently, allowing opportunities for integrated housing developments rather than lower density vacant fee simple lots. Pookeno is an ideal location to accommodate growth, and with its growing commercial, employment and community focus can reduce vehicle kilometres travelled compared with countryside living areas and the smaller towns and villages in the District; • Avoids the unnecessary use of highly productive rural land in the future (NPS – Highly Productive Land); • Establishes densities that can support the provision of local public transport in the medium term; • Provides for the efficient use of infrastructure; • Provides greater residential population and diversity within the growing town of Pookeno, supporting the local economy through commerce and exchange; and • Manages pressure for ongoing rezoning in the Future Urban Zone and in locations with fewer locational attributes compared with efficiently using land owned by CSL and within Pookeno West and Havelock. • These benefits outweigh the costs outlined in the Council’s Section 32.
Point Number	82.9
Plan Chapter	Subdivision
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Add new subdivision rules for one to three units and four or more units based on the requirements of the MDRS and RM-EHA with the matters of discretion being equivalent to those in the MDRZ2 [see submission for untracked version of the GRZ chapter].</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any other such relief, and consequential amendments (including zone and overlay maps, objectives and policies), as considered appropriate to give effect to the points raised in the submission.</p>

Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Variation 3 does not give effect to or implement the NPS-UD, RM-EMA and MDRS as it is not sufficiently enabling and fails to expand over those areas where the current rules of the GRZ already significantly restrict housing densities and opportunities for a variety of housing types and price points. • Provides for a range of housing opportunities, densities and lots sizes; • Supports local neighbourhood shops and services; • Provides for a range of house prices to the market, including affordable housing. This supports housing for a wider demographic than a monoculture of the same sized houses and lots as currently exists in Pookeno; • Utilises residential zoned land more efficiently, allowing opportunities for integrated housing developments rather than lower density vacant fee simple lots. Pookeno is an ideal location to accommodate growth, and with its growing commercial, employment and community focus can reduce vehicle kilometres travelled compared with countryside living areas and the smaller towns and villages in the District; • Avoids the unnecessary use of highly productive rural land in the future (NPS – Highly Productive Land); • Establishes densities that can support the provision of local public transport in the medium term; • Provides for the efficient use of infrastructure; • Provides greater residential population and diversity within the growing town of Pookeno, supporting the local economy through commerce and exchange; and • Manages pressure for ongoing rezoning in the Future Urban Zone and in locations with fewer locational attributes compared with efficiently using land owned by CSL and within Pookeno West and Havelock. • These benefits outweigh the costs outlined in the Council’s Section 32.
------------------------	---

Submitter Number	83	Submitter Names	Ngāti Naho Trust
Point Number	83.1		
Plan Chapter	All of Variation		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend		

Summary of Decision Requested:	That proposed v3 to the PDP does NOT compromise or put at risk the cultural landscape of the North Waikato region known by Mana Whenua like Ngāti Naho as “Manawa-ā-whenua”(‘heart of the land’) which refers to the existence of a massive water table and aquifers that connects all our waterways in towns like (but not limited to) Tuakau, Pookeno, Mangatangi, Maramarua, Mercer, Meremere, Te Kauwhata, Ohinewai, Tahuna and Huntly.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protect Māori values in relation to Te Mana o te Wai. • Protect the objectives of the NPS-FM 2020 • Mitigate the negative impact on the current lack of three waters infrastructure. • Mitigate the negative impact and adverse effects on natural resources in particular freshwater • Manage the impact on waterways in towns like Huntly and Ngaaruawaahia that are built on the banks of the Waikato River. • Pookeno has several wetlands, springs and streams flowing through its township and into the Mangatawhiri wetlands and stream and eventually direct into the Waikato River.
Point Number	83.2
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone Policy 6
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Add ‘Manawa-ā-whenua’ as a Qualifying Matter in (MRZ2-P6).
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To recognize and protect unique and character of the “Manawa-ā-whenua” to the cultural and environmental landscape regarding the significant water table and aquifers in the North Waikato.
Point Number	83.3
Plan Chapter	All of Variation
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Add Te Mana o te Wai principles relating to the roles of tangata whenua and other New Zealanders in the management of freshwater, and these principles inform this National Policy Statement and its implementation.
Decision Reason	To protect the 6 principles of Te Mana o te Wai by infusing it in te PDP namely: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mana whakahaere: the power, authority, and obligations of tangata whenua to make decisions that maintain, protect, and sustain the health and well-being of, and their relationship with, freshwater.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kaitiakitanga: the obligation of tangata whenua to preserve, restore, enhance, and sustainably use freshwater for the benefit of present and future generations Manaakitanga: the process by which tangata whenua show respect, generosity, and care for freshwater and for others • Governance: the responsibility of those with authority for making decisions about freshwater to do so in a way that prioritises the health and well-being of freshwater now and into the future Stewardship: the obligation of all New Zealanders to manage freshwater in a way that ensures it sustains present and future generations • Care and respect: the responsibility of all New Zealanders to care for freshwater in providing for the health of the nation.
Point Number	83.4
Plan Chapter	All of Variation
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Amend Variation 3 by including requirements for green infrastructure and low impact design.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter is concerned that proposed Variation 3 may prejudice or jeopardise the vision and strategy for the Waikato River as outlined in the vision and strategy for the Waikato River • The submitter is concerned that the proposed Variation may affect hapu aspirations of Ngati Naho regarding our waterways in particular the Waikato River, the Whangamarino and Mangatawhiri wetlands, Lake Waikare, Lake Whangape, Lake Rotongaro and the various puna wai throughout our traditional boundary and area of interest for Ngati Naho.
Point Number	83.5
Plan Chapter	All of Variation
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Apply a 1.2km buffer zone along the Waikato River, Lake Waikare, and the Whangamarino and Mangatawhiri wetlands that excludes any medium or high-density housing.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevent the negative impact and adverse effects of housing construction and development on the Waikato River and its waterways and tributaries including Lake Waikare and the Whangamarino and Mangatawhiri wetlands. • Provide a buffer zone against medium to high density housing especially in towns that are built on the banks of the Waikato River like Huntly and Ngaaruawaahia including Pookeno with the

	hydrology flow and network of streams that flow into the Mangatawhiri wetlands, stream and eventually into the Waikato River.
Point Number	83.6
Plan Chapter	All of Variation
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support
Summary of Decision Requested	Retain Outstanding natural features and landscapes s6(b) as a qualifying matter
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To ensure outstanding natural features are always protected from the negative impacts of the proposed v3 to the PDP. For example, natural features and landscapes like the Waikato River and Lake Waikare.
Point Number	83.7
Plan Chapter	All of Variation
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support
Summary of Decision Requested	Retain Areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna s6(c) as a qualifying matter
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To ensure areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna are always protected from the negative impacts of the proposed v3 to the PDP. For example, significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna like the Whangamarino and Mangatawhiri Wetlands and all its their waterways and tributaries.
Point Number	83.8
Plan Chapter	All of Variation
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support
Summary of Decision Requested	Retain Maintenance and enhancement of public access to and along lakes and rivers s6(d)
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To protect, mitigate or regulate the negative impact of public access and use of our lakes and rivers.
Point Number	83.9
Plan Chapter	All of Variation
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support

Summary of Decision Requested	Retain Management of significant risks from natural hazards s6(h) s77I (b) - Matter required to give effect to a national policy statement
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The lower Waikato River catchment is notoriously renowned for flooding at least once or twice a year. • The increase in population growth will have by default a greater demand and stress on existing infrastructure not to mention inadequate or non-existent infrastructure especially in relation to 3 Waters infrastructure.
Point Number	83.10
Plan Chapter	All of Variation
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support
Summary of Decision Requested	Retain Reverse Sensitivity
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact of reserves sensitivity matters regarding agriculture and horticultural development. • Reverse sensitivity relevant to both district and regional plan matters namely, noise, dust, spray drift, odour etc.
Point Number	83.11
Plan Chapter	Generic Topic
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support
Summary of Decision Requested	Retain the 800m walkable catchment from each of the four town centres AND Apply low impact design principles and guidelines
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter considers the outer fringe should remain as General Residential Zone.
Point Number	83.12
Plan Chapter	All of Variation
Support/ Oppose/ amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Increase the requirement for green spaces on a property AND Increase the distance and buffer zone between neighbour's boundaries.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure green spaces are provided given the impact of rapid and sudden population growth within the community because of the proposed v3 to the PDP.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Greenspaces are required so children have space and room to play outside, and houses are not stacked on top of each other or crammed next to each other increasing the green space deficit on properties.
Point Number	83.13
Plan Chapter	Maps
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support
Summary of Decision Requested	Retain the provisions and zoning pattern for Te Kauwahta and Raglan
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Population growth in Te Kauwhata and Raglan is rapidly increasing despite a severe lack of infrastructure for 3 waters and effective town planning Geographic proximity to the Raglan waterways and harbour and Lake Waikare for Te Kauwhata.
Point Number	83.14
Plan Chapter	All of Variation
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Add that prevent multi storey dwellings being constructed close to boundaries. AND Add implementation of low impact design builds.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter wants to protect communities from being split and protect WDC's vision for connected communities. Protect the health and wellbeing of the individuals and the community. Multi storey dwellings constructed close to boundaries will have adverse effects on neighbours – such as being cast in shadow, loss of outlook and claustrophobic conditions.
Point Number	83.15
Plan Chapter	All of Variation
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Add provisions that better manage impacts on services in particular three waters, electricity, energy, transport, telecommunications, internet and waste management.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No reasons stated
Point Number	83.16

Plan Chapter	Generic topic
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Add principles of fairness and equity provisions.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevent the devaluation of properties. • Prevent the loss of lifestyle, outlook, and surrounds. • Prevent homeowners from being blindsided by v3 developments. • Prevent existing housing and property covenants from being undermined or removed. • Prevent the potential for another Variation in the future being imposed on communities e.g., going from 3 storey to storey buildings. • Prevent people being pepper-potted in the community. • Prevent the character of a town or community from being changed or adversely affected.
Point Number	83.17
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Delete consultation not required from neighbours
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevent the lack of informed consent and consultation. • Protect democratic processes so neighbours are consulted, and consent is required. • Prevent property owners and indeed the community from being blindsided by v3 style housing and typology. • Prevent Council from approving or pushing through developments it knows will be unpopular or controversial.
Point Number	83.18
Plan Chapter	All of Variation
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Ensure there are no breaches of existing treaty of Waitangi Settlements namely, Waikato Raupatu Settlement Act 1995, Waikato River Settlement Act 2010.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not stated
Point Number	83.189

Plan Chapter	All of Variation
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Ensure that the proposed v3 to the PDP does not prejudice, discriminate, compromise or jeopardize residual or outstanding Treaty of Waitangi Claims (including any claims under Te Tiriti) and the potential redress mechanisms available such as co-governance and or co-management with Council or the potential return of RFR properties held by central or local government.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Protect the implementation of Hapū / Iwi Environmental Management Plans that address for example, Wai Māori / Wai Ora.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Protect the implementation of Hapū / Iwi Social Development Plans that address for example, Papakāinga Housing or Kaumātua Housing or hapū, marae or whānau development initiatives.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outstanding Treaty of Waitangi Claims that have yet to reach settlement within WDC catchment that are currently in Negotiations with the Crown in particular for this submission the wai.2035 claim for Te Paina Mercer and the mauri and mana of the Waikato river and its people.
Point Number	83.20
Plan Chapter	Generic topic
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Retain National Policy Statement for Electricity Transmission s77I (c) - Te Ture Whaimana o te Awa o Waikato</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Add a setback from wind and solar plants of 3km to 5km from medium density housing.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To mitigate the negative impact and stress from population growth and subsequent rising demand for hydro generated electricity on the 8 hydro dams along the Waikato, from Aratiatia to Karaapiro that have drowned important cultural and geothermal sites, altered fisheries, changed the Waikato river's ecology, hydrology, sedimentology, morphology, water clarity and quality, temperature regime, and recreational uses. To mitigate the impact of renewable energy generation from wind and solar.
Point Number	83.21
Plan Chapter	Generic topic

Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Mitigate the negative impact of existing roads and the construction of new roads that consume land resources and cause adverse impacts on natural water resources and discharge areas. The three most damaging effects of road construction and management are noise, dust, and vibrations.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Road construction and excavation can lead to soil exposed and erosion caused by changes in ground runoff conditions; road engineering destroys surface vegetation, resulting in a decrease in plant species and ecosystem structure and function; road construction destroys wildlife habitat.
Point Number	83.22
Plan Chapter	Generic topic
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support
Summary of Decision Requested	Not stated. The submitter states that the topic relates to the North Island Main Trunk rail.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Similarly, to road construction and excavation railway construction can lead to soil exposed and erosion caused by changes in ground runoff conditions; rail engineering can destroy surface vegetation, resulting in a decrease in plant species and ecosystem structure and function and rail construction can lead to the destruction of wildlife habitats and ecosystems. Rail freight and cargo rail can lead to safer roads and less pollution with the removal of trucks and heavy transport from the roads and motorways.
Point Number	83.23
Plan Chapter	Generic topic
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Add protection of the mana, mauri and wairua of the Waikato River and its people.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To restore the mauri and mana of the Waikato River and its people as stated by King Taawhiao when he placed Te Pou o Mangatawhiri, at Te Paina (Mercer). To protect and empower Mana Whenua to their exercise Mana Whakahaere as provided by the Waikato River Settlement Act 2010 to uphold and fulfil our obligation and responsibility.
Point Number	83.24
Plan Chapter	Generic topic
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Add the following to Natural character of the waterbodies and their margins s6(a):

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Including the mana, mauri and wairua of the Waikato River.</u> • <u>Including the wairua and mauri of the Manawa-ā-whenua.</u> • <u>Including the mauri tupua and mauri taniwha.</u>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not specifically stated.
Point Number	83.25
Plan Chapter	All of Variation
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Add Wairua as a Qualifying Matter in Reference A (MRZ2-P6).
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To protect the unique and special character of Wairua to the cultural and environmental landscape given the significant presence of the metaphysical entities and locations in the of the North Waikato.
Point Number	83.26
Plan Chapter	Generic topic
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support
Summary of Decision Requested	Add all of Ngati Naho's sites of cultural significance and protect and enhance them AND protect the heritage trail of the 1863-1864 land wars.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To protect and enhance all our sites of cultural significance in our rohe for Ngāti Naho including but not limited to waahi tapu, puna wai, urupa, marae, pā, papakāinga, repo, roto, pūkaki, awa, maunga, tokatapu, rākau, ana or pou. • For example, Te Pou o Mangatawhiri between Pookeno and Te Paina (Mercer) • To protect the heritage trail regarding the 1863 -1864 land wars.
Point Number	83.27
Plan Chapter	All of Variation
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Retain Section 6(e). within Variation 3 (Relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga)

Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To protect our mana (authority), kaitiakitanga (guardianship), tikanga (customs) mahi kai (Traditional practices and activities), whakapapa (identity and connection to the land and waterways) and kōrero tuku iho (history). To prevent breaches of Article 1 and 2 of the Treaty of Waitangi by WDC. To protect article 3 of the Treaty of Waitangi being breached by WDC. To prevent breaches of Te Tiriti o Waitangi. To ensure our aboriginal rights under common law are not prejudiced and or extinguished. to prevent the undermining of the Principles of the Treaty of Waitangi.
------------------------	---

Point Number	83.28
Plan Chapter	All of Variation
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose
Summary of Decision Requested	Reject Variation 3 changes to the Proposed Waikato District Plan.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refer to the reasons in Subm: 83.1 to 83.27.

Point Number	83.29
Plan Chapter	All of Variation
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose
Summary of Decision Requested	Add the 6 pou indicators in Subm 83.1 to 83.27 to the Waikato District including their reason.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refer to the reasons in Subm: 83.1 to 83.27.

Submitter Number	84	Submitter Names	Bruce Knobbs
Point Number	84.1		
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Amend MRZ2-S2 Height – building general from 11m to 7m so that it permits only 2 floors		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New builds should only accommodate 2 floors (ground and first). This is the same as an existing double-story house height. 		
Point Number	84.2		
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2		

Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Oppose
Summary of Decision Requested	Amend MRZ2-S5 Building coverage so that it allows only two dwellings per 600sqm site (300sqm per dwelling) of which building covers only 35-40%. The submission seeks no site smaller than 300sqm.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site coverage will provide for a building with a single floor dwelling of 120sqm max (which can be increased if building increases by one level.
Point Number	84.3
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Oppose
Summary of Decision Requested	Amend MRZ2-S12 Fences or walls to be at least 1.8m solid.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduces the probability of a fire in single dwelling spreading though the community. Two adjacent dwelling are then 8m apart physically.
Point Number	84.4
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Amend MRZ2-S12 Fences or walls to be at least 1.8m solid.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is in line with existing boundary fences / walls in the community.
Point Number	84.5
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Oppose
Summary of Decision Requested	Amend MRZ2-S6 Outdoor living space (per unit) so that outdoor living space is at least 150sqm.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More space around the house for young families. The effect of green space is more pronounced than a 20sqm outdoor space.

Submitter Number	85	Submitter Names	Mirika Paul
Point Number	85.1		
Plan Chapter	All of Variation		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Delete Variation 3 provisions from the Proposed District Plan.		

Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter opposes the building of apartments complexes within Ngaaruawaahia, especially near the marae area. • Near the bottom of papakainga and marae it floods during the wet season and the waters rise quickly. The houses won't last near the riverbank. It's a hazard. • The community want to keep Ngaaruawaahia as natural and scenic as much as possible. • Remove this idea and start working on fixing the roads instead and getting more businesses into town. • With Variation 3 it would be impossible to keep the rural feel. Ngaaruawaahia should not have the complexes built in the town as the town is better without skyscrapers. • The council need to fix the centre hub and work on more youth hubs. • The submitter is concerned as health care should be a priority and is the area where council should be looking. The town needs indoor farmers markets. Ngaaruawaahia is not like Hamilton.
------------------------	--

Submitter Number	86	Submitter Names	Wendy & Shane Harrod
Point Number	86.1		
Plan Chapter	Generic Topic		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose		
Summary of Decision Requested:	<p>No specific decision requested, however submission opposes the proposed 3 x 3 housing changes in Pookeno and expresses the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Covenants to protect the country village lifestyle in a rural setting. • Changes to the outlook of Pookeno. • Infrastructure cost, including wastewater. • Blocking of sun. • Privacy. • Devaluing existing properties. • Character. 		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understands growth will happen and accepted this with covenants to protect the country village lifestyle in the community. • This new proposal will ultimately change the outlook of Pookeno as planned. 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The inclusion of the proposed 3 x 3 housing in a town that is already struggling with keeping up with the demand of the rapidly growing subdivisions is only going to cause further issues for the community going forward. • To add several houses on one property will only long-term cause further issues for the rapid growth of the town. • The possibility of high-rise buildings will cause sun blockage, neighbours overlooking your entire property from a great height, de-value existing properties and just the plain out of character look this will have to the Pookeno Community.
--	--

Submitter Number	87	Submitter Names	Marae Tukere
Point Number	87.1		
Plan Chapter	Generic Topic		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend		
Summary of Decision Requested	Confirmation that the current and future water infrastructure is adequate to support intensified housing AND There must be no further discharge to the awa.		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Negative impact on te awa o Waikato is the paramount consideration. 		
Point Number	87.2		
Plan Chapter	All of Variation		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Maps		
Summary of Decision Requested	Apply a buffer area between the Tuurangawaewae Marae and any intensified housing development. AND Any associated consequential amendments		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The impact on the Marae needs to be taken into account. Tuurangawaewae Marae needs special consideration. 		
Point Number	87.3		
Plan Chapter	All of Variation		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Not stated		
Summary of Decision Requested	Not stated		

Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter accepts there is an urgent need for housing but considers there should also be consideration of the impact of intensified housing on the visual and physical aspects of our residential streets. Missed opportunity in Variation 3 for provisions to be included in the Proposed District Plan that can support property owners who choose not to develop their property to protect their privacy and other interests.
Point Number	87.4
Plan Chapter	All of Variation
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Consider whether the Variation should only apply to alternate sections
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This approach would prevent current residential streets from becoming urban.
Point Number	87.5
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Add provisions that protect the privacy and amenity of properties. AND Any associated consequential amendments.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not every property wants to develop to the full extent permitted. There is a missed opportunity in Variation 3 for provisions to be included in the Proposed District Plan that can support property owners who choose not to develop their property to protect their privacy and other interests.
Point Number	87.6
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2 MRZ-O6
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested:	Amend MRZ2-O6 Reverse Sensitivity as: <i>(1) Avoid or minimise the potential for reverse sensitivity by:</i> <i>(a) managing the location and design of sensitive activities through:</i> <i>- The use of building setbacks; and</i> <i>- The design of subdivisions and development.</i> <i><u>(b) Enabling properties/sites that do not develop to medium density residential to protect its privacy and</u></i>

	<p><u>amenity</u> <u>(c) restricting the development of sections immediately adjacent to the awa and to Tuurangawaewae Marae</u> AND Any associated consequential amendments.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter believes that council have missed the opportunity in Variation for provisions to be included that can support property owners who choose not to develop. • The submitter wishes to avoid adverse effects of permitted and controlled and use building activities that may occur directly next to them. • The submitter wishes that the status of Tuurangawaewae marae as a significant place of historical and cultural importance is recognised.
Point Number	87.7
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Amend the rule P11by adding in a new (2) as follows: <u>(2) Allow structures, and/or screen planting, that protect privacy and amenity on properties/sites that adjoin medium density residential development</u> AND And any associated consequential amendments.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter wishes to avoid adverse effects of permitted and controlled use building activities that may occur directly next to them.
Plan Number	87.8
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2 -
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Amend the name of Standard 4 rule as follows Setbacks <u>for Medium Density Residential Development</u> AND any associated consequential amendments</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No reason stated
Point Number	87.9
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential 2 - S9A and General Residential Zone

Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Add a new rule <i>MRZ2-S9AScreening on Non-Medium Density Residential developed properties</i> that enables privacy structures of 4m high or trees of 11m high (refer to submission) with associated matters of discretion. AND Any associated consequential amendments
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter believes that the council have missed the opportunity in Variation for provisions to be included that can support property owners who choose not to develop. • The submitter wishes to avoid adverse effects of permitted and controlled and use building activities that may occur directly next to them. • Having screening will help mitigate adverse effects that will be caused from enabling Variation 3.
Point Number	87.10
Plan Chapter	Generic Topic
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend to restrict the proposed 3 up model on sections immediately adjacent to the awa.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To avoid blocking the river views for other residents.

Submitter Number	88	Submitter Names	Brenda Roberts
Point Number	88.1		
Plan Chapter	Maps		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Amend the proposal to make existing General residential zone to Medium Density Residential Zone 2. The submission opposes the proposal and refers in particular to Pookeno.		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed rezone from GRZ to MRZ2 does not take into account the CBD of Pookeno township and the design process that past and present Pookeno Group Committee members and community members have “submitted” on to Council through previous Council Roadshows and meeting forums. • 3 storey residential housing from Helenslee Rd to Selby Street is not going to create a lifestyle of village living for families, rather ghetto style living due to small properties that have no provision for off street parking or areas for on site rubbish disposal/recycling. 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pookeno only has a bus service to and from Pukekohe and nowhere else, what is already a traffic management nightmare in the Main Street and surrounding roading network of Pookeno becomes more difficult and challenging to navigate. Does not allow for the Rural or Village feel of Pookeno to be retained that has been guaranteed in another Council document.
Point Number	88.2
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested:	Amend Medium Density Residential Zone to be up to 3 houses and limited to 2 storeys.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Variation 3 is not just renaming, MDRZ2 is much more than that, intensification becomes High and not Medium.

Submitter Number	89	Submitter Names	Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd
Point Number	89.1		
Plan Chapter	All of Variation		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend		
Summary of Decision Requested	Require Council to work collaboratively with industry and network utility providers to integrate infrastructure connection for all medium density residential service connections – not only limited to Council owned infrastructure		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a wider land development industry concern in relation to how and when Tier 1 Councils regulate connections outside the land use consent provisions and standards. BWS interested to see if WDC is looking at a pre-development infrastructure connection policy. 		
Point Number	89.2		
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Amend MRZ2-P3 as follows <i>Policy MRZ2-P3: Enable housing <u>and associated services</u> to be designed to meet the day-to-day needs of residents</i>		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Submitter supports the policy direction; however, it is considered that the scope of the policy could be slightly expanded upon to include connection to infrastructure services. 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Such connections are aligned with the words “...day-to-day needs...,” and therefore will not diminish the purpose and intent behind the policy. • From a surveying perspective, it is important to consider any built development from a probable subdivision or unit titling perspective. • There are MRZ2 performance criteria relating to controlled activity subdivision, there is risk if services connections have been planned or provided for with only a retrospective subdivision (and easement) design/ramification in mind. • The Submitter contends that appropriate reference to a well-considered infrastructure connection direction under VAR 3 is appropriate – with MRZ-P3 sought to be amended as suggested.
Point Number	89.3
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support
Summary of Decision Requested	Retain MRZ2-P11 Reverse Sensitivity.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Submitter supports this policy and direction as it relates to a qualifying matter. • The Submitter considers that lawfully established activities is a broad term which can be applied to both residential and non-residential land use activities. • The effects that will be established under the MDRS in most instances will be acceptable for abutting general residential zoned properties. • Existing residential land use will be significantly, and unreasonably effected from an amenity and character perspective (i.e., dominance, shading and visual). • If a high-density development is being considered at the interface with a general residential zone - the ability for Council (and or the developer) to consider permitted activities compliance with policy MRZ2-P11 will be useful in providing a degree of environmental balance to the initial stages of any given development proposal.
Point Number	89.4
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Amend development standard and/or permitted activity criterion is provided under VAR 3 to the effect that the MDRS relating to internal rear and side-yard building setbacks with GRZ land are to be 1.5m as opposed to only 1.0m. OR in the alternate a buffer area could be applied on the planning maps

Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter acknowledges that a 0.5m additional setback is a nominal distance. • It is considered the potential adverse environmental effects of the MDRS on the GRZ • The relief being sought will recognise a cross boundary impact and consequently implement a sensible mitigation to actual and potential effects. • The submitter considers that the effect of the urban fringe Qualifying Matter means that urban (general Residential Zone - GRZ) areas on the immediate periphery to MRZ2 zoned land (and which are not separated by a transportation corridor) will be subject to an unreasonable level of potential dominance effect given the MRDS.
------------------------	--

Submitter Number	90	Submitter Names	Patricia Burns
Point Number	90.1		
Plan Chapter	Maps		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Delete Variation 3 from Pookeno.		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pookeno does lacks the infrastructure to support the housing. • Environmental impact as green space will be diminished. • Effect on character, particularly overcrowding, traffic issues and congestion. 		

Submitter Number	91	Submitter Names	John Moeke
Point Number	91.1		
Plan Chapter	all of Variation		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Amend Variation 3 to include notification with neighbours adjoining properties		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It will cause overshadowing of natural light and will lose privacy. 		

Submitter Number	92	Submitter Names	Anna Wilson
Point Number	92.1		
Plan Chapter	All of Variation		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Reconsider the 800m and apply the Medium Density Residential Zone to focus on the areas that are yet to be developed, not areas that have existing covenants. Submission refers to Pookeno.		

Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presence of covenants which outline restrictions on how the land can be used or developed e.g. only allowed a single storey house. • The objective of these covenants being to maintain the quality of a subdivision and the value of the properties within it. • Will affect the value of existing houses. • Outlook will be different. • Change the character if the neighbourhood. • Galston Court in Pookeno is highly congested with traffic and parking – especially during school drop off and pick up times. • Huge safety concerns with kids crossing and cars u-turning in the entrance to Galston Court and around the centre barrier on Hillpark Drive near the daycare. • The Medium density housing is to accommodate more people but often doesn't include more garages. • Further strain on the infrastructure.
------------------------	---

Submitter Number	93	Submitter Names	Waikato Community Lands Trust & Others
Point Number	93.1		
Plan Chapter	All of Variation		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend		
Summary of Decision Requested	Variation 3 be amended to include new Plan provisions on inclusionary zoning and including financial contributions.		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inclusionary zoning is an important response to affordability issues. • Objections to inclusionary zoning are not supported by empirical evidence refer Hill Young Cooper report attached to submission. • The view of the submitters is that inclusionary zoning is lawful and justifiable. • Common criticism of inclusionary zoning are conceptual and not empirical. • Model plan provisions can be based on the Queenstown provisions. 		

Submitter Number	94	Submitter Names	Mr and Mrs. Lex Deaby
Point Number	94.1		
Plan Chapter	Maps		

Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose
Summary of Decision Requested:	Retain height restrictions for buildings. Submission opposes rezoning of streets.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Privacy. • Shade effects. • Natural light will be lost to neighbours. • Need to retain the character of town. • Freedom of space is essential for all. • Considers we are not a city

Submitter Number	95	Submitter Names	Adrian Paul Van Weerden
Point Number	95.1		
Plan Chapter	All of Variation		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend		
Summary of Decision Requested:	The submitter is seeking amendment to the Variation. No specific decision requested. i		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter makes reference to a property that is within the 800m o catchment area and that there is a busy kindergarten across the road and that there should not be heavy vehicles near it • The submitter makes reference to the property having an established residential house for 65 years. • The submitter makes reference to a historic building next door for community gatherings and questions who would want industry surrounding it. 		

Submitter Number	96	Submitter Names	Greg Wiechern
Point Number	96.1		
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Delete Medium Density Residential Zone 2. Submission expresses particular concern about Ngaaruawahia.		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Much of the area in Ngaaruawaahia isn't suitable for this form of development. • The town is generally a commuter town for people working in Hamilton and there isn't suitable public transport. • The Ngaaruawahia town centre currently has very limited services for residents. T • The existing supermarket has no space to develop, many of the other businesses are take away food premises. Few people will go to a supermarket and carry their groceries home. 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Medium density creates an issue for parking · Property prices do not drop with this type of development. • Medium density development really doesn't stack up in Ngaaruawaahia. The reason why many people have moved to the town is affordability of houses with space around them. • The prices have to be lower than in Hamilton as there is the time and cost of commuting to be taken into account. • Most families prefer to have some space. • Ngaaruawaahia really needs an area to setup a retirement village. • If built, any medium density housing must be built in a controlled manner, not randomly at a developer's whim. • It must allow for suitable leisure areas. · Some areas on Lower Waikato Esplanade, Old Taupiri Road, River Road, Hakarimata Road and Waingaro Road are designated as high risk flood area and/or Flood plain management area.
--	--

Submitter Number	97	Submitter Names	Jim Ivens
Point Number	97.1		
Plan Chapter	All of Variation		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Delete Variation 3 provisions from the Proposed District Plan		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council should recognise that the first priority is to its ratepayers and reject Variation 3 • The successive governments have failed to address the housing issues in New Zealand • This has been exacerbated by the current government with its Kiwi build monumental failure and its failure to get councils to free up land for residential purposes 		
Point Number	97.2		
Plan Chapter	All of Variation		
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Oppose in part		
Summary of Decision Requested	If the Council approve the Variation amend the walkable catchment criteria from 800m to 500m and consider applying it from a supermarket or High School, AND Amend the Variation 3 criteria to be single story		

Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter is concerned with the restrictions relating to the 800m walkable catchments and how MDRS was implemented in the four towns. • The submitter considers that given that very few people walk for services a criteria of 500m distance would be more effective. The submitter questions whether a cost benefit analysis is required to upgrade the existing infrastructure to meet the demands. • The Council needs to accept it would effectively destroy neighbourhoods and take responsibility for losses to homeowners eg sale price reductions.
Point Number	97.3
Plan Chapter	Maps
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Oppose in part
Summary of Decision Requested	Amend Variation 3 to exclude 69b Hakanoa Street as it is outside the 800m walkable catchment AND Delete other properties that are outside the 800m walkable catchment and those that are covered by other Variations to avoid confusion
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Variation 3 is applied to 69b Hakanoa Street but is located 1.04km from Huntly as such should be excluded. • There are confusing overlapping Variations to the district plan for instance the flooding Variation and this Variation. • The Council needs to accept it would effectively destroy neighbourhoods and take responsibility for losses to homeowners eg sale price reduction.

Submitter Number	98	Submitter Names	Turangawaewae Rugby League Sports and Cultural Club
Point Number	98.1		
Plan Chapter	Generic Topic		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Amend the Variation to apply Section 771(a) Section 6 matters to include the surrounding areas of Turangawaewae marae.		
Decision Reason	This includes significant cultural and historic areas.		
Point Number	98.2		

Plan Chapter	Maps
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Amend the zoning of the properties surrounding Tuurangawaewae Marae, including River Road, Regent Street, Kent Street, George Street, Edward Street, King and Queen Street that were proposed to be rezoned MDRS.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It will affect the natural character, historic landscape, heritage and well-being of the area. • Traffic congestion around Tuurangawaewae Marae will increase and affect whanau and major cultural events. • Parking for events is already limited. • Noise levels may increase and possibly affect cultural practices. • 3 storey / 11 metre structures would diminish the cultural significance of Tuurangawaewae Marae and more important the Kiingitanga. • The buildings would pose a distraction and blight on the landscape of the area. • The area chosen for the Marae was based on the Waikato River, confluence with the Waipaa River and cultural viewshafts to Taupiri Maunga and the Hakarimata Range. • These important attributes should not be diminished by property developers who will not appropriately consider those views.

Submitter Number	99	Submitter Names	Harkness Henry Lawyers
Point Number	99.1		
Plan Chapter	Maps		
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend		
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Ensure all General Residential Zones have the Medium Density Standards applied as anticipated by the Resource Management Act (Enabling Housing Supply Act and Other Matters Amendment Act)</p> <p>OR</p> <p>In the alternative, if the MDRS is not applied in the General Residential zone, apply the MDRS to 61 Old Taupiri Road, 26 Jackson Steet Ngaaruawaahia, 99 and 99A Ngaaruawaahia Road, Ngaaruawaahia, 18 Rangaimarie Road, Ngaaruawaahia AND retain the Medium Density Residential Zone 2 in 15 and 29/33 Galbraith Street Ngaaruawaahia</p> <p>OR</p>		

	<p>if the MDRS is not applied to the General Residential Zone, or the General Residential zone is not rezoned to medium Density Residential 2 Zone, that the Comprehensive Residential development ('CRD' rules are reinstated AND Rezone 99A Ngaaruawaahia Road and 18 Rangimarie Road are rezoned to include the whole property under the one General Residential Zone to avoid having half in the General Residential Zone and half in the Rural Zone.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Having the MDRS applied to all residential zones will mean the Council's Variation is compliant with the Amendment Act. • The walkable catchment is not a tool to limit the application of the MDRS in residential zones • The GRZ is still accessible to dairies, petrol stations, parks, schools etc. • There is no difference with infrastructure requirements, the boundary is based on the walkable catchment. • The GRZ restrictions should not be imposed as these limits the dwelling types that should be available for developers to assist in achieving housing outcomes. • More development will provide more affordable dwelling options. • The listed properties are large meaning residential amenity will not be affected. • Reverse sensitivity will not be an issue because of the activities that take place.

Submitter Number	100	Submitter Names	GDP Developments
Point Number	100.1		
Plan Chapter	Generic Topic		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Support in part		
Summary of Decision Requested:	<p>Amend the zoning of the site at 111 Harrisville Road, Tuakau from General Rural Zone to Medium Residential Zone 2 OR Amend the zoning of the site at 111 Harrisville Road, Tuakau from General Rural to General Residential (which is the less preferred option) AND Amend the zoning of the existing sites accessed off Percy Graham Drive and Gordon Paul Place from General Residential zone to Medium Density Residential Zone 2</p>		

	AND Any consequential amendments to the text of the PWDP – Decisions Version that are required to give effect to the submission
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will better achieve the objectives the Variation and the requirements of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development, the Waikato Regional Policy Statement, and Council’s own growth strategies. • More appropriate way to meet the objectives of the Variation, in particular MRZ2-O2 · Including the subject site in the MDR2 zone will make a meaningful contribution to achieving sufficient development capacity at Tuakau and the Waikato generally. • The development plan for the site is for 220 residential lots as shown in the submission. • The proposed lots are “infrastructure ready” in that they can be serviced with water, wastewater and stormwater in the short term. • The lots are “feasible” and “can reasonably be expected to be realised” • There are no significant impediments to development. • The site is only some 900m from the town centre and therefore will form a “walkable catchment” where residents live in close proximity to retail, transport and other services. • It is also located just below the Harrisville School.

Submitter Number	101	Submitter Names	Jim Livett
Point Number	101.1		
Plan Chapter	MRZ2		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Amend the proposal to a tiered transition between single and three storey properties OR Add the whole of Matipo Drive, Tuakau in MDRZ2		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Three storey housing on south facing slope will remove natural light from entering the submitters property, especially in the winter • A tiered transition from single to three storey properties would allow light to be able to angle into the section • There would be a significant drop in privacy for the submitter • Relocating the boundary for three storey properties would reduce the reduction of sunlight on all houses 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the proposal proceeds, the whole of the street should be approved to allow homeowners who would otherwise be affected but without any of the benefits of being able to subdivide their own property.
--	---

Submitter Number	102	Submitter Names	Kenneth Whyte
Point Number	102.1		
Plan Chapter	Maps		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Amend the area proposed for Variation 3 for Tuakau to be within 300 metres of the periphery of The Town Centre Zone		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed area so far is too large for a town the size of Tuakau, and it includes the new Riverside Grove subdivision and areas too close to Tuakau Primary School. This would streamline future Tuakau development by creating three residential densities: High density Residential close to the Town Centre to Medium Density Residential and then Residential. 		

Submitter Number	103	Submitter Names	Perjuli Developments Limited
Point Number	103.1		
Plan Chapter	Maps		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Rezone 5837 Great South Road to Medium Density Residential 1 Zone		
To Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The property is only 1.1km to the south of Ngaaruawaahia's MRZ2 area (VAR 3) and is therefore easily accessible to the Town Centre Zone. Mass transportation networks (i.e., regular bus services) are easily available to Hamilton City, with the industrial and commercial areas of North Hamilton (Te Rapa) being only 8km to the south of the property. The submitter considers Variation 3 has ignored land to the south of Ngaaruawaahia as appropriate to enable medium density housing; and consequently, requests that this be addressed through the VAR 3 review process. The availability and capacity of infrastructure is considered to provide Council and the local community with confidence that enabling a higher density of residential development at 5837 Great South Road is a pragmatic and sensible proposition – and furthermore that such density will 		

	<p>not be to the detriment of the safe and efficient provision of services to the adjacent residential areas to the south of Ngaaruawaahia.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The land subject to this submission is immediately adjacent to the recently completed Stage 5 of the River Terraces residential development, and consequently infrastructure (including transportation) has been provided to the location at to a level and standard commensurate the latest resilience and technical construction standards. • The submitter considers enabling a higher density of residential development under Variation 3 represents an efficient use of infrastructure, and furthermore, such efficiency presents a benefit to both local residents and ratepayers of the wider Waikato District.
--	--

Submitter Number	104	Submitter Names	Aaron Holland
Point Number	104.1		
Plan Chapter	Maps		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Amend the zoning of the property at 2D Ellery Street Ngaaruawahia (legally described as Lot 4 DP 498598) from a split zoning of Medium Density Residential Zone / Industrial zone to be Medium Density Residential Zone 2 in its entirety.		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site falls within a walkable catchment to the Ngaaruawahia Town Centre, and is not subject to a qualifying matter. • Meets legislative requirements. Enables additional residential capacity in the district's larger towns subject to qualifying matters. Contributes towards achieving the targets for housing development capacity as set out in the PDP and Future Proof. Enables a variety of housing choice. • Reduces pressure on urban expansion and associated infrastructure investment requirements by enabling more intensification of existing urban areas. • Creates quality built form outcomes. • Delivers on a more walkable and compact urban form by increasing residential intensification in close proximity to the town centres of the four largest towns. 		

Submitter Number	105	Submitter Names	Havelock Villages Limited
Point Number	105.1		
Plan Chapter	Maps		

Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested:	<p>Amend to apply the MDRS to all residential land within urban environments of the District, subject to any legitimate qualifying matters. This would apply to Pookeno, Tuakau, Huntly and Ngaaruawaahia. If necessary, a new zone created to accommodate that amendment. This zone could be referred to as General Residential Zone 2 (GRZ2) or similar.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any other such relief, and consequential amendments (including zone and overlay maps, objectives and policies), as considered appropriate to give effect to the points raised in the submission.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports enabling development throughout the main settlements in the district especially in those areas identified as suitable for urban growth and development in the PWDP.
Point Number	105.2
Plan Chapter	Qualifying Matter
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Oppose
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Delete the Urban Fringe qualifying matter, which fails to meet the relevant statutory requirements and is inappropriate.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any other such relief, and consequential amendments (including zone and overlay maps, objectives and policies), as considered appropriate to give effect to the points raised in the submission (which could include the application of the MRZ2 to the full extent over the four settlements that the submitter is seeking MDRS over.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Act does not contemplate a general qualifying matter applying to multiple sites based on general planning principles. • The principle of the qualifying matter is contrary to the clear intent of the RM-EHA. • The urban fringe qualifying matter fails to meet the threshold of either national importance or national significance. • The Urban Fringe Qualifying Matter is a generalised matter and not the site-specific assessment contemplated by the RM-EHA.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The section 32 evaluation does not undertake the detailed site-by-site analysis and is based largely on general principles of walkable catchments and the ideal locations for greater density. • This is inconsistent with the intent of the RM-EMA which is providing for greater density within walkable catchments of centres and rapid transit. • The Urban Fringe qualifying matter is not a matter with sufficient merit or significance to disqualify land beyond the 800m walkable catchment from town centres from utilising the MDRS. • Fails to recognise the mobility provided by other forms active transport, along with simply that given the size and layout of the towns all land and residents in the GRZ are in close proximity to the town centres. • Fails to recognise that higher density residential options are appropriate in many other areas beyond the strict 800m metric (particularly where the GRZ only now provides for one dwelling per site as a permitted activity). • There are a number of advantages to the GRZ providing for MDRS, including range of housing opportunities, supporting local neighbourhood shops and services, range of housing prices, efficient use of the land resource. • Does not provide for the restrictive covenants in place in Pookeno which demonstrates that the MDRS should go beyond the identified urban fringe. • The section 32 understates the disadvantages of limiting the application of the MDRS to an 800m walkable catchment around the Town Centre Zone
Point Number	105.3
Plan Chapter	General Residential Zone
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision	<p>Delete the relevant standards from the GRZ that are being replaced by the MDRS [see submission for untracked version of the GRZ chapter].</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any other such relief, and consequential amendments (including zone and overlay maps, objectives and policies), as considered appropriate to give effect to the points raised in the submission.</p>

Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Variation 3 does not give effect to or implement the NPS-UD, RM-EMA and MDRS as it is not sufficiently enabling and fails to expand over those areas where the current rules of the GRZ already significantly restrict housing densities and opportunities for a variety of housing types and price points. • Provides for a range of housing opportunities, densities and lots sizes; • Supports local neighbourhood shops and services; • Provides for a range of house prices to the market, including affordable housing. This supports housing for a wider demographic than a monoculture of the same sized houses and lots as currently exists in Pookeno; • Utilises residential zoned land more efficiently, allowing opportunities for integrated housing developments rather than lower density vacant fee simple lots. Pookeno is an ideal location to accommodate growth, and with its growing commercial, employment and community focus can reduce vehicle kilometres travelled compared with countryside living areas and the smaller towns and villages in the District; • Establishes densities that can support the provision of local public transport in the medium term; • Provides for the efficient use of infrastructure; • Provides greater residential population and diversity within the growing town of Pookeno, supporting the local economy through commerce and exchange; and • Manages pressure for ongoing rezoning in the Future Urban Zone and in locations with fewer locational attributes compared with efficiently using land owned by CSL and within Pookeno West and Havelock. • These benefits outweigh the costs outlined in the Council’s Section 32. • Whether the development of such land is feasible and reasonably expected to be realised is another matter (NPS-UD – Clause 3.26). Given this is uncertain, it would be inappropriate to limit the application of the MDRS as has been done in V3.
Point Number	105.4
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Standard
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend

<p>Summary of Decision Requested</p>	<p>Add a new rule that any infringement of the MDRS is a restricted discretionary activity [see submission for untracked version of the GRZ chapter].</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Add matters of discretion based on the equivalent of those from the MDRZ2 proposed in V3.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any other such relief, and consequential amendments (including zone and overlay maps, objectives and policies), as considered appropriate to give effect to the points raised in the submission.</p>
<p>Decision Reason</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Variation 3 does not give effect to or implement the NPS-UD, RM-EMA and MDRS as it is not sufficiently enabling and fails to expand over those areas where the current rules of the GRZ already significantly restrict housing densities and opportunities for a variety of housing types and price points. • Provides for a range of housing opportunities, densities and lots sizes; • Supports local neighbourhood shops and services; • Provides for a range of house prices to the market, including affordable housing. This supports housing for a wider demographic than a monoculture of the same sized houses and lots as currently exists in Pookeno; • Utilises residential zoned land more efficiently, allowing opportunities for integrated housing developments rather than lower density vacant fee simple lots. Pookeno is an ideal location to accommodate growth, and with its growing commercial, employment and community focus can reduce vehicle kilometres travelled compared with countryside living areas and the smaller towns and villages in the District; • Establishes densities that can support the provision of local public transport in the medium term; • Provides for the efficient use of infrastructure; • Provides greater residential population and diversity within the growing town of Pookeno, supporting the local economy through commerce and exchange; and • Manages pressure for ongoing rezoning in the Future Urban Zone and in locations with fewer locational attributes. • These benefits outweigh the costs outlined in the Council’s Section 32.

Point Number	105.5
Plan Chapter	General Residential Zone
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Add a new rule in the GRZ that one to three units are permitted subject to compliance with the MDRS [see submission for untracked version of the GRZ chapter].</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any other such relief, and consequential amendments (including zone and overlay maps, objectives and policies), as considered appropriate to give effect to the points raised in the submission.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Variation 3 does not give effect to or implement the NPS-UD, RM-EMA and MDRS as it is not sufficiently enabling and fails to expand over those areas where the current rules of the GRZ already significantly restrict housing densities and opportunities for a variety of housing types and price points. • Provides for a range of housing opportunities, densities and lots sizes; • Supports local neighbourhood shops and services; • Provides for a range of house prices to the market, including affordable housing. This supports housing for a wider demographic than a monoculture of the same sized houses and lots as currently exists in Pookeno; • Utilises residential zoned land more efficiently, allowing opportunities for integrated housing developments rather than lower density vacant fee simple lots. Pookeno is an ideal location to accommodate growth, and with its growing commercial, employment and community focus can reduce vehicle kilometres travelled compared with countryside living areas and the smaller towns and villages in the District; • Establishes densities that can support the provision of local public transport in the medium term; • Provides for the efficient use of infrastructure; • Provides greater residential population and diversity within the growing town of Pookeno, supporting the local economy through commerce and exchange; and • Manages pressure for ongoing rezoning in the Future Urban Zone and in locations with fewer locational attributes.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These benefits outweigh the costs outlined in the Council’s Section 32.
Point Number	105.6
Plan Chapter	General Residential Zone
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Add a new rule in the GRZ that four or more units are restricted discretionary activity subject to compliance with the MDRS and the remaining standards of the GRZ [see submission for untracked version of the GRZ chapter].</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any other such relief, and consequential amendments (including zone and overlay maps, objectives and policies), as considered appropriate to give effect to the points raised in the submission.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Variation 3 does not give effect to or implement the NPS-UD, RM-EMA and MDRS as it is not sufficiently enabling and fails to expand over those areas where the current rules of the GRZ already significantly restrict housing densities and opportunities for a variety of housing types and price points. • Provides for a range of housing opportunities, densities and lots sizes; • Supports local neighbourhood shops and services; • Provides for a range of house prices to the market, including affordable housing. This supports housing for a wider demographic than a monoculture of the same sized houses and lots as currently exists in Pookeno; • Utilises residential zoned land more efficiently, allowing opportunities for integrated housing developments rather than lower density vacant fee simple lots. Pookeno is an ideal location to accommodate growth, and with its growing commercial, employment and community focus can reduce vehicle kilometres travelled compared with countryside living areas and the smaller towns and villages in the District; • Establishes densities that can support the provision of local public transport in the medium term; • Provides for the efficient use of infrastructure; • Provides greater residential population and diversity within the growing town of Pookeno, supporting the local economy through commerce and exchange; and

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manages pressure for ongoing rezoning in the Future Urban Zone and in locations with fewer locational attributes. • These benefits outweigh the costs outlined in the Council’s Section 32.
Point Number	105.7
Plan Chapter	Generic Topic
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Add matters of discretion for four or more units based on the equivalent of those from the MDRZ2 proposed in V3 or the notified Multi-Unit Housing discretions of the Proposed District Plan [see submission for untracked version of the GRZ chapter].</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any other such relief, and consequential amendments (including zone and overlay maps, objectives and policies), as considered appropriate to give effect to the points raised in the submission. .</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Variation 3 does not give effect to or implement the NPS-UD, RM-EMA and MDRS as it is not sufficiently enabling and fails to expand over those areas where the current rules of the GRZ already significantly restrict housing densities and opportunities for a variety of housing types and price points. • Provides for a range of housing opportunities, densities and lots sizes; • Supports local neighbourhood shops and services; • Provides for a range of house prices to the market, including affordable housing. This supports housing for a wider demographic than a monoculture of the same sized houses and lots as currently exists in Pookeno; • Utilises residential zoned land more efficiently, allowing opportunities for integrated housing developments rather than lower density vacant fee simple lots. Pookeno is an ideal location to accommodate growth, and with its growing commercial, employment and community focus can reduce vehicle kilometres travelled compared with countryside living areas and the smaller towns and villages in the District; • Establishes densities that can support the provision of local public transport in the medium term; • Provides for the efficient use of infrastructure;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides greater residential population and diversity within the growing town of Pookeno, supporting the local economy through commerce and exchange; and • Manages pressure for ongoing rezoning in the Future Urban Zone and in locations with fewer locational attributes. • These benefits outweigh the costs outlined in the Council’s Section 32.
Point Number	105.8
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Add a rule that for four or more units that any infringement of a MDRS rule is a restricted discretionary activity [see submission for untracked version of the GRZ chapter].</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any other such relief, and consequential amendments (including zone and overlay maps, objectives and policies), as considered appropriate to give effect to the points raised in the submission.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Variation 3 does not give effect to or implement the NPS-UD, RM-EMA and MDRS as it is not sufficiently enabling and fails to expand over those areas where the current rules of the GRZ already significantly restrict housing densities and opportunities for a variety of housing types and price points. • Provides for a range of housing opportunities, densities and lots sizes; • Supports local neighbourhood shops and services; • Provides for a range of house prices to the market, including affordable housing. This supports housing for a wider demographic than a monoculture of the same sized houses and lots as currently exists in Pookeno; • Utilises residential zoned land more efficiently, allowing opportunities for integrated housing developments rather than lower density vacant fee simple lots. Pookeno is an ideal location to accommodate growth, and with its growing commercial, employment and community focus can reduce vehicle kilometres travelled compared with countryside living areas and the smaller towns and villages in the District; • Establishes densities that can support the provision of local public transport in the medium term;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides for the efficient use of infrastructure; • Provides greater residential population and diversity within the growing town of Pookeno, supporting the local economy through commerce and exchange; and • Manages pressure for ongoing rezoning in the Future Urban Zone and in locations with fewer locational attributes. • These benefits outweigh the costs outlined in the Council’s Section 32.
Point Number	105.9
Plan Chapter	Subdivision
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Add new subdivision rules for one to three units and four or more units based on the requirements of the MDRS and RM-EHA with the matters of discretion being equivalent to those in the MDRZ2 [see submission for untracked version of the GRZ chapter].</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any other such relief, and consequential amendments (including zone and overlay maps, objectives and policies), as considered appropriate to give effect to the points raised in the submission.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • V3 does not give effect to or implement the NPS-UD, RM-EMA and MDRS as it is not sufficiently enabling and fails to expand over those areas where the current rules of the GRZ already significantly restrict housing densities and opportunities for a variety of housing types and price points. • Provides for a range of housing opportunities, densities and lots sizes; • Supports local neighbourhood shops and services; • Provides for a range of house prices to the market, including affordable housing. This supports housing for a wider demographic than a monoculture of the same sized houses and lots as currently exists in Pookeno; • Utilises residential zoned land more efficiently, allowing opportunities for integrated housing developments rather than lower density vacant fee simple lots. Pookeno is an ideal location to accommodate growth, and with its growing commercial, employment and community focus can

	<p>reduce vehicle kilometres travelled compared with countryside living areas and the smaller towns and villages in the District;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishes densities that can support the provision of local public transport in the medium term; • Provides for the efficient use of infrastructure; • Provides greater residential population and diversity within the growing town of Pookeno, supporting the local economy through commerce and exchange; and • Manages pressure for ongoing rezoning in the Future Urban Zone and in locations with fewer locational attributes. • These benefits outweigh the costs outlined in the Council's Section 32.
--	--

Submitter Number	106	Submitter Names	Kāinga Ora
Point Number	106.1		
Plan Chapter	All of Variation		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend		
Summary of Decision Requested:	<p>No specific decision requested, however the submission generally supports the proposed provisions contained within the Medium Density Residential Zone 2.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any such further, alternative or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully achieve the relief sought in the submission.</p>		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refer to reasons provided within specific submission points. 		
Point Number	106.2		
Plan Chapter	All of Variation		
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend		
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Amend Variation 3 to have only one Medium Density Residential Zone in the PDP applied across the Waikato District, with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Proposed MRZ2 is selected as the preferred set of Medium Density Residential Zone provisions in the PDP and renamed as the 'Medium Density Residential Zone' (MRZ) • Medium Density Residential Zone 1 (MDZ1) is deleted from Variation 3; and • The spatial application of the MDZ1 and MRZ2 are combined in the PDP as one zone, renamed as MRZ and colour-coded the same legend in the planning maps. 		

	AND Any such further, alternative or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully achieve the relief sought in the submission.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is not appropriate or consistent with the intended spatial hierarchy of zones under the National Planning Standards • Duplicates chapters in the Plan and will lead to administrative confusion for plan users now and into the future with regard to the application and interpretation of Medium Density Residential Zones in the Waikato district and across the Waikato region. • Considers there to be very little to limited distinction on the inclusion and application of the two 'Medium Density Residential Zones' in Variation 3 to the PDP. • Does not recognise the likely increase in population anticipated in Raglan or Te Kauwhata that will make them 'urban environments' in the future. • While there are slight differences in rules and standards, it is unnecessary to have two Medium Density Residential Zones which generally appear to be the same or similar in intended outcomes and residential environment in the PDP. • A single MRZ Chapter can more-effectively and efficiently manage the land use issues across the district and ensure that the PDP is consistent with the National Planning Standards.
Point Number	106.3
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Oppose
Summary of Decision Requested	Delete the setback requirements from rail and transport corridors AND Any such further, alternative or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully achieve the relief sought in the submission.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refer to further details in 106.37
Point Number	106.4
Plan Chapter	New Chapter – High Density Residential Zone
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Add a new High Density Residential Zone (HRZ) [see submission for new chapter and provisions]

	<p>AND</p> <p>Amend the planning maps to apply a High density residential zone to the sites within a 400m walkable catchment of the town centre of Ngaaruawaahia [see submission for amended planning maps].</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend the planning maps to apply a High density residential zone to the sites within an 800m walkable catchment of the town centre of Huntly [see submission for amended planning maps].</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any such further, alternative or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully achieve the relief sought in the submission.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The HRZ is considered appropriate given the size and range of activities within these town centres. • Locating higher density residential in proximity to town centres is a consistent approach sought by Kāinga Ora nationally and is consistent with the NPS-UD.
Point Number	106.5
Plan Chapter	Maps
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Amend the planning maps to extend the MRZ in Raglan to a 400m walkable catchment of the Raglan Town Centre and include land that has previously been retained as General Residential Zone [see submission for identification of sites].</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any such further, alternative or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully achieve the relief sought in the submission.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that the extent of the MRZ applied to Raglan is more aligned with the intention for Raglan to be an urban environment (as outlined within the Future Proof Strategy). • Kāinga Ora appreciates that the current environmental and statutory context within Raglan and Te Kauwhata is different to the ‘urban environments’ of Huntly, Ngaaruawaahia, Pookeno and Tuakau; and therefore seeks that the MRZ attached within Appendix 3 is applied to a walkable catchment around the town centres only. To respond to the requirements of policy 1 of the NPS-UD
Point Number	106.6
Plan Chapter	Generic topic
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Not stated

Summary of Decision Requested	Encourages the Council to immediately prepare and notify plan changes that would increase the extent of the town centre zoning footprint within Raglan. Such a plan change should also provide for consideration of additional medium density zoning within the walkable catchment of the future extent of the Raglan Town Centre. AND Any such further, alternative or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully achieve the relief sought in the submission.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The absence of scope to Town centre zoning within this process
Point Number	106.7
Plan Chapter	All of Variation
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support in part
Summary of Decision Requested	No specific decision requested, but submission states that where proposed amendments to the operative district plan are not included in the submission table, those provisions are supported in part, subject to the relief sought by Kāinga Ora in its primary submission. AND Any such further, alternative or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully achieve the relief sought in the submission.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Kāinga Ora supports the provisions that are not included in the submission table to the extent that the relief sought within its primary submission is achieved.
Point Number	106.8
Plan Chapter	Qualifying Matter
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Oppose
Summary of Decision Requested	Delete the “urban fringe” qualifying matter. AND Apply the proposed MRZ2 zone (which contains the MDRS standards) to the spatial extent of the GRZ in its entirety within Huntly, Ngaaruawaahia, Pookeno and Tuakau. AND Consequential changes and amendments to the provisions and planning maps. AND Any such further, alternative or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully achieve the relief sought in the submission.

Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes the 'urban fringe' qualifying matter, which has been used as the basis to limit the spatial extent of the MRZ2 zone as it applies to Huntly, Ngaaruawaahia, Pookeno and Tuakau. • Opposes the spatial extents to the MRZ2 and GRZ as they apply (as-notified) to Huntly, Ngaaruawaahia, Pookeno and Tuakau. • Does not consider the 'urban fringe' matter to be a legitimate 'qualifying matter' as the Housing Supply Act intends. • The supporting s32 analysis and the required site by site analysis necessary under ss77J-77L of the Housing Supply Act to support the MDRS has not being undertaken.
Point Number	106.9
Plan Chapter	Generic topic
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Add a height variation control over the Huntly and Ngaaruawaahia centres to enable a proportionate height of buildings to that sought within the HRZ, including consequential amendments to the Town Centre Zone provisions as required [see submission for new provisions]</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Add a height variation control over business zoned land in the PDP [see submission for maps]. AND Any such further, alternative or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully achieve the relief sought in the submission.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To enable a proportionate height of buildings to that sought within the HRZ
Point Number	106.10
Plan Chapter	Maps
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Amend the zoning of sites [see submission for maps and identification of sites].</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any such further, alternative or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully achieve the relief sought in the submission.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are a range of individual or groupings of sites that appear to retain the zoning under the PDP, while surrounding areas are up-zoned under Variation 3. The submission seeks that such land achieves a consistent zoning in order to achieve the objectives of the NPSUD.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Such zoning fragmentation can compromise opportunities for comprehensive spatial planning and/or lead to differing development outcomes, which will not achieve a 'well-functioning urban environment' in the future. Further details are provided in subsequent parts of the submission and summary.
Point Number	106.11
Plan Chapter	Maps
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Amend the zoning of the Large Lot Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone in Tuakau [see submission for maps and identification of sites]</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any such further, alternative or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully achieve the relief sought in the submission.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are a range of individual or groupings of sites that appear to retain the zoning under the PDP, while surrounding areas are up-zoned under Variation 3. The submission seeks that such land achieves a consistent zoning in order to achieve the objectives of the NPSUD. · Such zoning fragmentation can compromise opportunities for comprehensive spatial planning and/or lead to differing development outcomes, which will not achieve a 'well-functioning urban environment' in the future.
Point Number	106.12
Plan Chapter	Maps
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Amend the zoning of the site at 24 Great South Road and at 7 Walter Rodgers Road, Pookeno from Medium Density Residential Zone 2 to Commercial zone.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any such further, alternative or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully achieve the relief sought in the submission.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are a range of individual or groupings of sites that appear to retain the zoning under the PDP, while surrounding areas are up-zoned under Variation 3. · Seeks a consistent zoning in order to achieve the objectives of the NPSUD. ·

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Such zoning fragmentation can compromise opportunities for comprehensive spatial planning and/or lead to differing development outcomes, which will not achieve a 'well-functioning urban environment' in the future.
Point Number	106.13
Plan Chapter	Maps
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Amend the zoning of 56 Huia Road, Pookeno from General Rural Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. AND Any such further, alternative or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully achieve the relief sought in the submission.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are a range of individual or groupings of sites that appear to retain the zoning under the PDP, while surrounding areas are up-zoned under Variation 3. · Seeks a consistent zoning in order to achieve the objectives of the NPSUD. · Such zoning fragmentation can compromise opportunities for comprehensive spatial planning and/or lead to differing development outcomes, which will not achieve a 'well-functioning urban environment' in the future.
Point Number	106.14
Plan Chapter	Maps
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Amend the zoning of 46-50 Te Kauwhata Road and at 26D -40 Blunt Road, Te Kauwhata from General residential zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. AND Any such further, alternative or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully achieve the relief sought in the submission.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are a range of individual or groupings of sites that appear to retain the zoning under the PDP, while surrounding areas are up-zoned under Variation 3. · Seeks a consistent zoning in order to achieve the objectives of the NPSUD. · Such zoning fragmentation can compromise opportunities for comprehensive spatial planning and/or lead to differing development outcomes, which will not achieve a 'well-functioning urban environment' in the future.

Point Number	106.15
Plan Chapter	Maps
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Amend the zoning of 32 Main Road and at 1-7 Baird Ave, Te Kauwhata from Commercial zone to Town centre zone. AND Any such further, alternative or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully achieve the relief sought in the submission.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are a range of individual or groupings of sites that appear to retain the zoning under the PDP, while surrounding areas are up-zoned under Variation 3. · • Seeks a consistent zoning in order to achieve the objectives of the NPSUD. · • Such zoning fragmentation can compromise opportunities for comprehensive spatial planning and/or lead to differing development outcomes, which will not achieve a ‘well-functioning urban environment’ in the future.
Point Number	106.16
Plan Chapter	Maps
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Amend the zoning of 34 Harris Street, Huntly from Rural Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. AND Any such further, alternative or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully achieve the relief sought in the submission.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are a range of individual or groupings of sites that appear to retain the zoning under the PDP, while surrounding areas are up-zoned under Variation 3. · • Seeks a consistent zoning in order to achieve the objectives of the NPSUD. · • Such zoning fragmentation can compromise opportunities for comprehensive spatial planning and/or lead to differing development outcomes, which will not achieve a ‘well-functioning urban environment’ in the future.
Point Number	106.17
Plan Chapter	Definitions

Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Delete the definition for “Papakaainga” AND Delete the definition for “Papakaainga housing development” AND Add the following definition for “Papakaainga”: <i><u>A development by tangata whenua established to be occupied by tangata whenua for residential activities and ancillary social, cultural, economic, conservation and/or recreation activities to support the cultural, environmental and economic wellbeing of tangata whenua.</u></i> AND Any such further, alternative or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully achieve the relief sought in the submission.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not consider a separate definition for Papakaainga to be required in addition to ‘Papakaainga housing development’. • Does not support the reference to comprehensive residential development under the definition of papakaainga housing development and seeks a definition be included that is consistent with the definition of papakaainga housing across the Waikato region.
Point Number	106.18
Plan Chapter	Strategic Directions
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Add a new policy to the Strategic direction chapter as follows: <i><u>To provide for high density residential development within a 400m walkable catchment of the town centres of Huntly and Ngaaruwaahia</u></i> AND Any such further, alternative or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully achieve the relief sought in the submission.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seeks a high density residential zone be incorporated into the Proposed District Plan and applied within a 400m walkable catchment of both the Huntly and Ngaaruwaahia town centres of up to 6 storeys. • This will give effect to Policy 3(d) of the NPS-UD that applies to the Waikato District, as a Tier 1 urban authority.

Point Number	106.19
Plan Chapter	High Density Residential Zone – new chapter
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Add reference to the High Density Residential Zone within the SUB subdivision provisions associated with the Medium Density Residential Zone. AND Any such further, alternative or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully achieve the relief sought in the submission.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seeks that the High Density Residential Zone is included within the subdivision provisions. • The subdivision provisions of the Medium Density Residential Zone are considered appropriate to address subdivision within the High Density Residential Zone also.
Point Number	106.20
Plan Chapter	Subdivision
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Amend SUB-P3 Lot sizes as follows: <i>(1) Except for residential subdivision within the MRZ2 – Medium Density Residential Zone 2, mMinimum lot size and dimension of lots enable the achievement of the character and density outcomes of each zone;</i> and AND Any such further, alternative or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully achieve the relief sought in the submission.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally supports the amendment and the enabling provisions for subdivision in the MRZ2 zone which give effect to the purpose of the Housing Supply Act. • Seeks amendments throughout Variation 2 to remove the reference to the MRZ 1 and 2 chapter, to reflect a single ‘Medium Density Residential Zone’ chapter.
Point Number	106.21
Plan Chapter	Subdivision
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose
Summary of Decision Requested	Amend the following rules to remove all references to the MRZ1 zone and replace it with MRZ: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SUB-R30 Subdivision – general

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SUB-R32 Subdivision – general · • SUB-R33 Subdivision – boundary adjustments · • SUB-R34 Subdivision – amendments and updates to Cross Lease Flats Plans and Conversion to Freehold · • SUB-R35 Subdivision – amendments and updates to Cross Lease Flats Plans and Conversion to Freehold · • SUB-R36 Title Boundaries – contaminated land · • SUB-R37 Subdivision – road frontage · • SUB-R38 Subdivision creating reserves · • SUB-R39 Subdivision creating reserves <p>AND Any such further, alternative or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully achieve the relief sought in the submission.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes there being two Medium Density Residential Zones
Point Number	106.22
Plan Chapter	Subdivision
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Delete SUB-R153(1)(a)(i) Subdivision – general relating to the minimum lot size for vacant lots as detailed in submission. AND Amend SUB-153 Subdivision – general to remove all references to the MRZ2 zone and replace it with MRZ AND Any such further, alternative or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully achieve the relief sought in the submission.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes the inclusion of minimum lot sizes associated with subdivision. • Supports subdivision as a controlled activity in the MRZ zone and notification provisions, as they are consistent with the notification requirements under Schedule 3A of the Housing Supply Act. · • Opposes there being two Medium Density Residential Zones.
Point Number	106.23
Plan Chapter	Subdivision

Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Delete SUB-R154(1)(b) Subdivision - residential relating to minimum net site area. AND Amend SUB-154 Subdivision – residential to remove all references to the MR22 zone and replace it with MRZ AND Any such further, alternative or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully achieve the relief sought in the submission.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes the inclusion of minimum lot sizes associated with subdivision. · • Supports subdivision as a controlled activity in the MRZ zone and notification provisions, as they are consistent with the notification requirements under Schedule 3A of the Housing Supply Act. · • Opposes there being two Medium Density Residential Zones.
Point Number	106.24
Plan Chapter	Subdivision
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Amend SUB-156 Subdivision – boundary adjustments to remove all references to the MR22 zone and replace it with MRZ AND Amend SUB-156 Subdivision – boundary adjustments so that reference to SUB-R31 to R32 is replaced with the amended provisions of R50-51 and R52. AND Any such further, alternative or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully achieve the relief sought in the submission.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Note that the relief sought and reasons provided within this submission point do not align and a clarification may be require - refer to submission.
Point Number	106.25
Plan Chapter	Maps
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Amend the zoning of the General residential zoned sites in Huntly, Ngaaruawaahia, Pookeno, and Tuakau to Medium density residential 2 zone (as sought to be modified elsewhere in this submission).</p>

	<p>AND</p> <p>Amend the zoning so that General residential zone is only applied in areas that are not defined as ‘urban environments’ under the Housing Supply Act, with the exception of Raglan and Te Kauwhata. AND any such further, alternative or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully achieve the relief sought in the submission.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes the spatial extent of the GRZ as notified in the Huntly, Ngaaruawaahia, Pookeno, and Tuakau Centres.
Point Number	106.26
Plan Chapter	General Residential Zone
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Add the following new rule to the General residential zone:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Papakaainga development – 1 unit Permitted • Papakaainga development – 2+ units Restricted Discretionary <p>AND</p> <p>Any such further, alternative or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully achieve the relief sought in the submission.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Considers it is appropriate to enable a permitted level of development for papakaainga housing on general title land, to align with permitted levels of development for residential activities and enable urban papakaainga developments. · • In addition, this is enabled through clause 80E(1)(b)(ii) of the Resource Management Act
Point Number	106.27
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Amend the Purpose of the Medium Density Residential Zone 2 chapter. See submission for amendments sought. AND</p> <p>Any such further, alternative or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully achieve the relief sought in the submission.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally supports the proposed modifications of that chapter inclusive of amendments to give effect to the Housing Supply Act so as to form the basis for the proposed MRZ2 chapter and its application to ‘urban environments’ within the Waikato District. ·

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposed to the ‘urban fringe’ qualifying matter, which has been used as the basis to limit the spatial extent of the MRZ2 zone as it applies to Huntly, Ngaaruawaahia, Pookeno and Tuakau. Does not consider the ‘urban fringe’ matter to be a legitimate ‘qualifying matter’ as the Housing Supply Act intends. • Seeks a single MRZ zone. · • Consequential to Kāinga Ora seeking a high density zone, the MRZ will not accommodate the highest level of residential growth. · • Kāinga Ora does not consider it the role of a zone to co-ordinate the delivery of infrastructure and services.
Point Number	106.28
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Amend MRZ2-O6 Reverse sensitivity as follows: <i>Avoid <u>where practical</u> or <u>otherwise</u> minimise the potential for reverse sensitivity by managing the location and design of sensitive activities through:</i> <i>(a) The use of building setbacks; and</i> <i>(b) The design of subdivisions and development AND Delete reference to the MRZ2 chapter, to reflect a single ‘Medium Density Residential Zone’ chapter.</i> AND Any such further, alternative or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully achieve the relief sought in the submission.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally supports the need to manage the potential for reverse sensitivity effects. · • Notes that the use of the term ‘avoid’ is contrary to the directive under Environmental Defence Society Inc v New Zealand King Salmon Company Ltd [2014] NZSC 38 (“King Salmon”) concerning the term ‘avoid’. · • As the policy uses ‘avoid’, there cannot be any exceptions to what is tantamount to a prohibited activity and the policy is unclear as to what would be appropriate mitigation. · • Council should ensure the use of ‘avoid’ in this context is appropriate with the wider policy framework and is not contrary to other enabling provisions, or amend (as proposed) to qualify its use.

Point Number	106.29
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2
Support/Oppose/Amend	Support
Summary of Decision Requested	Retain the deletion of MRZ2-R8 Construction or alteration of a building for a sensitive land use AND Any such further, alternative or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully achieve the relief sought in the submission.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports the deletion of the Rule in favour of the proposed MRZ-R10 rule.
Point Number	106.30
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 1
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Add MRZ-R13 which relates to buildings, structures, objects or vegetation that obscures the sight line of the Raglan navigation beacons. AND Any such further, alternative or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully achieve the relief sought in the submission.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deletion of the activity is opposed as it should apply to the single MRZ chapter which would also apply to Raglan.
Point Number	106.31
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Amend MRZ2-S1 Land use – Building as follows: <i>Residential unit – including papakainga</i> AND Delete reference to the MRZ2 chapter, to reflect a single ‘Medium Density Residential Zone’ chapter. AND Any such further, alternative or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully achieve the relief sought in the submission.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports the standard and notification provisions, as they are consistent with the notification requirements under Schedule 3A of the Housing Supply Act. ·

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The activity status for residential units within the MDRZ should be extended to include papakainga and be more enabling of this form of development in accordance with clause 80E(1)(b)(ii) of the RMA.
Point Number	106.32
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Add MRZ-S2 Minimum residential unit size AND Delete reference to the MRZ2 chapter, to reflect a single 'Medium Density Residential Zone' chapter. AND Any such further, alternative or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully achieve the relief sought in the submission.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposes the proposed deletion of the minimum residential unit size standard. · Such a standard ensures that residential units achieve a minimum internal floor area which ensures liveability and a well-functioning environment in accordance with the NPS-UD
Point Number	106.33
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2
Support/Oppose/Amend	Support
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Retain MRZ2-S10 Impervious surfaces AND Delete reference to the MRZ2 chapter, to reflect a single 'Medium Density Residential Zone' chapter. AND Any such further, alternative or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully achieve the relief sought in the submission.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the provision as notified and the need to manage overall impervious surfaces within the MRZ2.
Point Number	106.34
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2
Support/Oppose/Amend	Support

Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Retain MRZ2-S11 Ground floor internal habitable space AND Delete reference to the MRZ2 chapter, to reflect a single ‘Medium Density Residential Zone’ chapter. AND Any such further, alternative or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully achieve the relief sought in the submission.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports the standard as notified.
Point Number	106.35
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2
Support/Oppose/Amend	Support
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Retain MRZ2-S12 Fences or walls AND Delete reference to the MRZ2 chapter, to reflect a single ‘Medium Density Residential Zone’ chapter. AND Any such further, alternative or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully achieve the relief sought in the submission.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports the standard as notified.
Point Number	106.36
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Amend MRZ2-S13 Building setbacks – water bodies as follows: (1) <i>Activity status: PER</i> <i>Where:</i> (a) <i>A building must be set back a minimum of:</i> (i) <i>20m from the margin of any lake;</i> (ii) <i>20m from the margin of any wetland;</i> (iii) 20m 21.5m 23m <i>23m from the bank of any river (other than the Waikato River and Waipā River);</i> (iv) 20m 25.5m <i>38m from the margin of either the Waikato River and the Waipā River AND</i> River.</p>

	<p>Undertake an appropriate site by site analysis under ss77J-77L of the Housing Supply Act if the increase is to be over and above what the RMA anticipates.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Delete reference to the MRZ2 chapter, to reflect a single 'Medium Density Residential Zone' chapter.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any such further, alternative or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully achieve the relief sought in the submission.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally supports the standard as-notified but seek to understand why metrics have been applied that are not overly-dissimilar to the standard esplanade reserve requirement that would apply in situations where subdivision is proposed adjoining a River. · • In the s32 analysis and qualifying matter assessment, there are conflicting set back metrics and little justification on why the particular proposed setback distances have been proposed • Seeks to understand why metrics have been applied that are not overly dissimilar to the standard esplanade reserve requirement that would apply in situations where subdivision is proposed adjoining a
Point Number	106.37
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Delete the setbacks for railway corridors, national route/regional arterial and the Waikato Expressway from MRZ2-S14 Building setback – sensitive land use as follows: (1) <i>Activity status: PER</i></p> <p>Where:</p> <p>(a) Any new building or alteration to an existing building for a sensitive land use shall be set back a minimum of:</p> <p>(i) 5m from the designated boundary of the railway corridor;</p> <p>(ii) 15m from the boundary of a national route or regional arterial;</p> <p>(iii) 25m from the designated boundary of the Waikato Expressway;</p> <p>...</p> <p>(2) <i>Activity status where compliance not achieved: RDIS Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters:</i></p> <p>(a) Road network safety and efficiency;</p> <p>AND</p>

	Any such further, alternative or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully achieve the relief sought in the submission.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Kāinga Ora generally opposes any rule for building setback for sensitive land use in relation to railway corridors, national route/regional arterial and the Waikato Expressway.
Point Number	106.38
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2
Support/Oppose/Amend	Support in part
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Retain the building height figure associated with MRZ2-S2 AND Delete reference to the MRZ2 chapter, to reflect a single 'Medium Density Residential Zone' chapter. AND Any such further, alternative or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully achieve the relief sought in the submission.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the standard figures, as they are consistent with the notification requirements under Schedule 3A of the Housing Supply Act.
Point Number	106.39
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2
Support/Oppose/Amend	Support in part
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Retain the height in relation to boundary figure associated with MRZ2-S7 AND Delete reference to the MRZ2 chapter, to reflect a single 'Medium Density Residential Zone' chapter. AND Any such further, alternative or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully achieve the relief sought in the submission.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the standard figures, as they are consistent with the notification requirements under Schedule 3A of the Housing Supply Act.
Point Number	106.40
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2
Support/Oppose/Amend	Support in part

Summary of Decision Requested	Retain the outlook space per unit figure associated with MRZ2-S3 AND Delete reference to the MRZ2 chapter, to reflect a single 'Medium Density Residential Zone' chapter. AND Any such further, alternative or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully achieve the relief sought in the submission.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the standard figures, as they are consistent with the notification requirements under Schedule 3A of the Housing Supply Act.
Point Number	106.41
Plan Chapter	All of Variation 3
Support/Oppose/Amend	Support in part
Summary of Decision Requested	Retain the proposed amendments to the Town Centre Zone provisions, which largely seek to cross-reference the proposed MRZ2 Chapter. AND Any such further, alternative or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully achieve the relief sought in the submission.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the proposed amendments to the TCZ provisions, which largely seek to cross-reference the proposed MRZ2 Chapter.
Point Number	106.42
Plan Chapter	Generic topic
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Add an additional height overlay applies to the Town centre zone in Huntly, Ngaaruawaahia, Pookeno and Tuakau, to reflect the increased building heights sought within the proposed High density residential zone sought elsewhere in the submission. AND Any such further, alternative or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully achieve the relief sought in the submission.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As a consequence of adding a HRZ.

Submitter Number	107	Submitter Names	Retirement Villages Association
Point Number	107.1		
Plan Chapter	Generic topic		

Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Amend variation to enable retirement housing and care options in all relevant residential zones and provide for the functional and operational need.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Include a restricted discretionary activity rule for retirement villages in all residential zones (including General Residential and Medium Density Residential Zone 1)</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Include consequential amendments including a retirement village-specific objective, policy and rule framework.</p>
Decision Reasons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If this opportunity is not taken now, the existing consenting challenges facing retirement village operators are likely to be perpetuated for many years. • The NPSUD states that contributing to well-functioning urban environments means enabling a “variety of homes” to meet the “needs of different households” (Policy 1), and that cannot be achieved in our major centres without enabling significant intensification of our urban environments (Policy 3). These NPSUD policies therefore require Variation 3 to specifically respond to the need to provide suitable and diverse housing choices and options for our ageing population as part of the intensification of urban environments. • There is an ageing demographic with increasing housing needs of older people. • Enabling retirement villages will enable people to age in place which has been demonstrated to be beneficial. • Retirement villages will not be permitted activities under the MDRS because of the “no more than 3 residential units per site” density standard (clause 10). However, retirement villages require “the construction and use of 4 or more residential units on a site”. They will therefore be restricted discretionary activities under the MDRS. • To give effect to the NPSUD and the Enabling Housing Act. • Without a specific framework, retirement village proposals face material uncertainty and consenting barriers as council officers attempt to apply general residential approaches that are not fit-for-purpose to retirement villages.
Point number	107.2
Plan Chapter	All of Variation
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose

Summary of Decision Requested	Incorporate the MDRS into the District Plan without amendments
Decision Reasons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A number of the provisions in the Variation dilute, conflict or overlap with the MDRS. • A failure to make these amendments will give rise to significant.
Point Number	107.3
Plan Chapter	All of Variation
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose
Summary of Decision Requested	Review the application of the MDRS to Huntly Tuakau, Ngaaruaawhaia and Pookeno, and in particular the urban fringe qualifying matter AND Review the application of MRZ1 in Raglan and Te Kauwhata.
Decision Reasons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refer to reasons in Submission 107.1
Point number	107.4
Plan Chapter	All of Variation
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Add objectives and policies that recognise the need to provide appropriate accommodation and care for the ageing population (refer to submission for text)
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Required to give effect to the MDRS and NPSUD. • The Proposed District Plan must recognise and provide for the benefits of retirement villages and their functional and operational needs, in order to provide a well functioning urban environment that enables all people and communities to provide for their wellbeing.
Point Number	107.5
Plan Chapter	All of Variation
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Add rules that permit the use and operation of retirement villages
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retirement Villages are required to be a restricted discretionary activity as they involve the construction and use of 4 or more residential units on a site. • The submitter considers there could be a permitted rule and a restricted discretionary rule.
Point Number	107.6

Plan Chapter	All of Variation
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Add matters of discretion that are a tailored and fit for purpose approach for retirement villages
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognise the positive effects of retirement villages. • Focus effects on the exceedance of standards. • Enable the need to provide for efficient use of larger sites and the functional and operational needs of retirement villages to be taken into account when assessing effects.
Point Number	107.7
Plan Chapter	All of Variation
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Public notification for retirement villages should always be precluded and limited notification should only be available when a retirement village breaches one or more of the height, height in relation to boundary, setbacks and building coverage standard
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notification is a key consent issue for retirement village operators.
Point Number	107.8
Plan Chapter	All of Variation
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Review the development standards so they are fit for purpose for retirement villages AND Review the development standards that go beyond the scope of the MDRS
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter considers the development standards should reflect the MDRS, except where amendments are necessary to reflect the particular characteristics of retirement villages.
Point number	107.9
Plan Chapter	Local Centre Zone, Town Centre, and Commercial Zone and any other zone that enables residential activities
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Add permitted activity provisions for retirement villages that reflect the unique characteristics of retirement villages AND the development standards are no more onerous than the MDRS AND retirement village specific objectives and policies are added.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Variation 3 must provide for intensification in non-residential zones.

Point Number	107.10
Plan Chapter	All of Variation
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Any alternative or consequential relief to the matters addressed in the submission points 107.1 to 107.9
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No reason stated.
Point Number	107.11
Plan Chapter	Definitions
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested:	Add a new definition of retirements units as follows: <i>Retirement unit means any unit within a retirement village that is used or designed to be used for a residential activity (whether it includes cooking bathing, and toilet facilities). A retirement unit is a not a residential unit.</i>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter seeks to include a new definition for ‘retirement units’ in the District Plan, as this term has been sought to be included in multiple provisions in these submissions. This definition is required to acknowledge the differences from typical residential activities in terms of layout and amenity needs.
Point Number	107.12
Plan Chapter	Strategic Direction
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Supports
Summary of Decision Requested	Retain Objective SD-O4 as notified.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter supports Objective SD-O4 as it reflects the requirements of the NPSUD to enable a variety of housing types to meet the housing needs of the community.
Point Number	107.13
Plan Chapter	Strategic Direction
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support
Summary of Decision Requested	Retain Objective SD-O14 as notified.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter supports Objective SD-O14 as it aligns with Objective 1 of the MDRS.

Point Number	107.14
Plan Chapter	Strategic Direction
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Oppose
Summary of Decision Requested	Delete Policy SD-P1 OR Amend to enable residential development
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SD-P1 is inconsistent with the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD and requires amendment as part of Variation 3. • The submitter opposes SD-P1 'Activities within Hamilton's urban expansion area', as it may result in limitations to housing development, which does not align with the purposes of the NPSUD and the MDRS. • This policy does not support responsive planning in line with the NPSUD. The outcomes looked for by this policy are not clear, and as worded, this policy may limit all subdivision and development in these areas.
Point Number	107.15
Plan Chapter	Strategic Direction
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support
Summary of Decision Requested	Retain Policy SD-P2 as notified.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter supports Policy SD-P2 as it aligns with Policy 2 of the MDRS.
Point Number	107.16
Plan Chapter	Medium Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Delete the words 'within a walkable catchment' from the purpose statement.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter supports in part the purpose statement for the Medium Density Residential Zone 2, but considers amendments are needed to better give effect to the NPSUD and the Enabling Housing Act. • The submitter opposes the reference to 'within a walkable catchment of the town centres' as the Enabling Housing Act enables development across the relevant residential zones, not just in walkable catchments.

Point Number	107.17
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support
Summary of Decision Requested	Retain Objective MRZ2-O1 as notified.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter supports Objective MRZ2-O1 as it aligns with Objective 2 of the MDRS.
Point Number	107.18
Plan Chapter	Medium Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Oppose in part
Summary of Decision Requested	Amend Objective MRZ2-O2.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No specific wording for objective MRZ2-O2 is provided. The submitter recognises that promotion of a compact urban settlement pattern is consistent with the direction of the NPSUD The importance of providing for 'ageing in place' means that retirement villages need to be in all residential areas.
Point Number	107.19
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Oppose in part
Summary of Decision Requested	Amend Objective MRZ2-O3 (Residential amenity) as follows: <i>Achieve a level of residential amenity commensurate with a medium density environment comprised of primarily including three-storey buildings, including semidetached and terraced housing, townhouses and low-rise apartments <u>and retirement villages.</u></i>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter opposes Objective MRZ2-O3 in part. It is considered the reference to "primarily" three-storey buildings is inconsistent with Policy 1 and Policy 5 of the MDRS (and MRZ2-P1 and MRZ2-P4 of the Variation). The submitter also considers specific reference should be made to retirement villages.
Point Number	107.20
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Oppose

Summary of Decision Requested	Delete Objective MRZ2-O5.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter opposes Objective MRZ2-O5 as qualifying matters are covered by Policy 2 of the MDRS, which is already incorporated into the Variation under SD-P2. This Policy is therefore unnecessary, may lead to interpretation difficulties and restrict potential development outcomes.
Point Number	107.21
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Oppose
Summary of Decision Requested	Delete MRZ2-O6. (Reverse sensitivity)
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter opposes this objective in part as it is uncertain as to how it applies given residential development is the primary development type anticipated in this zone
Point Number	107.22
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Add a new objective for the Medium Density Residential Zone 2 that provides for the housing and care needs of the ageing population. <u><i>MRZ2-OX Ageing population Recognise and enable the housing and care needs of the ageing population.</i></u>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter considers that an ageing population specific objective should be included that recognises and enables the housing and care needs of the ageing population.
Point Number	107.23
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Add a new Policy is included in the Policies of the Medium Density Residential Zone 2, as follows: <u><i>MRZ2-PX Changing communities to provide for the diverse and changing residential needs of communities and recognise that the existing character and amenity of the residential zones will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.</i></u>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter considers that a policy is required that recognises the diverse and changing residential needs of communities, and that the existing character and amenity of the residential zones will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.

Point Number	107.24
Plan Chapter	Medium Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Add a new Policy is included in the Policies of the Medium Density Residential Zone 2 that recognises the intensification opportunities provided for by larger sites: <u>MRZ2-PX Larger sites Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within the Residential Zone by providing for more efficient use of those sites</u>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The current policies for the Medium Density Residential Zone 2 do not recognise the potential opportunities provided by larger sites The submitter considers that a policy regarding the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites should be included in the District Plan.
Point Number	107.25
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Add a new Policy in the Medium Density Residential Zone 2 section, as follows:</p> <p><u>MRZ2-PX Provision of housing for an ageing population</u></p> <p><u>1. Provide for a diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the needs and characteristics of older persons in residential areas, such as retirement villages.</u></p> <p><u>2. Recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, including that they:</u></p> <p><u>(a) May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services.</u></p> <p><u>(b) Have a unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.</u></p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The current policies for the Medium Density Residential Zone 2 do not recognise the needs of the ageing population.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the needs and characteristics of older person and the functional and operational needs of retirement villages needs to be recognised.
Point Number	107.26
Plan Chapter	Medium Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Add a new Policy to the Medium Density Residential Zone 2 section, as follows:</p> <p><u><i>MRZ2-PX Role of density standards</i></u></p> <p><u><i>Enable the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments.</i></u></p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter considers that it would be appropriate to enable the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments.
Point Number	107.27
Plan Chapter	Medium Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support
Summary of Decision Requested	Retain <i>Policy MRZ2-P1 as notified.</i>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter supports Policy MRZ2-P1 as it aligns with Policy 1 of the MDRS.
Point Number	107.28
Plan Chapter	Medium Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Supports
Summary of Decision Requested	Retain Policy MRZ2-P2 as notified.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter supports Policy MRZ2-P2 as it aligns with Policy 2 of the MDRS.
Point Number	107.29
Plan Chapter	Medium Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support
Summary of Decision Requested	Retain Policy MRZ2-P3 as notified.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter supports Policy MRZ2-P3 as it aligns with Policy 3 of the MDRS.

Point Number	107.30
Plan chapter	Medium Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support
Summary of Decision Requested	Retain Policy MRZ2-P4 as notified.
Decision Reasons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter supports Policy MRZ2-P4 as it aligns with Policy 4 of the MDRS.
Point Number	107.31
Plan Chapter	Medium Residential Zone 2 –
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Amend MRZ2-P5 for consistency with the MDRS. No specific amendment is provided.
Decision Reasons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter opposes in part Policy MRZ2-P5 to the extent it seeks to manage the form, scale, and design of development in a manner which conflicts with the MDRS. The submitter considers: MRZ2-P5(1) is consistent with Policy 5 of the MDRS but provides further guidance on the meaning of that policy. The submitter considers: MRZ2-P5(2) is inconsistent with the MDRS setback standard which permits development that has a 1m side yard. A 1m side yard cannot accommodate all the matters set out in (2). The submitter considers: MRZ2-P5(3) is generally not inconsistent with the MDRS outdoor living space standard. However, the submitter opposes the requirement for such spaces to be “attractive” given the subjectivity of such a term. MRZ2-P5(4) is supported as it recognises the communal outdoor living spaces that retirement villages provide.
Point Number	107.32
Plan Chapter	Medium Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Amend Policy MRZ2-P6 as follows:</p> <p><i>MRZ2-P6 Qualifying Matters</i></p> <p>Restrict residential development to an appropriate level to provide for and protect any relevant qualifying matters <i>through amendments to the MDRS rules and standards.</i></p>

Decision Requested	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter opposes in part Policy MR22-P6 as it does not clearly identify the way potential development outcomes need to be restricted and which qualifying matters are relevant. It should be clear that restrictions beyond those provided for through zoning / rules are not necessary.
Point Number	107.33
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Amend <i>Policy MRZP7</i> by amending (1) by adding the words 'including' and amending (a) so that the words 'adjacent' is deleted and replace it with the words 'in close proximity'
Decision Reasons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter supports Policy MR22-P7 in part and the enabling of higher intensity residential living in certain areas, which is consistent with the Enabling Housing Act and the direction of the NPSUD. It suggests amendments are necessary to this Policy as part of Variation 3 to recognise that higher density development may also be appropriate in other areas in the MR22. The submitter considers the importance of providing for 'ageing in place' means that retirement villages need to be in all residential areas.
Point Number	107.34
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Oppose
Summary of Decision Requested	Amend policy MR22-P8 (Changes to amenity values) as follows: <i>Recognise that the planned urban built form may result in changes to the amenity values and characteristics of the urban character over time <u>and those changes are not, of themselves, an adverse effect.</u></i>
Decision Reasons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter supports Policy MR22-P8 as it recognises that amenity values and urban character will change over time, consistent with Objective 4 of the NPSUD. The submitter considers the policy needs to go further to give effect to Policy 6 of the NPSUD.
Point Number	107.35
Plan Chapter	Medium Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Oppose
Summary of Decision Requested	Delete MR22-P11 (Reverse sensitivity)

Decision Reasons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter opposes Policy MRZ2-P11 as “sensitive activities” are not defined and this policy has the potential to constrain residential development within the MRZ, despite residential being the primary development type anticipated in this zone. • If this policy is intended to support MRZ2-S14, it should be redrafted to specifically relate to those identified existing activities.
Point Number	107.36
Plan Chapter	Medium Residential Zone 2 – A new retirement village or alterations to an existing retirement village
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Oppose
Summary of Decision Requested	Delete MRZ2-R2 AND Replace it with a new rule permitted activity rule entitled ‘Retirement villages, excluding the construction of buildings. Refer to submission for the detail of the rule
Decision Reasons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter supports the inclusion of a retirement village-specific rule in the MRZ2 chapter. • The submitter opposes the application of general standards and activity specific standards associated with Rule MRZ2-R2. • The submitter seeks that Variation 3 provides for retirement villages as a permitted activity without any standards, with the construction of the retirement village being a restricted discretionary activity under a separate rule, recognising that retirement villages are residential activities that are appropriate in residential zones and provide substantial benefit in residential zones including enabling older people to remain in familiar community environments for longer (close to family and support networks), while also freeing up several dwellings for families to move into. • The submitter opposes the living space/balcony area and service court activity-specific standards that apply to retirement villages, as they conflict with the MDRS. • The submitter also opposes the matters of discretion, which are so broad as to make the restriction on discretion ineffective. • The submitter considers that the construction of retirement villages should have focused matters of discretion to provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities. • The submitter considers the matters of discretion applicable to retirement villages need to appropriately provide for / support the efficient use of larger sites for retirement villages, and the functional and operational needs of retirement villages.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter also considers that proposals for the construction of retirement villages within the Medium Density Residential Zone 2 should be precluded from being publicly notified. The submitter also considers that a retirement village that is compliant with standards MRZ2-S2 (Height – building general), MRZ2-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) and MRZ2-S4 (Setback) should also be precluded from limited notification.
Point Number	107.37
Plan Chapter	Medium Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support
Summary of Decision Requested	Amend Rule MRZ2-S1(1) and MRZ2-S1(a) by adding the words ‘retirement unit/s’ as shown in the submission
Decision Requested	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter supports Rule MRZ2-S1 as it aligns with clause 10 of the MDRS. The submitter considers that specific reference to retirement units is required. The submitter seeks to amend Rule MRZ2-S1(2) to exclude retirement villages from the matters of discretion, so the retirement village specific matters of discretion apply to the construction of a retirement village building that exceeds this standard (as per Rule MRZ2-RX refer Submission 107.36).
Point Number	107.38
Plan Chapter	Medium Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support in part
Summary of Decision Requested	Amend Rule MRZ2-S2(2) to exclude retirement villages from these matters of discretion so the retirement village specific matters of discretion apply to the construction of a retirement village building that exceeds this standard (as per Rule MRZ2-RX above refer Submission Point 107.36).
Decision Reasons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter supports Rule MRZ2-S2, and the building height provisions which align with the building height standard of the MDRS. The submitter considers however that the matters of discretion for a restricted discretionary activity under Rule MRZ2-S2(2) are not appropriate for retirement villages. The submitter seeks to exclude retirement villages from these matters of discretion, with retirement village specific matters of discretion applying instead. These retirement village specific matters of discretion are those provided in response to Rule 2A.4.1.3(e) above.

Point Number	107.39
Plan Chapter	Medium Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Amend Rule MRZ2-S3 Height in Relation to Boundary by stating the rule does not apply to boundaries adjoining the Settlement Zone, Local Centre Zone, Commercial Zone or Industrial Zone as shown in the submission.
Decision Reasons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter supports Rule MRZ2-S3 and the height in relation to boundary provisions in principle which reflect the height in relation to boundary standards of the MDRS. • The submitter considers that additional exclusions should be integrated with this standard to enable larger scale developments to occur where adjacent to less sensitive zones, where the effects of larger buildings will be appropriate. • The submitter also considers however that the matters of discretion for a restricted discretionary activity under Rule MRZ2-S3(2) are not appropriate for retirement villages. • The submitter seeks that retirement village specific matters of discretion apply instead. These retirement village specific matters of discretion are those provided in relation to Rule MRZ2-RX above.
Point Number	107.40
Plan Chapter	Medium Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Amend Rule MRZ2-S4(2) to exclude retirement villages from these matters of discretion so the retirement village specific matters of discretion apply to the construction of a retirement village building that exceeds this standard (as per Rule MRZ2-RX. Refer Submission 107.36).
Decision Reasons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter supports Rule MRZ2-S4 and the setback provisions which reflect the setback standards of the MDRS. • The submitter also considers that the matters of discretion for a restricted discretionary activity under Rule MRZ2-S4(2) are not appropriate for retirement villages. • The submitter seeks that retirement village specific matters of discretion apply instead. These retirement village specific matters of discretion are those provided in relation to Rule MRZ2-RX above.
Point Number	107.41

Plan Chapter	Medium Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Amend Rule MRZ2-S5(2) to exclude retirement villages from these matters of discretion so the retirement village specific matters of discretion apply to the construction of a retirement village building that exceeds this standard (as per Rule MRZ2-RX Refer Submission 107.36). AND the submitter seeks to exclude retirement villages from the matters of discretion and apply specific matters of discretion.
Decision Reasons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter supports Rule MRZ2-S5, and the building coverage provisions which reflect the building coverage standards of the MDRS. • The submitter considers that the matters of discretion for a restricted discretionary activity under Rule MRZ2-S5(2) are not appropriate for retirement villages. • The submitter seeks that retirement village specific matters of discretion apply instead. • These retirement village specific matters of discretion are those provided in relation to Rule MRZ2-RX Refer Submission 107.36.
Point Number	107.42
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Amend Rule MRZ2-S6 to add specific standards for retirement units with additions shown in the submission AND the submitter seeks to exclude retirement villages from the matters of discretion and apply specific matters of discretion.
Decision Requested	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter supports Rule MRZ2-S6 and the outdoor living space provisions in principle which reflect the outdoor living space standard of the Act. • The submitter considers that because of retirement villages providing a range of private and communal outdoor areas, amendments should be made to Rule MRZ2-S6 that enable the communal areas to count towards the amenity standard. • The submitter also considers that the matters of discretion for a restricted discretionary activity under Rule MRZ2-S6(2) are not appropriate for retirement villages. • The submitter seeks that retirement village specific matters of discretion apply instead. These retirement village specific matters of discretion are those provided in relation to Rule MRZ2-RX Refer Submission 107.36.
Point Number	107.43

Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Amend Rule MRZ2-S7 to add specific standards for retirement units with the additions shown in the submission AND the submitter seeks to exclude retirement villages from the matters of discretion and apply specific matters of discretion.
Decision Reasons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter supports Rules MRZ2-S7, and the outlook space provisions in principle which reflect the outlook space standard of the Act. • The submitter however considers that in a retirement village environment (that has multiple communal spaces available for residents) the standard is not directly relevant • The submitter considers amendments should be made to the outlook space rules to provide for outlook space requirements that are appropriate for retirement villages • The submitter also considers that the matters of discretion for a restricted discretionary activity under Rule MRZ2-S7(2) are not appropriate for retirement villages • The submitter seeks that the retirement village specific matters of discretion apply instead. • These retirement village specific matters of discretion are those provided in response to Rule MRZ2-RX Refer Submission 107.36
Point Number	107.44
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Amend Rule MRZ2-S8 as: <i>MRZ2-S8(1)(a): Any residential unit or retirement unit facing the public street must have a minimum of 20% of the street-facing façade in glazing. This can be in the form of windows or doors.</i> AND The submitter seeks to exclude retirement villages from the matters of discretion and apply specific matters of discretion.
Decision Reasons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter supports Rule MRZ2-S8 and the windows to street provisions in principle which reflects the windows to street MDRS. • The submitter however considers amendment to the rule is required to clarify that the standard also applies to retirement units. • It should also only apply to public streets and not internal/private streets.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter also considers that the matters of discretion for a restricted discretionary activity under Rule MRZ2-S8(2) are not appropriate for retirement villages. • The submitter seeks that the retirement village specific matters of discretion apply instead. • These retirement village specific matters of discretion are those provided in response to Rule MRZ2-RX. Refer Submission 107.36.
Point Number	107.45
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone – S9 Landscaped Area
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Amend Rule MRZ2-S9 to provide for retirement units.</p> <p>MRZ2-S9 (1)</p> <p>(a) A residential unit or <i>retirement unit</i> at ground floor level has a landscaped area of a minimum of 20% of a developed site with grass or plants and can include the canopy of trees regardless of the ground treatment below them.</p> <p>(b) The landscaped area may be located on any part of the development site and does not need to be associated with each residential unit or retirement unit.</p>
Decision Reasons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter supports Rule MRZ2-S9 and the landscaped area provisions in principle which reflects the landscaped area MDRS. • The submitter considers amendment to these rules is required to clarify that the standards also apply to retirement units. • The submitter also considers that the matters of discretion for a restricted discretionary activity under Rule MRZ2-S9(2) are not appropriate for retirement villages. • The submitter seeks that the retirement village specific matters of discretion apply instead. • These retirement village specific matters of discretion are those provided in relation to Rule MRZ2-RX. (Refer Submission 107.36).
Point Number	107.46
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Amend Rule MRZ2-S10(2) (Impervious Surfaces) as follows:</p> <p>(2) Activity status where compliance not achieved: RDIS</p> <p>Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters:</p>

	<p><i>(a) Site design, layout, and amenity; and</i></p> <p><i>(b) The risk of flooding, nuisance or damage to the site or other buildings and sites.</i></p> <p><i><u>(c) The effects of any on-site stormwater retention or detention devices.</u></i></p>
Decision Reasons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter does not oppose Rule MRZ2-S10 and the 70% impervious surface area standard as it does not preclude a 50% building coverage. The submitter considers that the impermeable surface standard should provide for technical solutions (such as retention and detention).
Point Number	107.47 - S11 Ground floor internal habitable space
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Oppose
Summary of Decision Requested	Delete Rule MRZ2-S11
Decisions Reasons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter opposes Rule MRZ2-S11 and requirements for garages, as this is not a requirement of the MDRS.
Point Number	107.48
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Oppose
Summary of Decision Requested	Delete Rule MRZ2-S12 – Fences or walls
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter opposes Rule MRZ2-S12 and the requirements for fences and walls, as this is not a requirement of the MDRS.
Point Number	107.49
Plan Chapter	Local Centre Zone
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Amend the purpose, objectives and policies to recognise that residential activities are appropriate within the LCZ.
Decision Reasons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter considers amendments to the purpose, objectives and policies are required to recognise that residential activities are appropriate within the LCZ (including at ground floor in appropriate circumstances).
Point Number	107.50

Plan Chapter	Local Centre Zone
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Add the following policies into Part 3- Local Centre Zone</p> <p>Provision of housing for an ageing population</p> <p>1. Provide for a diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the needs and characteristics of older persons in the Local Centre Zone, such as retirement villages.</p> <p>2. Recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, including that they:</p> <p>a. May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services.</p> <p>b. Have unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.</p> <p>Larger sites</p> <p>Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within the Medium Density Residential Zone by providing for more efficient use of those sites.</p> <p>Density standards</p> <p>Enable the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Delete or Amend other Local Centre Zone objectives and policies for consistency</p>
Decisions Reasons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter considers Variation 3 should include changes to the Local Centre Zone. • The Enabling Housing Act is not limited to residential zones and councils are required to ensure district plans provide for intensification in urban non-residential zones. • Amendments to the Local Centre Zone are therefore required to comply with s77N RMA. • The submitter considers policy support for retirement villages in the Local Centre Zone is required (as also set out in the submission above).
Point Number	107.51
Plan Chapter	Local Centre Zone
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend

Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Add a new Rule to provide for the activity of retirement villages as a permitted activity: <u>COMZ-RX - Retirement Villages, excluding the construction of buildings</u> <u>(1) Activity status: Permitted</u> <u>Land-use effects standards and Land-use building standards do not apply.</u> <u>Activity Specific Standards: Nil</u> <u>(2) Activity status where compliance not achieved: n/a.</u></p>
Decisions Reasons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter considers Variation 3 should include amendments to LCZ-R4. • The submitter supports the permitted activity status for residential activities in the Commercial Zone. • The submitter considers a retirement village specific rule is required recognising that retirement villages provide substantial benefit, including enabling older people to remain in familiar community environments for longer (close to family and support networks), whilst also freeing up several dwellings located in surrounding suburbs.
Point Number	107.52
Plan Chapter	Local Centre Zone
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Add a new rule LCZ-RX as shown in the submission that lists the Construction of buildings Retirement Villages as a Restricted Discretionary. The submission includes matters of discretion specific to the activity and requests that the activity should be precluded from public notification.</p>
Decisions Reasons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter opposes the discretionary activity status that would apply to retirement villages in the Commercial Zone as an activity that is not specifically listed. In line with the relief sought in the residential zones above. • The submitter considers that to give effect to the NPSUD and the Enabling Housing Act, Variation 3 should provide for the construction of retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity under a specific retirement village rule, and that the construction of retirement villages should have their own set of focused matters of discretion (so to provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities). • The submitter also considers that proposals for the construction of retirement villages within the Local Centre Zone should be precluded from being publicly notified.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter also considers that a retirement village that is compliant with standards LCZ-S4 (Building Height), LCZ-S5 (Height in relation to boundary), LCZ-S6 (Building setback – zone boundaries) should also be precluded from limited notification.
Point Number	107.53
Plan Chapter	Local Centre Zone
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support
Summary of Decision Requested	Retain LCZ-S4 standard.
Decisions Reasons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter supports this standard because it is similarly enabling too the MDRS height standard.
Point Number	107.54
Plan Chapter	Local Centre Zone
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Amend the LCZ-S5 (Height in relation to boundary) so that it is no more restrictive than the MDRS height in relation to boundary standard.
Decisions Reasons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter opposes this standard to the extent it is more restrictive than the MDRS height in relation to boundary standard.
Point Number	107.55
Plan Chapter	Local Centre Zone
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Amend LCZ-S6 (Building Setbacks) so that it is no more restrictive than the MDRS yard standard when applied to residential activities.
Decisions Reasons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter opposes this standard to the extent it is more restrictive than the MDRS yard standard as it relates to residential activities (including retirement villages).
Point Number	107.56
Plan Chapter	Local Centre Zone
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Amend LCZZ-S10 (Outdoor living spaces) so that it is no more onerous than the MDRS outdoor living space standard and recognises that communal spaces may be provided instead of private/exclusive use spaces.

Decision Reasons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter opposes this standard to the extent it is more onerous than the MDRS outdoor living space standard. • The submitter also opposes this standard as it does not recognise that retirement villages provide communal outdoor living spaces for residents.
Point Number	107.57
Plan Chapter	Commercial Zone – Purpose, Objectives and Policies
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Oppose
Summary of Decision Requested	Amend the purpose, objectives and policies to recognise that residential activities are appropriate within the COMZ.
Decision Reasons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter considers amendments to the purpose, objectives and policies are required to recognise that residential activities are appropriate within the TCZ (including at ground floor in appropriate circumstances).
Point Number	107.58
Plan Chapter	Commercial Zone – NEW Policies
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Oppose
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Add the following policies into Part 3 - Town Centre Zone</p> <p><u>Provision of housing for an ageing population</u></p> <p><u>1. Provide for a diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the needs and characteristics of older persons in the Commercial Zone, such as retirement villages.</u></p> <p><u>2. Recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, including that they:</u></p> <p><u>a. May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services.</u></p> <p><u>b. Have unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.</u></p> <p><u>Larger sites.</u></p> <p><u>c) Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within the Medium Density Residential Zone by providing for more efficient use of those sites.</u></p> <p><u>d) Density standards Enable the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments.</u></p>

	AND Delete or Amens other Commercial Zone objectives and policies of consistency.
Decision Reasons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter considers Variation 3 should include changes to the Town Centre Zone. • The Enabling Housing Act is not limited to residential zones and councils are required to ensure district plans provide for intensification in urban non-residential zones. Amendments to the Town Centre Zone are therefore, required to comply with s77N RMA. The submitter considers policy support for retirement villages in the Commercial Zone is required (as also set out in the submission above).
Point Number	107.59
Plan Chapter	Commercial Zone – NEW Rule
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Add a new Rule to provide for the activity of retirement villages as a permitted activity: <i>COMZ-RX - Retirement Villages, excluding the construction of buildings</i> <i>(1) Activity status: Permitted</i> <i>Land-use effects standards and Land-use building standards do not apply.</i> <i>Activity Specific Standards: Nil</i> <i>(2) Activity status where compliance not achieved: n/a.</i></p>
Decision Reasons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To give effect to the NPSUD and the Enabling Housing Act, the submitter considers Variation 3 should include amendments to COMZ-R4The submitter supports the permitted activity status for residential activities in the Town Centre Zone. • The submitter considers a retirement village specific rule is required recognising that retirement villages provide substantial benefit, including enabling older people to remain in familiar community environments for longer (close to family and support networks), whilst also freeing up several dwellings located in surrounding suburbs.
Point Number	107.60
Plan Chapter	Commercial Zone –
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Oppose

Summary of Decision Requested	Add a new rule COMZ-RX as shown in the submission that lists the Construction of buildings Retirement Villages as a Restricted Discretionary. The submission includes matters of discretion specific to the activity and requests that the activity should be precluded from public notification.
Decision Reasons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter opposes the discretionary activity status that would apply to retirement villages in the Town Centre Zone as an activity that is not specifically listed. • The submitter considers that to give effect to the NPSUD and the Enabling Housing Act, Variation 3 should provide for the construction of retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity under a specific retirement village rule, and that the construction of retirement villages should have their own set of focused matters of discretion (so to provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities). • The submitter also considers that proposals for the construction of retirement villages within the Town Centre Zone should be precluded from being publicly notified. • The submitter also considers that a retirement village that is compliant with standards COMZ-S4 (Building Height), COMZ-S5 (Height in relation to boundary), COMZ-S5 (Building setback – zone boundaries) should also be precluded from limited notification.
Point Number	107.61
Plan Chapter	Commercial Zone
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Support
Summary of Decision Requested	Retain COMZZ-S4.
Decisions Reasons	The submitter supports this standard because it is similarly enabling too the MDRS height standard.
Point Number	107.62
Plan Chapter	Commercial Zone
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Amend COMZ-S5 so that it is no more restrictive than the MDRS height in relation to boundary standard.
Decisions Reasons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter opposes this standard to the extent it is more restrictive than the MDRS height in relation to boundary standard.
Point Number	107.63

Plan Chapter	Commercial Zone
Support/ Oppose/Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Amend COMZ-S6 so that it is no more restrictive than the MDRS yard standard when applied to residential activities.
Decisions Reasons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter opposes this standard to the extent it is more restrictive than the MDRS yard standard as it relates to residential activities (including retirement villages).
Point Number	107.64
Plan Chapter	Commercial Zone – S10 – Outdoor Living Space
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Amend COMZ-S10 so that it is no more onerous than the MDRS outdoor living space standard and recognises that communal spaces may be provided instead of private exclusive use spaces.
Decision Reasons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter opposes this standard to the extent it is more onerous than the MDRS outdoor living space standard. The submitter also opposes this standard as it does not recognise that retirement villages provide communal outdoor living spaces for residents.
Point Number	107.65
Plan Chapter	Town Centre Zone – Objectives and Policies
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Amend the purpose, objectives and policies to recognise that residential activities are appropriate within the TCZ.
Decision Reasons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter considers amendments to the purpose, objectives and policies are required to recognise that residential activities are appropriate within the TCZ (including at ground floor in appropriate circumstances).
Point Number	107.66
Plan Chapter	Town Centre Zone - Policies
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose
Summary of Decision Requested	Add the following policies into Part 3 - Town Centre Zone

	<p><u>Provision of housing for an ageing population</u></p> <p><u>1. Provide for a diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the needs and characteristics of older persons in the Commercial Zone, such as retirement villages.</u></p> <p><u>2. Recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, including that they:</u></p> <p><u>a. May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services.</u></p> <p><u>b. Have unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.</u></p> <p><u>Larger sites. Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within the Medium Density Residential Zone by providing for more efficient use of those sites.</u></p> <p><u>d)Density standards Enable the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments.</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Delete or Amend other Town Centre Zone objectives and policies for consistency.</p>
Decision Reasons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter considers Variation 3 should include changes to the Town Centre Zone. • The Enabling Housing Act is not limited to residential zones and councils are required to ensure district plans provide for intensification in urban non-residential zones. Amendments to the Town Centre Zone are therefore, required to comply with s77N RMA. • The submitter considers policy support for retirement villages in the Town Centre Zone is required (as also set out in the submission above).
Point Number	107.67
Plan Chapter	Town Centre Zone
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Add a new Rule to provide for the activity of retirement villages as a permitted activity:</p> <p><u>TCZ-RX - Retirement Villages, excluding the construction of buildings</u></p> <p><u>(1) Activity status: Permitted</u></p> <p><u>Land-use effects standards and Land-use building standards do not apply.</u></p> <p><u>Activity Specific Standards: Nil</u></p> <p><u>(2) Activity status where compliance not achieved: n/a.</u></p>

Decision Reasons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To give effect to the NPSUD and the Enabling Housing Act, the submitter considers Variation 3 should include amendments to TCZ-R2. • The submitter supports the permitted activity status for residential activities in the Town Centre Zone. • The submitter considers a retirement village specific rule is required recognising that retirement villages provide substantial benefit, including enabling older people to remain in familiar community environments for longer (close to family and support networks), whilst also freeing up several dwellings located in surrounding suburbs.
Point Number	107.68
Plan Chapter	Town Centre Zone
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose in part
Summary of Decision Requested	Add a new rule TCZ-RX as shown in the submission that lists the Construction of buildings Retirement Villages as a Restricted Discretionary. The submission includes matters of discretion specific to the activity and requests that the activity should be precluded from public notification.
Decision Reasons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter opposes the discretionary activity status that would apply to retirement villages in the Town Centre Zone as an activity that is not specifically listed. • The submitter considers that to give effect to the NPSUD and the Enabling Housing Act, Variation 3 should provide for the construction of retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity under a specific retirement village rule, and that the construction of retirement villages should have their own set of focused matters of discretion (so to provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities). • The submitter also considers that proposals for the construction of retirement villages within the Town Centre Zone should be precluded from being publicly notified. • The submitter also considers that a retirement village that is compliant with standards TCZ-S3 (Building Height), TCZ-S4 (Height in relation to boundary), TCZ-S8 (Building setback – zone boundaries) should also be precluded from limited notification.
Point Number	107.69
Plan Chapter	Town Centre Zone
Support/Oppose/Amend	Support

Summary of Decision Requested	Retain TCZ-S3.
Decision Reasons	The submitter supports this standard because it is similarly enabling too the MDRS height standard.
Point Number	107.70
Plan Chapter	Town Centre Zone
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Amend TCZ-S4 so that it is no more restrictive than the MDRS height in relation to boundary standard.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter opposes this standard to the extent it is more restrictive than the MDRS height in relation to boundary standard.
Point Number	107.71
Plan Chapter	Town Centre Zone
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Amend TCZ-S8 so that it is no more restrictive than the MDRS yard standard when applied to residential activities.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter opposes this standard to the extent it is more restrictive than the MDRS yard standard as it relates to residential activities (including retirement villages).
Point Number	107.72
Plan Chapter	Town Centre Zone
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested	Amend TCZ-S11 so that it is no more onerous than the MDRS outdoor living space standard and recognise that communal spaces may be provided instead of private exclusive use spaces.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter opposes this standard to the extent it is more onerous than the MDRS outdoor living space standard. The submitter also opposes this standard as it does not recognise that retirement villages provide communal outdoor living spaces for residents.
Point Number	107.73
Plan Chapter	Maps
Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Oppose

Summary of Decision Requested	<p>Reconsider the aerial extent of the Medium Density Residential 2 Zone; AND Remove the urban fringe qualifying matter so those areas are rezoned from General Residential to Medium Density Residential Zone 2; AND The Medium Density 1 Zone is rezoned to Medium Density Residential Zone 2 (Raglan and Te Kauwhata).</p>
Decisions Reasons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter opposes the geographical extent of the proposed Medium Density Residential Zone 2. • The submitter opposes the application of the Urban Fringe qualifying matter which seeks to encourage intensive residential development to areas within 800m walkable catchments of towns. • The Enabling Housing Act and NPSUD does not include any requirement to constrain the development to within the walkable catchments of town centres in relevant residential zones. • The Urban Fringe Qualifying Matter has been used to justify the retention of large areas of General Residential Zone and there is not adequate justification for this zoning in terms of the requirements under s77L of the Act. • The submitter opposes the retention of the Medium Density Residential Zone 1 in Raglan and Te Kauwhata. • The submitter considers that under the Enabling Housing Act, both Raglan and Te Kauwhata are 'relevant residential zones. While both have a population of less than 5,000 as of 2018, the Future Proof 2022 strategy referenced in the section 32 report refers to both Raglan and Te Kauwhata as identified urban areas. Map 1: Settlement Pattern also refers to both the towns as 'urban enablement areas. • The submitter therefore considers that Waikato District Council intends both areas to become part of an urban environment, and therefore the MDRS should be applied to these areas.

Submitter Number	108	Submitter Names	Ryman Healthcare Limited
Point Number	108.1		
Plan Chapter	All of Variation		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend		
Summary of Decision Requested:	The submitter seeks the same relief sought by Retirement Villages Association (RVA #107).		

Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refer to reasons in #107. • Submitter seeks to emphasise that Variation 3 will have a significant impact on the provision of housing and care for the Waikato District's growing ageing population. • The submitter considers that there is a real risk that the proposed changes will delay necessary retirement and aged care accommodation in the region.
------------------------	--

Submitter Number	109	Submitter Names	Michael Allington
Point Number	109.1		
Plan Chapter	Maps		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Delete GRZ TO MRZ AND Delete MRZ to MRZ2. This submission relates to Pookeno.		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter brought their one-story house with covenants protecting it. For this reason, a lot of retired people live in Pookeno. • Mental health of residents will be affected when developing 3x3 houses next to the existing residents. • The three storey homes will have little, if any, road parking that will cause the streets to become clogged up. • This [Pookeno] is a rural village, and the rezoning should not go ahead. 		

Submitter Number	110	Submitter Names	Bronwyn Heath
Point Number	110.1		
Plan Chapter	Generic Topic		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Amend Variation 3 so that MRZ2 is not located on the main road of Pookeno, and instead is applied out of the town area. Submission opposes the rezoning of Pookeno from MRZ to MRZ2.		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not enough footpaths. • Safety of public. • Environmental impact as there is no space and overloads a small area. 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not what buyers have invested in. • Insufficient infrastructure. • Access into and out of Pookeno.
--	--

Submitter Number	111	Submitter Names	Lana Tapu
Point Number	111.1		
Plan Chapter	Generic topic		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Not stated		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Not stated.		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitter does not want 3 storey buildings in Tuakau and thinks they should go elsewhere. 		

Submitter Number	112	Submitter Names	Richard Piechazak
Point Number	112.1		
Plan Chapter	Subdivision		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Support		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Approve future subdivision.		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subdivision should be allowed for. 		

Submitter Number	113	Submitter Names	Mrs S Paul
Point Number	113.1		
Plan Chapter	All of Variation		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Require assurance if the Variation goes ahead, it does not impact on existing residents.		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter considers the Variation is designed for big cities not small communities. • The submitter is concerned about parking, shade, privacy and noise affecting the wellbeing of residents. • The submitter considers more houses are needed but not at the expense of existing residents. • The submission is not designed for the average person to fill out. 		

Submitter Number	114	Submitter Names	Waikato Tainui
Point Number	114.1		
Plan Chapter	Generic Topic		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Amend the definition of “Qualifying matter” to include the area surrounding Tuurangawaewae Marae.		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better reflects the significance of the site to Waikato-Tainui and the Kiingitanga. • Whilst not identified in the Proposed District Plan Decisions Version as a Site of Significance, Tuurangawaewae Marae is a site of significance to Waikato-Tainui and the Kiingitanga. • Better reflects the significance of Tuurangawaewae Marae in regard to section 6(e) and 6(f) of the RMA. 		
Point Number	114.2		
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Amend the explanatory note in MRZ2 to include reference to the area surrounding Tuurangawaewae Marae in the context of a qualifying matter.		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better reflects the significance of the site to Waikato-Tainui and the Kiingitanga. • Whilst not identified in the Proposed District Plan Decisions Version as a Site of Significance, Tuurangawaewae Marae is a site of significance to Waikato-Tainui and the Kiingitanga. • Better reflects the significance of Tuurangawaewae Marae in regard to section 6(e) and 6(f) of the RMA. 		
Point Number	114.3		
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Support		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Retain Te Ture Whaimana as qualifying matter in MRZ2 Explanatory note.		

Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriately sets out that Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato is a pertinent qualifying matter as set out in the s771(c) of the Resource Management Act 1991.
Point Number	114.4
Plan Chapter	Strategic Direction
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested:	<p>Amend policy SD-P2 Medium Density Residential Standards as follows:</p> <p><i>Apply the MDRS across all relevant residential zones in the district plan except in circumstances where the qualifying matter is relevant (including Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato or other matters of significance such as historic heritage and the relationship of Maaori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga).</i></p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This amendment more clearly sets out that Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato is a pertinent qualifying matter as set out in the s771(c) of the Resource Management Act 1991.
Point Number	114.5
Plan Chapter	Maps
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested:	<p>Amend the MRZ2 zoning surrounding Tuarangawaewae Marae being the sites on River Road, Regent Street, Kent Street, George Street, Edward Street, King and Queen Street.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tuarangawaewae marae should be considered in the context of a qualifying matter given the significance of the site in the context of section 6(e) and 6(f) of the RMA. Impacts of traffic on River Road on Tuarangawaewae Marae. The proposed building heights enabled in the MRZ2 Zone would diminish the cultural character of the area. The proposed building heights of the MRZ2 Zone would visually obstruct Tuarangawaewae whanau views of the marae and possibly the awa. The multi storey buildings will also add as a distraction to the importance and status of the marae and Kiingitanga.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> These areas also include papakainga and a vast majority of Tuurangawaewae whaanau live in this area who would be affected by the proposed zoning.
Point Number	114.6
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2
Support/Oppose/Amend	Support
Summary of Decision Requested:	Retain the following cross reference in the MRZ2 chapter located above the MRZ2 purpose statement: 'The relevant district-wide chapter provision apply in addition to this chapter'.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gives necessary reference for plan users to consider and address other chapters.
Point Number	114.7
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested:	<p>Amend the purpose statement in the MRZ2 chapter as follows:</p> <p><i>Provide greater diversity / choice of housing. ;</i></p> <p><i>and - Recognise and account for qualifying matters including Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato.</i></p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Better recognises the limitations which have informed the extent of the zone.
Point Number	114.8
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested:	<p>Amend MRZ2-05 Qualifying matters as follows:</p> <p>The capacity to accommodate medium density residential development may be limited to recognise and for protect one or more qualifying matters.</p>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The amendment will ensure the objective is compatible and consistent with Policy MRZ2-P6 which implements it.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The amendment will reduce ambiguity in implementing the objective.
Point Number	114.9
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2
Support/Oppose/Amend	
Summary of Decision Requested:	Retain MRZ2-P6 Qualifying matters.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriately recognises the constraints that qualifying matters place on residential development.
Point Number	114.10
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend
Summary of Decision Requested:	Amend MRZ2-S1 – Residential Unit matters of discretion to include the following: - <i>Effects on cultural values.</i>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides for addressing effects on cultural values · Important given the scale and extent of development provided for as a restricted discretionary activity.
Point Number	114.11
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2
Support/Oppose/Amend	
Summary of Decision Requested:	Amend MRZ2-S2 – Building height matters of discretion to include the following: - <i>Effects on cultural values.</i>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides for addressing effects on cultural values · Important given the scale and extent of development provided for as a restricted discretionary activity.
Point Number	114.12
Plan Chapter	Medium Density Residential Zone 2
Support/Oppose/Amend	Amend

Summary of Decision Requested:	Amend MRZ2-S3 – Height in relation to boundary matters of discretion to include the following: - <i>Effects on cultural values.</i>
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides for addressing effects on cultural values · Important given the scale and extent of development provided for as a restricted discretionary activity.
Point Number	114.13
Plan Chapter	Generic topic
Support/Oppose/Amend	Not stated
Summary of Decision Requested:	No specific decision requested, but submission considers that including Te Ture Whaimana in planning documents, including maatauranga maori is not an optional addition but a key component of any plan review within the Waikato and Waipaa River Catchments.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Te Ture Whaimana is the primary direction setting document for the Waikato River and activities within its catchment affecting the Waikato and Waipaa Rivers. This legislative document prevails over any inconsistencies in other policies, plans, or processes affecting the Waikato River. Relevant policies, plans, and processes cannot be amended so that they are inconsistent with Te Ture Whaimana and must be reviewed and amended, if required, to address any inconsistencies.
Point Number	114.14
Plan Chapter	Generic topic
Support/Oppose/Amend	Not stated
Summary of Decision Requested:	No specific decision requested, but submission considers the Joint Management Agreement between Waikato District Council and Waikato-Tainui means Council has a duty to uphold Te Ture Whaimana and ensure its achievement as a JMA partner. The submission considers that Waikato District Council is required to not only reduce pressure on the river but to restore and protect the health and wellbeing of the awa and achieve betterment in relation to all activities in all areas of the district regardless of the MDRS provisions and qualifying matters.
Decision Reason	No reasons provided.

Point Number	114.15
Plan Chapter	Generic Topic
Support/Oppose/Amend	Not stated
Summary of Decision Requested:	No specific decision requested, however submitter considers that housing intensification, inappropriate subdivisions, use or development of resources has the potential to adversely affect the Waikato River and therefore, fails to give effect to Te Ture Whaimana.
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 771 of the Housing Supply Amendment Act (HSAA) outlines that a specified territorial authority may make Medium Density Residential Standards (and the relevant building height or density requirements under Policy 3 of the NPS-UD) less enabling of development in relation to an area with a relevant zone to the extent necessary to accommodate a matter required to give effect to Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato.

Submitter Number	115	Submitter Names	Queen's Redoubt Trust
Point Number	115.1		
Plan Chapter	Maps		
Support/Oppose/Amend	Oppose		
Summary of Decision Requested:	Do not allow anything but single storey housing in the south side of Selby Street, adjoining the Queen's Redoubt site, and in William Rogers Road, Pookeno, opposite the entrance to the redoubt.		
Decision Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The south side of Selby Street adjoins the Queen's Redoubt historic site/reserve. High rise buildings adjacent to the site will compromise its integrity and view shafts. The sections on the south side of Selby Street and No. 20 Great South Road, the so-called Redoubt House are part of the original Queen's Redoubt. The sections are part of Queen's Redoubt Archaeological Site (S12/22) and are protected under the HNZPTA Act. The Queen's Redoubt property was to become a special heritage zone under Franklin DC Plan Change 42. The submitter believes this zone was unfortunately not completed by WDC. The site has been identified by Ann McEwan's Pookeno Heritage Assessment as a nationally significant heritage site in NZ. The Queen's Redoubt Trust have raised substantial sums of money and the site is a NZ Ward Education Centre with over 1000 school children visiting in the last 6 months. 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Queen's Redoubt site and its history is the subject of a substantial book by the submitters.
--	---