

## HII Lakeside - Appendix I: Table of submission and further submission points (*Rebuttal Evidence*)

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
565.1	Rochelle Hulme	Oppose	Delete the medium and higher density precincts from Lakeside Development Area, Te Kauwhata.	The lakeside lot sizes are too small for the semi-rural area with limited infrastructure. It will damage the village.	Reject	16
565.2	Rochelle Hulme	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.5.9.1 C1 (a)(ii) - Subdivision Lakeside - general, by deleting A, B and C and replacing with the lot sizes in the Te Kauwhata West Residential Area Rule 16.4.3, as notified (minimum 650m <sup>2</sup> , average 875m <sup>2</sup> ) or a minimum lot size of 450m <sup>2</sup> .	The lakeside lot sizes are too small for the semi-rural area with limited infrastructure. It will damage the village.	Reject	16
FS1371.8	Lakeside Development Limited	Oppose	Lakeside development Limited seeks that the proposed changes sought in the submission point made by Rochelle Hulme be declined and that the standards relating to density of the Lakeside Te Kauwhata Precinct remain unchanged.	<p>The provisions of the Te Kauwhata Precinct, specifically relating to minimum lot size requirements within the Lakeside Development, are effectively carried over from the Operative District Plan. These provisions were extensively tested through the Lakeside Plan Change Process. The Lakeside development is a key part for providing growth within the northern Waikato area. It is appropriate to provide a range of densities in Te Kauwhata. This is key to providing housing choice in Te Kauwhata. This is essential to providing affordable housing in Te Kauwhata. That will not promote the sustainable management of resources and will achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 ("RMA"); That will not enable the well-being of the community; That will not meet the reasonably foreseeable need of future generations; That will not enable the efficient use and development of the district's assets; That will not represent the most appropriate means of exercising the Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means.</p>	Accept	
FS1388.815	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use	Awaiting recommendation	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure.</p> <p>Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</p>		
579.1	Simon Ash for Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited	Neutral/Amend	<p>Amend Rule 16.5.2PI (a)(i) Activity-Specific conditions as follows: (a) Secondary Access Control: (i) A secondary road access into the Lakeside Precinct Plan Area (as shown on Lakeside Precinct Plan 16.5.1(3)(ab)) must be opened for traffic before the number of dwellings include independent living units within a retirement village...</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any amendments or consequential changes that are necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.</p>	Correct referencing.	Accept	6
FS1388.885	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	<p>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure.</p> <p>Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</p>	Reject	
579.2	Simon Ash for Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited	Neutral/Amend	Delete matter of discretion (a) (ii) for Rule 16.5.3RDI Restricted Discretionary Activities relating to matters identified in the assessment criteria.	Incorrect reference as there is no assessment criteria.	Accept	7

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any amendments or consequential changes that are necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.			
FS/388.886	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
579.3	Simon Ash for Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.5.3 (2) (RD1) (a) (ii) (e) as follows: (ii) A CLDC is in accordance with the Lakeside Precinct Plans identified above if: ... E. Lakeside Walkway is within 4030m of the location shown on Precinct Plan Rule 16.5.1 (3) (c);... AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any amendments or consequential changes that are necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	Update to allow amended alignment.	Accept	7
FS/388.887	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
579.4	Simon Ash for Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.5.4 (1) D2 Discretionary Activities as follows: (iii) Any activity that does not comply with one or more of the activity specific conditions for a permitted activity under Rule 16.1.2 <del>applies under the or</del> Land Use - Effects Rule 16.2 or Land Use Buildings Rule 16.3. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any amendments or consequential changes that are necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	Ensures provision is workable and correct.	Accept	8
FS1388.888	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Reject	
579.5	Simon Ash for Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 16.5.7.2 P3 Earthworks - general. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any amendments or consequential changes that are necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	Flood risk area has been removed and as such provision is no longer required.	Accept	10
FS1388.889	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results</i>	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
<b>579.6</b>	<b>Simon Ash for Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.5.9.1 CI (a) (i) Subdivision Lakeside - general as follows: (i) Subdivision is for an existing or approved housing development <i>or is applied for concurrently with an application for housing development.</i> AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any amendments or consequential changes that are necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	Allows housing development to be applied for at the same time in subdivision.	Reject	16
FS1388.890	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Reject	
<b>579.7</b>	<b>Simon Ash for Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited</b>	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 16.5.9.2 RDI (b) (ii) Lakeside Comprehensive Subdivision Consent relating to matters identified in the assessment criteria. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any amendments or consequential changes that are necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	Incorrect reference as no assessment criteria.	Accept	17
FS1388.891	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects</i>	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure.</p> <p>Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</p>		
579.8	Simon Ash for Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited	Neutral/Amend	<p>Amend Rule 16.5.9.2RD1 (a) (iv) Lakeside Comprehensive Subdivision Consent (CS) as follows:            (iv) The Lakeside Walkway is within <del>40</del>30m of the location shown on Precinct Plan 16.5.1(3)(c);            AND            Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any amendments or consequential changes that are necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.</p>	Update to allow amended alignment.	Accept	17
FS1388.892	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	<p>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure.</p> <p>Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</p>	Reject	
830.3	Linda Silvester	Oppose	<p>Add a new provision in Rule 16.5.8.6 RD1(b)(iv) Living court to require that windows and balconies overlooking adjacent outdoor spaces and living areas have been avoided so as to respect the amenity and comfort of neighbouring properties.</p>	This follows Housing New Zealand's Simple Guide expectation that buildings and spaces should relate well to each other.	<p>Accept</p> <p>Reject</p>	13

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
965.9	Sandra Ellmers for Sandra EllmersFamily Trust	Oppose	Delete Rule 17.5.7 PI (a)(ii) Gross leasable floor area.	Submitter currently has a proposal before Council which includes development of approximately 2ha of Business zoned land they own and if they do not decide to subdivide the area into small lots but retain ownership off the total area this rule would prevent them from erecting more than two individual leasable units on the land. Therefore, the majority of the land would be underutilised when there is a dire shortage of Business Zoned land and Business premises in Raglan. There is no bare land available within the Business Zone in Raglan to accommodate any sizeable buildings or developments. The rule if implemented would substantially limit much needed development on the only Business Zone land available for new development in Raglan. There is no valid reason for preventing development of more than two individual units on Business Zoned land and no valid reason for limiting the size of leasable floor area for individual units.	Reject	20
330.91	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 22.8.8 Lakeside Comprehensive Subdivision Consent.	No reasons provided.	Reject	23
FS1386.451	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Accept	
FS1371.44	Lakeside Development Limited	Oppose	Lakeside development Limited seeks that the submission	<i>The provisions in the Lakeside Te Kauwhata</i>	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<i>by Andrew and Christine Gore in relation to Lakeside Te Kauwhata Precinct be declined.</i>	<i>Precinct in the proposed plan have been well tested through the plan change to the Operative District Plan. The Operative District Plan provisions have been effectively rolled over into the Proposed Plan. Those provisions are considered to be the most effective in giving effect to the plan.</i>		
<b>367.28</b>	<b>Liam McGrath for Mercer Residents and Ratepayers Committee</b>	Oppose	Amend 22.8.2 P4 (e) Permitted Activities, by reducing the length of operation time to an earlier time to be in line with other curfew times.	Lakeside Te Kauwhata Precinct is a densely populated area thus consideration must be given to neighbours for the operating times of machinery, especially if it is marketed to families or retirees. 9pm is too late and impractical.	Reject	24
FS1386.554	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
FS1371.1	Lakeside Development Limited	Oppose	Lakeside development seeks that the current operation hours of home occupations be retained and the submission point be declined.	Will not enable the most efficient use and development of residential development within the Lakeside Te Kauwhata Precinct. The precinct enables higher density residential development which provides for home occupations within the precinct provisions. While the precinct provisions will see a noticeable change in the level of development within the area, limiting home occupations is not consistent with the level of development anticipated for the area. Will not enable the wellbeing of the community as limiting the operation and function of home occupations within the precinct will inhibit small-scale commercial development within the precinct area that is necessary to provide the type of	Accept	



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>amenities and commercial services required to ensure the success of new residential developments. Lakeside is unique in that all residents will be new to the neighbourhood. All will be aware of the hours of operation for home occupation before they move into the neighbourhood.</i>		
<b>435.12</b>	<b>Jade Hyslop</b>	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.5.8.7 PI (a) Building setbacks - All boundaries, to provide for variable setbacks to suit the character of each road OR Amend Rule 16.5.8.7 PI (a) Building setbacks - All boundaries, to have a minimum 6m setback from the road boundary for all developments in the Residential Zone.	There are locations where there is no need for any setback, but it is not clear that any generic rule can be set to identify them. A 6m setback will generally retain village character of Raglan and protect many views. Submitter doesn't understand why WDC hasn't taken up the Environment Court's suggestion to undertake a more detailed assessment and there is nothing in s32 documents to explain that failure. s32--12-residential-zone-setbacks report lists assertions that 6m setback is odd, doesn't work and is generally not practical due to topography. The setback should reflect character of roads within Raglan, protect Raglan views and retain Raglan's existing character.	Reject	14
<i>FS1329.7</i>	<i>Koning Family Trust and Martin Koning</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose. Disallow the amendment of setback rules to require a 6m setback across the entire Residential Zone.</i>	<i>The submitter seeks to establish rules that require a 6m building setback in all Residential Zones. This may not be the most appropriate outcome in all cases.</i>	<i>Accept</i>	
<b>435.16</b>	<b>Jade Hyslop</b>	Oppose	Add a requirement (not discretionary) Rule 16.5.8.6 Living Court, to avoid balconies and windows that compromise privacy of neighboring outdoor spaces and living areas.	Follows Housing NZ's Simple Guide expectation that buildings and spaces should relate well to each other.	<a href="#">Accept</a> <a href="#">Reject</a>	13
<b>553.27</b>	<b>Malibu Hamilton</b>	Support	Retain Rule 22.8.2 P1, P2, P3, and P4 Permitted Activities.	The New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010 in Policy (d) recognises Tangata whenua needs for papakāinga, marae. The Waikato Regional Policy Statement, 2016 also has Policy 6.4 Marae and papakāinga provisions. The Future Proof Strategy Planning for Growth November 2017 has Priority 15 that seeks developments of papakāinga housing that meets the needs and aspirations in the sub-region. RMA sections 6(e), 7(a), and 8 set out legal obligations when managing the	Accept	24

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				natural and physical resources of the region to Tangata whenua.		
FS1388.791	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
567.14	Ngati Tamaoho Trust	Neutral/Amend	Add a new matter of discretion to Rule 22.8.3 RDI - Restricted Discretionary Activities, as follows: <u>(v) environmental effects.</u>	No reasons provided.	Reject	25
567.37	Ngati Tamaoho Trust	Neutral/Amend	Add a new activity specific condition to Rule 22.8.2 P7 - Permitted Activities for Forestry, as follows: <u>appropriate silt and sediment control.</u>	No reasons provided.	Reject	24
567.38	Ngati Tamaoho Trust	Neutral/Amend	Add a new activity specific condition to Rule 22.8.2 P18 - Permitted Activities for Horticulture, as follows: <u>appropriate silt control through traps and bunding.</u>	No reasons provided.	Reject	24
579.10	Simon Ash for Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Lakeside Te Kauwhata Precinct Plan 3 in Rule 16.5.1(3) to show the provision of four parks, with the park in the north western portion of the site being deleted. OR Retain Lakeside Te Kauwhata Precinct Plan 3 in Rule 16.5.1 (3) with five parks if Council confirms that it is financially able to maintain 5 parks. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any amendments or consequential changes that are necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the	LDL will form and vest parks at its own cost, but do not want to be in a position where the Council wants only four parks because the ongoing operational funding issues, but the plan provisions require five parks. Plan Change 20 originally proposed two parks, Council wanted to increase this to 5 which LDL accepted. The Council should either commit to the number of parks it wants or leave the number fluid and therefore remove the depiction of five parks within diagram 3.	Reject	5

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			submission.			
<b>579.11</b>	<b>Simon Ash for Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited</b>	Support	Retain the Business Zone rules as applicable to Specific Area: Lakeside Te Kauwhata Precinct are appropriate, except those to which amendments are sought in subsequent submission points.	The Business Zone and Lakeside Te Kauwhata Precinct rules clearly identify what provisions apply.	Accept	19
<i>FS1388.894</i>	<i>Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	<i>Reject</i>	
<b>579.12</b>	<b>Simon Ash for Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.5.1(2) Application of rules as follows: (2) The rules that apply to a permitted activity in Rule 17.5.2 P1-P17 17.1.2 P1-P18 within the... AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any amendments or consequential changes that are necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	Correct referencing.	Accept	19
<i>FS1388.895</i>	<i>Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk</i>	<i>Reject</i>	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
579.13	Simon Ash for Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 17.5.2 RDI Restricted Discretionary Activities matters of discretion (a) (ii) relating to matters identified in the assessment criteria. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any amendments or consequential changes that are necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	Incorrect reference as non-assessment criteria.	Accept	19
FS1388.896	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
579.14	Simon Ash for Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.5.4 NCI Non-complying Activities as follows: A CLDC that does not meet the requirements of Rule 17.5.2 RDI (b) relating to infrastructure requirements. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any amendments or consequential changes that are necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	Correct referencing.	Accept	19
FS1388.897	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
579.15	Simon Ash for Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.5.5 PI Daylight admission as follows: Any building shall not protrude through a height control plane rising at an angle of 45 degrees commencing at an elevation of 3.5m above ground level at every point of the site boundary where it adjoins a residential zone. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any amendments or consequential changes that are necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	Correct spelling.	Accept	19
579.16	Simon Ash for Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.5.6 RDI Gross floor area, as follows: (a) Any building which does not comply with Rule 17.5.6.2 PI. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any amendments or consequential changes that are necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	Correct referencing.	Accept	19
579.17	Simon Ash for Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.5.9 RDI (a) Subdivision as follows: (a) A Comprehensive Subdivision Consent (CS) that meets all of the following conditions: (i) is in accordance with Te Kauwhata Lakeside Precinct Plan 16.5.1(3)(a); the roading network, walkways and cycleways shown on Precinct Plan 16.5.1(3)(b); and the open space shown on Precinct Plan 16.5.1(3)(c); as set out in the precinct parameters below; and (ii) A CS is in accordance with the Lakeside Precinct Plans identified above if: A. Primary roads are within 50m of the location shown on Precinct Plan 16.5.1(3)(b); and B. Bus route is either on the alignment shown on Precinct Plan 16.5.1(3)(b) or a continuous alignment that achieves the same circulation; and C. (i) indicative areas of open space are within 200m of the location	Correct referencing.	Accept	19

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			shown on Precinct Plan 16.5.1(3)(bc). AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any amendments or consequential changes that are necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.			
FS1388.898	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
579.18	Simon Ash for Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.5.9 RDI (f)- Subdivision as follows: (f) Council's discretion is limited to the following matters: (i) consistency with the Te Kauwhata Lakeside Precinct Plan in 16.5.1(3)(a), (b) and (c); (ii) matters identified in the assessment criteria in X; (iii) managing the effects of wastewater and stormwater; (iv) roading network and compliance with a Council approved roading standard; (v) provision and location of existing and future utilities and connections; (vi) location of roads and their connections; (vii) provision of open space, including linkages between residential areas, open space and Lake Waikare; (viii) effects of natural hazards (including flooding), geotechnical suitability and land contamination; (ix) provision of the historic Iwi overlay area shown on Precinct Plan 16.5.1.3(bc). AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any amendments or consequential changes that are necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	Incorrect reference as no assessment criteria. Correct referencing.	Accept	19
FS1388.899	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
579.19	Simon Ash for Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.5.9 DI Subdivision as follows: (a) A CS that does not comply with Rule 17.5.9 RD1 and meets all of the following conditions and condition 17.5.9RD1 (bc) relating to infrastructure... AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any amendments or consequential changes that are necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	Correct reference.	Accept	19
FS1388.900	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
579.20	Simon Ash for Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.5.9 NCI Subdivision as follows: A CS that does not meet the requirements of Rule 17.5.9 RD1 (eb) relating to Infrastructure Requirements, shall be a non-complying activity. AND	Correct referencing.	Accept	19

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any amendments or consequential changes that are necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.			
579.21	Simon Ash for Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited	Neutral/Amend	<p>Add a new restricted discretionary activity rule to Rule 22.8.3(1) as follows: Activity: RDI (a) <u>A comprehensive land development consent (CLDC) that meets all of the following conditions: (i) is in accordance with Te Kauwhata Lakeside Precinct Plan 16.5.1(3)(a); the roading network, walkways and cycle ways shown on Precinct Plan 16.5.1(3)(v); and the open space shown on Precinct Plan 16.5.1(3)(c) as set out in the precinct parameters below; and (b) A CLDC is in accordance with the Lakeside Precinct Plans identified below if: (i) Primary roads are within 50m of the location shown on Precinct Plan 16.5.1(3)(b); and (ii) Bus route is either on the alignment shown on Precinct Plan 16.5.1(3)(b) or a continuous alignment that achieves the same circulation; and (iii) Subject to (v) below, the indicative walkways/cycle ways are within 100m of the location shown on Precinct Plan 16.5.1(3)(b) provided that connections are retained between the Lakeside Walkway and the residential development; and (iv) Subject to (v) below, the Lakeside Walkway is within 30m of the location shown on Precinct Plan 16.5.1(3)(b); (v) Any walkway/cycle way or the Lakeside Walkway that needs to be aligned so as to avoid an area of infested alligator weed as identified within in alligator weed management plan may be relocated from the alignment shown on 16.5.1(3)(b) to the extent necessary to avoid the infested area. (c) A CLDC can relate to the entire Te Kauwhata Lakeside Precinct Plan Area, or may be for an individual stage or stages beyond the business zone, provided that an individual stage is 5ha or more. (d) Applications for approval of a CLDC as a restricted discretionary activity will be considered without public notification and without the need to serve notice on or obtain the written approval of any affected persons. (e) LDC approval does not constitute authorization by the Waikato District Council as road controlling authority in terms of Section 357 of the Local Government Act 1974.</u></p>	The provision for a Comprehensive Land Development Consent (CLDC) has been omitted from the provisions. The inclusion of a CLDC as a restricted discretionary activity is necessary as there is infrastructure and earthworks that need to be installed in the Rural Zone within the Te Kauwhata Precinct to service the residential development. The provision for a CLDC in the Rural Zone was accepted as part of Plan Change 20.	Accept	25



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p><u>Written authorisation is required from the Waikato District Council prior to any works commencing that affect public roads. Matters of Discretion: (a) Council's discretion is reserved over: (i) consistency with the Te Kauwhata Lakeside Precinct Plans in 16.5.1(3)(a), 16.5.1(3)(b) and 16.5.1(3)(c); (ii) managing the effects of wastewater and stormwater; (iii) roading network and compliance with a Council-approved roading standard; (iv) provision and location of existing and future utilities and connections; (v) location of roads and their connections; (vi) provision of open space, including linkages between residential areas, open space and Lake Waikare; (vii) effects of natural hazards (including flooding), geotechnical suitability and land contamination.</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any amendments or consequential changes that are necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.</p>			
FS1388.901	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	<p>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure.</p> <p>Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</p>	Reject	
579.22	Simon Ash for Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited	Neutral/Amend	<p>Amend Rule 22.8.1 Application of rules as follows: (1) Rules 22.8.2, 22.8.3, 22.8.4 and 22.8.5 apply in the Lakeside Te Kauwhata Precinct., in addition to the activity rules in: 22.1.2 (Permitted Activities); 22.1.3 (Restricted-Discretionary Activities); 22.1.4 (Discretionary Activities); and 22.1.5 (Non-complying Activities); (2) The rules that apply to a permitted activity in 22.8.2 P1-18 within the Lakeside Te</p>	Needs to be reformatted so that it is clear which provisions apply within the Precinct and also to be consistent with the layout of the Business Zone provisions.	Accept	23

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p>Kauwhata Precinct are as follows: (a) Rule 22.2 (Land Use - Effects), except: (i) Rule 22.2.7.1 (Earthworks - General) does not apply where earthworks consent has been obtained under Rule 22.8.8 (Comprehensive Land Development Consent); (b) The following provisions in Rule 22.3 (Land Use - Building): (i) Rule 22.3.4 (Height) (ii) Rule 22.3.5 (Daylight admission) (iii) Rule 22.3.6 (Building coverage) (iv) Rule 22.3.7 (Building setbacks) (3) Rule 22.8.6 and 22.8.7 apply to subdivision in the Te Kauwhata Precinct in addition to: (a) Rule 22.4.1.7 Subdivision creating Reserves; and (b) Rule 22.4.7 (Esplanade reserves and Esplanade strips). (b) (4) The following precinct plan applies to the Rural Zone in the Lakeside Te Kauwhata Precinct as identified on the planning maps.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any amendments or consequential changes that are necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.</p>			
FS1388.902	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	<p>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure.</p> <p>Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</p>	Reject	
579.24	Simon Ash for Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited	Neutral/Amend	<p>Amend Rule 22.8.2 P6 as follows: P6 Pastoral Farming <u>only</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any amendments or consequential changes that are necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.</p>	<p>The provisions provide for a wide range of activities including forestry, industrial activity and waste management facilities. It is unnecessary and inappropriate to provide for these activities in locations adjoining medium/high density residential development. These activities should be provided for in the wider Rural Zone, but it</p>	Accept Reject	24

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				is not appropriate for these site specific provisions.		
FS1388.904	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept Accept	
579.25	Simon Ash for Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend the activity specific conditions for Rule 22.8.2 P21 relating to Information Kiosk as follows: (a) Provided it is <del>catered</del> located within the cultural and heritage overlay show on on Precinct 4. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any amendments or consequential changes that are necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	Spelling correction.	Accept	24
FS1388.905	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
579.26	Simon Ash for Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited	Neutral/Amend	Add a provision for a CLDC as a restricted discretionary activity to Rule 22.8.3 RDI Restricted Discretionary Activities. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any amendments or consequential changes that are necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	Provision for a CLDC is necessary to enable the required infrastructure to be installed within the Rural zoned land in the Te Kauwhata precinct.	Accept	25
FSI388.906	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
579.27	Simon Ash for Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited	Neutral/Amend	Add a provision within Rule 22.8.4 Discretionary Activities for a CDC that does not comply with the provisions for a Restricted Discretionary activity as follows: (a) A CLDC that does not comply with Rule 22.8.3 RDI and meets all of the following conditions: (i) Primary roads are within 50m-100m of the location shown on Precinct Plan 16.5.1(3)(b); and (ii) Bus route is either on the alignment shown on the Precinct Plan 16.5.3.1(3)(b) or a continuous alignments that achieved the same circulation; and (iii) Indicative walkways are within 150m of the location shown on the Precinct Plan 6.5.3.1(3)(b); (iv) Lakeside walkway is within 70m of the location shown on Proposed Plan 16.5.3.1(3)(b). The matters over which Council reserves discretion shall be used for assessing discretionary applications under this rule. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any amendments or consequential changes that are necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the	Provision for a CLDC is necessary to enable the required infrastructure to be installed within the Rural Zoned land of the Te Kauwhata Precinct.	Accept	26

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			submission. Null			
FSI388.907	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
579.28	Simon Ash for Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 22.8.4 D4 Waste management facility. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any amendments or consequential changes that are necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	These activities are not appropriate for the Rural Zoned land within the Te Kauwhata Precinct.	Accept	26
FSI388.908	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
579.29	Simon Ash for Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 22.8.5 NCI Non-complying Activities. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any amendments or consequential changes that are necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the	This provision is unnecessary as indicative roads can be re-aligned around buildings.	Reject	27

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			submission. Null			
FS1388.909	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
579.30	Simon Ash for Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 22.8.6 Earthworks - General. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any amendments or consequential changes that are necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	There is no need to provide for earthworks within a flood risk area as the flood risk control has been removed.	Accept	28
579.31	Simon Ash for Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.8.7 C1 - Subdivision Lakeside General as follows: <u>Subdivision is in accordance with the Lakeside Precinct Plans identified above if...</u> AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any amendments or consequential changes that are necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	Amendment is necessary to understand and give effect to the provisions.	Reject	29
FS1388.910	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
579.32	Simon Ash for Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited	Support	Retain the approach of Lakeside being a 'Specific Area'. AND Retain the 'Te Kauwhata Specific Area' provisions contained within the Residential, Business and Rural sections of the Proposed Waikato District Plan.	Lakeside is a comprehensive planned community with unique and special development controls. Supports the carrying over of Plan Change 20 into the Proposed Waikato District Plan for the following reasons: It will create significant growth and development within the district, with approximately 1600 residential lots, a community hub, retirement village and recreational reserves. Will take advantage of the Waikato expressway and will focus growth around the existing Te Kauwhata centre and economic corridor between Auckland and Hamilton. Upgrade of wastewater infrastructure required to service the long term development will result in a significantly improved system. Assist the Council in the provision of infrastructure for the broader Te Kauwhata area. and support Council with applications under the Housing Infrastructure Fund, and subsequently assist in providing upgraded wastewater, water and roading infrastructure for Te Kauwhata. The creation of 43 hectares of recreational reserves on the land which borders the western edge of Lake Waikare and provides a public walkway network, in excess of 5km in length will be constructed. Recreational opportunities proposed for the reserves include an Iwi Reserve, recreational sports ground, children's playground and an equestrian park. The remainder of the reserve land will be managed to allow wetland regeneration alongside replanting. Consents have been granted which demonstrate a genuine commitment to the development of the Te Kauwhata Lakeside development. It is of fundamental importance in creating an	Accept	4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				efficient regulatory framework and under which the Lakeside development can progress.		
<b>579.33</b>	<b>Simon Ash for Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited</b>	Support	Amend the title for Section 16.5 Lakeside Te Kauwhata Precinct as follows: 16.5 <u>Specific Area</u> : Lakeside Te Kauwhata Precinct AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any amendments or consequential changes that are necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	It is noted that the description of the Te Kauwhata provisions in the Business and Rural sections refer to a 'Specific Area'. This does not occur within the Residential Zone chapter. Amendment is required to give consistency.	Accept	5
FS1388.911	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Reject	
<b>579.46</b>	<b>Simon Ash for Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited</b>	Neutral/Amend	Delete the Development Precinct from the Lakeside Development 2017 Limited property, Te Kauwhata. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any amendments or consequential changes that are necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	The identification of the Development Precinct is considered to be unnecessary as it does not link to a particular rule and as the precincts are already shown on the Precinct Plans in the Residential Zone provisions.	Reject	31
<b>579.47</b>	<b>Simon Ash for Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited</b>	Support	Retain the Residential zone provisions as they relate to the Te Kauwhata Lakeside Precinct, except the provisions for which amendments are requested.	The Residential Zone is a fundamental tool in enabling the development of 1600 homes. The key enabling mechanism in the zone are the provision for a "Comprehensive Development Consent" and "Comprehensive Subdivision". These provisions enable for a bundled consent for the creation of lots and associated	Accept	5



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				infrastructure. It is a comprehensive approach which will ensure the integration of housing development with the provision of infrastructure.		
FS1388.921	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
579.48	Simon Ash for Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.5.1(1) Application of rules, as follows: (1) The rules that apply to a permitted activity in Rule 16.5.2 within the Lakeside Te Kauwhata Precinct as identified in the planning maps are as follows: (i) Rule 15.2 (Land Use - Effects) except: ... A. Rule 16.2.4.1 (Earthworks - general) and Rule 16.2.4.2 (Earthworks - Maaori Sites and Maori Areas of Significance) does not apply and Rule 16.5.7.2 applies instead B.... C. Rule 16.2.6 Notable trees (†) D. Rule 16.5.7.1 Noise and Vibration - North Island Main Trunk line (NIMT) (‡) E. Rule 16.3 (Land Use - Building) does not apply, Rule 16.5.8 (Land use- Building) applies instead. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any amendments or consequential changes that are necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	Correct referencing.	Accept	5
FS1388.922	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</p>		
579.49	Simon Ash for Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited	Neutral/Amend	<p>Amend Rule 16.5.1(3) by replacing the Lakeside Te Kauwhata Precinct plans with the updated Lakeside Te Kauwhata Precinct plans (included as Diagram within the submission). AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any amendments or consequential changes that are necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.</p>	Revised precinct plans show new alignment of main boulevard.	Accept in part	5
FS1388.923	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	<p>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</p>	Reject	
579.50	Simon Ash for Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited	Neutral/Amend	<p>Amend Rule 22.8.7 C1 (x) Subdivision Lakeside General as follows (x) subject to v) below Lakeside Walkway is within 4030m of the location shown on Precinct Plan 16.5.1(3)(c); AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any amendments or consequential changes that are necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.</p>	Amendment is necessary to enable works to locate appropriately given the stop bank, property boundary and alligator weed.	Accept	29

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
579.51	Simon Ash for Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.8.8 RDI (a) (ii) D Lakeside Comprehensive Subdivision Consent as follows: D. Lakeside Walkway is within ±0±0m of the location shown on Precinct Plan 16.5.1.3(3)(c). AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any amendments or consequential changes that are necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	Amendment is necessary to enable works to locate appropriately given the stop bank, property boundary and alligator weed.	Accept	30
FS1388.924	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
579.52	Simon Ash for Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 22.8.8 RDI (c)(ii) Lakeside Comprehensive Subdivision Consent. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any amendments or consequential changes that are necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	Reference is not required.	Accept	30
FS1388.925	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework.	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
579.53	Simon Ash for Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.8.8 DI (a)(iv) as follows: iv) Lakeside Walkway is within 10m-30-2050m of the location shown on Precinct Plan 16.5.1(3)(b). AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any amendments or consequential changes that are necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	Amendment is necessary to enable works to locate appropriately given the stop bank, property boundary and alligator weed.	Accept	30
FS1388.926	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
579.64	Simon Ash for Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any amendments or consequential changes that are necessary to give effect to the matters raised in this submission.	Recognise there may be alternatives or other consequential changes that are necessary to give effect to the matters raised in this submission. Various as outlined in the submission.	Accept	4
579.65	Simon Ash for Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 16.5.9.3 (b) (ii) Subdivisions- Sites less than 5ha. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any amendments or consequential changes that are necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	Reference is incorrect.	Accept	18
FS1388.927	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission,	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
	E			<p>neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure.</p> <p>Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</p>		
579.68	Simon Ash for Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 22.8.2 P4 relating to A home occupation. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any amendments or consequential changes that are necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	Such an activity is inappropriate within the Te Kauwhata Precinct.	Accept Reject	24
FS1388.929	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	<p>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure.</p> <p>Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</p>	Accept Reject	
579.69	Simon Ash for Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 22.8.2 P5 relating to Afforestation. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any amendments or consequential changes that are necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	Such an activity is inappropriate within the Te Kauwhata Precinct.	Accept	24

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1388.930	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
579.70	Simon Ash for Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 22.8.2 P7 relating to Forestry. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any amendments or consequential changes that are necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	Such an activity is inappropriate within the Te Kauwhata Precinct.	Accept	24
579.71	Simon Ash for Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 22.8.2 P9 relating to Homestay. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any amendments or consequential changes that are necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	Such an activity is inappropriate within the Te Kauwhata Precinct.	Accept Reject	24
FS1388.931	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of	Accept Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
579.72	Simon Ash for Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend the activity specific conditions for Rule 22.8.2 P22 relating to Structures providing information on culture, history or environment of the Lake Waikare and Te Kauwhata area as follows: (a) Provided it is entered <u>located</u> within the cultural and heritage overlay shown on Precinct 4. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any amendments or consequential changes that are necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	Spelling correction.	Accept	24
FS1388.932	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
579.73	Simon Ash for Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.8.2 P23 relating to Memorials recognising the culture and history of the Lake Waikare and Te Kauwhata area as follows: (a) Provided it is entered <u>located</u> within the cultural and heritage overlay shown on Precinct 4. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any amendments or consequential changes that are necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	Spelling correction.	Accept	24
FS1388.933	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed,	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure.</p> <p>Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</p>		
579.74	Simon Ash for Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 22.8.3 RDI Restricted Discretionary Activities (relating to Intensive Farming). AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any amendments or consequential changes that are necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	Rural industry and intensive farming are not appropriate to adjoin large scale residential development.	Accept	25
FS1388.934	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	<p>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure.</p> <p>Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</p>	Reject	
579.75	Simon Ash for Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 22.8.4 D5 Hazardous waste storage, processing or disposal. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any amendments or consequential changes that are necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	This activity is not appropriate for the Rural Zoned land within the Te Kauwhata Precinct.	Accept	26
FS1388.935	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	<p>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use</p>	Reject	



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure.</p> <p>Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</p>		
579.76	Simon Ash for Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 22.8.4 D7 A correctional facility. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any amendments or consequential changes that are necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	This activity is not appropriate for the Rural Zoned land within the Te Kauwhata Precinct.	Accept	26
FS1388.936	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	<p>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure.</p> <p>Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</p>	Reject	
579.77	Simon Ash for Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 22.8.4 D8 An extractive industry. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any amendments or consequential changes that are necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	This activity is not appropriate for the Rural Zoned land within the Te Kauwhata Precinct.	Accept	26
FS1388.937	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	<p>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use</p>	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure.</p> <p>Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</p>		
579.78	Simon Ash for Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 22.8.4 D9 Commercial activity, excluding a produce stall. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any amendments or consequential changes that are necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	This activity is not appropriate for the Rural Zoned land within the Te Kauwhata Precinct.	Accept	26
FS1388.938	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
579.79	Simon Ash for Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 22.8.4 D10 Industrial activity. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any amendments or consequential changes that are necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	This activity is not appropriate for the Rural Zoned land within the Te Kauwhata Precinct.	Accept	26

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1388.939	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
579.80	Simon Ash for Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 22.8.4 D11 Travellers accommodation for more than 5 people. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any amendments or consequential changes that are necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	This activity is not appropriate for the Rural Zoned land within the Te Kauwhata Precinct.	Accept	26
579.81	Simon Ash for Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 22.8.4 D12 Transport depot. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any amendments or consequential changes that are necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	This activity is not appropriate for the Rural Zoned land within the Te Kauwhata Precinct.	Accept	26
FS1388.940	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
579.82	Simon Ash for Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 22.8.4 D13 Place of assembly. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any amendments or consequential changes that are necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	This activity is not appropriate for the Rural Zoned land within the Te Kauwhata Precinct.	Accept	26
FS1388.941	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
579.83	Simon Ash for Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 22.8.4 D14 Boarding, breeding or animal training establishments. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any amendments or consequential changes that are necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	This activity is not appropriate for the Rural Zoned land within the Te Kauwhata Precinct.	Accept	26
FS1388.942	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
<b>579.85</b>	<b>Simon Ash for Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited</b>	Support	No specific decision sought, but submission supports the identification of indicative roads in Lakeside, Te Kauwhata.	They provide a clear indication as to how the Lakeside development will integrate with the surrounding street network and Te Kauwhata in general.	Accept	5
<i>FS1388.943</i>	<i>Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	<i>Reject</i>	
<b>579.86</b>	<b>Simon Ash for Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited</b>	Support	No specific decision sought, but submission supports the straightened alignment of the main boulevard in Lakeside, Te Kauwhata as compared with Plan Change 20.	The new alignment will enable better views of the Iwi Reserve and Lake Waikare and beyond.	Accept	5
<b>579.91</b>	<b>Simon Ash for Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited</b>	Not Stated	Delete Rule 22.8.3 RD2 Restricted Discretionary Activities (relating to Rural Industry).	No reasons provided.	Accept	25
<i>FS1388.944</i>	<i>Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is</i>	<i>Reject</i>	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
<b>780.15</b>	<b>John Lawson (Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Incorporation on behalf of Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Incorporated Society</b>	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.5.8.7 Building setbacks - All boundaries to provide for variable setbacks to suit the character of each road OR Amend Rule 16.5.8.7 Building setbacks - All boundaries to require a minimum 6m setback from the road boundary for all developments in the Residential Zone.	There are locations where there is no need for any setback, but it is not clear that any generic rule can be set to identify them. A 6m setback will generally retain the village character of Raglan and protect many views. The submitter does not understand why Council is not accounting for the Environment Court decision (NZEnvC 411 - paragraph 59, page 17) and there is no reference to it in the s32 documents. The 2017 Infrastructure Issues and Options report for item 21.49 - Building set back, makes no mention of the environment court decision and only mentions the Roading Team's view on technical matters, not amenity. The s32 - 12 - residential zone - setback report lists assertions that the 6m setback is odd, doesn't work and is generally not practical due to topography, set against other assertions that setback should reflect the character of the roads within Raglan, protect Raglan views and retain Raglans existing character. None of these seems to have been evaluated by the s32 report, which is silent about the Environment Court.	Reject	14
FS1329.13	Koning Family Trust and Martin Koning	Oppose	Oppose. Disallow the amendment of setback rules to require a 6m setback across the entire Residential Zone.	The submitter seeks to establish rules that require a 6m building setback in all Residential Zones. This may not be the most appropriate outcome in all cases.	Accept	
FS1093.1	Garth & Sandra Ellmers	Oppose	Since the adoption of an increase in the building setback to 6M very few applications for building consents in Raglan have been able to comply with the requirement for the 6M set back.. Many potential purchasers of lots have given up or have had to apply for a dispensation in order to be able to build on the site. This is mainly due to the fact that most available land in Raglan is undulating so access to most lots is either above the road or below the road. This makes many sites very difficult to build on without the additional restrictions of larger than normal	There is no valid reason why the setbacks in Raglan should be 6M, not 3M as in most other areas. It is entirely impractical and this rule has proven not to work so should be changed as proposed by WDC.	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p>building set back requirements. Any existing rule that does not obviously work or is not suitable for the terrain should be changed. There has been a 10 year period since the 6M setback rule was introduced against the recommendation of WDC. During this time it has primarily resulted in obstructing and or preventing building on many lots. There is a shortage of available lots for building in Raglan so if retained this punitive 6M setback will further add to the difficulty in obtaining suitable land on which to build. A 6M setback does little if anything to preserve view shafts. Erecting buildings further back on lots restricts the views of the lots behind so there is no gain from erecting buildings further back on the lot. Larger than normal (6M) building set backs do not define Raglan's character. Most of the early buildings in Raglan were built very close to the road. For security purposes it is more desirable to build close to the road in full view of the road. This also allows larger areas behind dwellings which provide a safe option for children to play away from driveways and the road.</p>			
FS1269.68	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Oppose	Null	Housing New Zealand opposes the proposed amendment; to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission.	Accept	
780.35	<b>John Lawson (Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Incorporation on behalf of Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Incorporated Society</b>	Oppose	Add a new requirement to Rule 16.5.8.6 RD1(b)(iv) Living Court that windows and balconies overlooking adjacent outdoor spaces and living areas have been avoided so as to respect the amenity and comfort of neighbouring properties.	This follows Housing NZ's Simple Guide expectation that buildings and spaces should relate well to each other.	Accept Reject	13
FS1371.32	Lakeside Development Limited	Oppose	Lakeside Development Limited seeks that the submission made by Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Incorporation in relation to amendments to the Living Court standards be declined.	Amending the Living Court standards will not enable the urban form intended for certain parts of the district, specifically those areas marked for residential intensification. The Living Court standards as they are currently provided for in the Proposed District Plan will ensure the amenity of private outdoor spaces and habitable rooms of neighbouring properties, as such the standards do not need to be amended. The current controls do not provide appropriate levels of amenity for medium and high density areas. Placing large onerous controls detrimentally impacts the ability to deliver affordable housing and increasing diverse housing typologies. Will not promote the sustainable management of resources and will achieve the purpose of the	Reject Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>RMA 1991. Will not enable the wellbeing of the community. Will not meet the reasonably foreseeable need of future generations. Will not represent the most appropriate means of exercising the Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means.</i>		
<b>781.14</b>	<b>Ministry of Education</b>	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 22.8.4 D6 Discretionary Activities for an education facility. AND Amend Rule 22.8.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities as follows: Activity <u>RD3 Education facilities</u> Council's discretion shall be restricted to the following matters: <u>The extent to which it is necessary to locate the activity in the Lakeside Te Kauwhata Precinct.</u> <u>Reverse sensitivity effects of adjacent activities.</u> <u>The extent to which the activity may adversely impact on the transport network.</u> <u>The extent to which the activity may adversely impact on the streetscape.</u> <u>The extent to which the activity may adversely impact on the noise environment.</u>	Opposes the activity status given to education facilities in this zone. Education facilities such as schools, community education, tertiary education institutions, work skills training centres, outdoor education centres and sports training establishments within rural areas are essential social infrastructure. The submitter requests consistency with their requested definition of 'Education facilities'.	Reject	26
<i>FS1387.1218</i>	<i>Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	<i>Accept</i>	
<b>798.14</b>	<b>Ngati Te Ata</b>	Not Stated	Add the following activity specific condition to Rule 22.8.2 P18 Horticulture: <u>appropriate silt control through silt traps and bunding.</u>	No reasons provided.	Reject	24
<i>FS1387.1283</i>	<i>Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is</i>	<i>Accept</i>	



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
<b>798.15</b>	<b>Ngati Te Ata</b>	Neutral/Amend	Add a matter of discretion to Rule 22.8.3 RD1 Restricted discretionary activities as follows: <u>(v) effects on the environment.</u>	No reasons provided.	Reject	25
FS1387.1284	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
<b>798.33</b>	<b>Ngati Te Ata</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.8.2 P7 Permitted Activities to include "deforestation" AND Add the following activity specific conditions to Rule 22.8.2 P7 Permitted Activities: appropriate site and sediment control	No reasons provided.	Reject	24
FS1387.1291	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed,	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</p>		
81.176	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Add to Rule 22.8.3 RD2 Restricted Discretionary Activities assessment criteria as follows: (vi) Stormwater management and the mitigation of potential adverse effects.	A list is provided in (a) of the matters that council will consider when considering activities against this rule. The effects of stormwater should be included as a matter of discretion to encourage an assessment of effects on the environment from stormwater infrastructure, giving effect to WRPS Policy 6.3.	Reject	25
825.15	John Lawson	Oppose	<p>Amend Rule 16.5.8.7 Building setbacks - All boundaries to provide for variable setbacks to suit the character of each road OR Amend Rule 16.5.8.7 Building setbacks - All boundaries to require a minimum 6m setback from the road boundary for all developments in the Residential Zone.</p>	<p>There are locations where there is no need for any setback, but it is not clear that any generic rule can be set to identify them. A 6m setback will generally retain the village character of Raglan and protect many views. The submitter does not understand why Council is not accounting for the Environment Court decision (NZEnvC 411 - paragraph 59, page 17) and there is no reference to it in the s32 documents. The 2017 Infrastructure Issues and Options report for item 21.49 - Building set back, makes no mention of the environment court decision and only mentions the Roading Team's view on technical matters, not amenity. The s32 - 12 - residential zone - setback report lists assertions that the 6m setback is odd, doesn't work and is generally not practical due to topography, set against other assertions that setback should reflect the character of the roads within Raglan, protect Raglan views and retain Raglan's existing character. None of these seems to have been evaluated by the s32 report,</p>	Reject	14

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				which is silent about the Environment Court.		
FS1325.5	Avondale Trust	Oppose	<i>I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed. I suggest a minimum road setback of 1.5m as in Tauranga and other areas.</i>	<i>A 6m road setback is far too restrictive and very difficult to attain on small lots. Lots in Raglan are often steep so require minimum road setbacks.</i>	Accept	
FS1329.21	Koning Family Trust and Martin Koning	Oppose	<i>Oppose. Disallow the amendment of setback rules to require a 6m setback across the entire Residential Zone.</i>	<i>The submitter seeks to establish rules that require a 6m building setback in all Residential Zones. This may not be the most appropriate outcome in all cases.</i>	Accept	
FS1093.8	Garth & Sandra Ellmers	Oppose	<i>A minimum set back of 6M from the road boundary for all developments in the Residential Zone is not workable in the Raglan area. The majority of land zoned for residential development in Raglan is situated on the hills surrounding the Waingaroa Inner Harbour. Therefore most lots when developed rise above or below the road. Having a 6M building setback from the road is therefore virtually impossible to achieve on a majority of sites. In the Nikau Park subdivision in Raglan out of 21 lots there were only three lots on which a 6M building setback could be achieved due to the steep contour of the land and difficult access to the land from the road. Dispensations had to be applied for for the majority of sites to allow for the 'usual' 3M set backs which is commonly used in most areas in NZ. Any rule which requires almost total dispensation is therefore not a workable rule and should not be enforced.</i>	<i>There is no evidence that a 6m setback will retain the village character of Raglan and protect many views. Character cannot be contrived. Uniformity only results in mundane, uninteresting development. Sections sizes are now smaller than in the past so having larger than normal building setbacks will leave less room for both the building and recreation area behind the main dwelling. I can also see no evidence that a 6M setback will open views up as it could result in restriction of views from homes located adjacent to the rear boundaries.</i>	Accept	
FS1371.33	Lakeside Development Limited	Oppose	<i>Lakeside Development Limited seek that the submission made in relation to providing for variable setback distances for any building not be allowed and that these standards remain as they are currently provided for in the Proposed District Plan.</i>	<i>Amending the building setback standards would allow variable setbacks across all boundaries. Any such amendments would not enable the protection, maintenance and enhancement of consistent character and amenity outcomes anticipated. Any such amendments would result in inappropriate and inefficient development of land within the district. Will not promote the sustainable management of resources and will not achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991. Will not enable the wellbeing of the community. Will not meet the reasonably foreseeable need of future generations. Will not enable the efficient use and development of the district's assets. Will not represent the most appropriate means of exercising the Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means.</i>	Accept	
825.35	John Lawson	Oppose	Add a new requirement to Rule 16.5.8.6 RD1(b)(iv)	This follows Housing NZ's Simple Guide	Accept	13

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			Living Court that windows and balconies overlooking adjacent outdoor spaces and living areas have been avoided so as to respect the amenity and comfort of neighbouring properties.	expectation that buildings and spaces should relate well to each other.	Reject	
FS1371.34	Lakeside Development Limited	Oppose	Lakeside Development Limited seeks that the submission made in relation to amendments to the Living Court Standards remain unchanged from how the standard is currently provided for in the Proposed District Plan.	Amend the Living Court standards will not enable the compact urban form intended for the district, specifically those areas marked for residential intensification. The Living Court standards as they are currently provided for in the Proposed District Plan will ensure the amenity of private outdoor spaces and habitable rooms of neighbouring properties, as such the standards do not need to be amended. Will not promote the sustainable management of resources and will not achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991. Will not enable the wellbeing of the community. Will not meet the reasonably foreseeable need of future generations. Will not enable the efficient use and development of the district's assets. Will not represent the most appropriate means of exercising the Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means.	Reject Accept	
830.16	Linda Silvester	Neutral/Amend	Add provisions in Rule 16.5.3 to Restricted Discretionary Activities that will give effect to the Waikato District Council's Walking, Cycling and Bridle Trails Strategy to create links within existing and new developments.	The Waikato District Council Walking, Cycling and Bridle Trails Strategy is made relevant in provision 1.10.2.3 Waikato Region strategies and plans, however it is not implemented in the Proposed District Plan. Policy 4.1.8 Integration and connectivity recognises the need to provide "good access to facilities and services by a range of transport modes through the provision of integrated networks of roads, public transport, cycle and pedestrian routes." Policy 4.1.10 Tuakau, Policy 4.1.11 Pokeno, Policy 4.1.12 Te Kauwhata, Policy 4.1.14 Taupiri, Policy 4.1.15 Ngaruawahia, Policy 4.1.16 Horotiu and Policy 4.1.17 Te Kowhai all mention walking and cycling provisions, though means and locations are unclear. Policy 4.1.18 Raglan does not mention cycling and walking despite its large pedestrian and cycle use. Provision 1.4.2.2 states that parts of State Highway 1 will offer	Reject	7

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				opportunities for some town centre improvements and cycle/walk ways. However, nowhere in the Proposed District Plan is it indicated that where some might be, may be a land use issue. Waikato District Council said that detailed rules for walk/cycle ways are not appropriate within a District Plan, yet there are detailed transport provisions. There is strong public support for harbour and coastal walkways. Encourage environmental tourism. The lack of progress indicated that opportunities are not taken with subdivisions and that more details need to be included in the District Plan.		
FS1387.1346	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
330.189	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 22.8 Lakeside Te Kauwhata Precinct.	No reasons provided.	Reject	23
FS1386.421	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework.	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
FS1371.45	Lakeside Development Limited	Oppose	Lakeside development Limited seeks that the submission by Andrew and Christine Gore in relation to Lakeside Te Kawhata Precinct be declined.	The provisions in the Lakeside Te Kawhata Precinct in the proposed plan have been well tested through the plan change to the Operative District Plan. The Operative District Plan provisions have effectively been rolled over into the Proposed Plan. Those provisions are considered to be the most effective in giving effect to the plan.	Accept	
<b>330.190</b>	<b>Andrew and Christine Gore</b>	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 22.8.1 Application of rules.	No reasons provided.	Reject	23
FS1371.46	Lakeside Development Limited	Oppose	Lakeside Development Limited seeks that the submission by Andrew and Christine Gore in relation to Lakeside Te Kawhata Precinct be declined.	The provisions in the Lakeside Te Kawhata Precinct in the Proposed Plan have been well tested through the plan change to the Operative District Plan. The Operative District Plan provisions have effectively been rolled over into the Proposed Plan. Those provisions are considered to be the most effective in giving effect to the plan.	Accept	
<b>330.191</b>	<b>Andrew and Christine Gore</b>	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 22.8.2 Permitted Activities.	No reasons provided.	Reject	23
FS1371.47	Lakeside Development Limited	Oppose	Lakeside Development Limited seeks that the submission by Andrew and Christine Gore in relation to Lakeside Te Kawhata Precinct be declined.	The provisions in the Lakeside Te Kawhata Precinct in the Proposed Plan have been well tested through the plan change to the Operative District Plan. The Operative District Plan provisions have effectively been rolled over into the Proposed Plan. Those provisions are considered to be the most effective in giving effect to the plan.	Accept	
FS1386.422	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
<b>330.192</b>	<b>Andrew and Christine Gore</b>	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 22.8.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities.	No reasons provided.	Reject	23
FS1386.423	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
FS1371.48	Lakeside Development Limited	Oppose	Lakeside Development Limited seeks that the submission by Andrew and Christine Gore in relation to Lakeside Te Kawhata Precinct be declined.	The provisions in the Lakeside Te Kawhata Precinct in the Proposed Plan have been well tested through the plan change to the Operative District Plan. The Operative District Plan provisions have effectively been rolled over into the Proposed Plan. Those provisions are considered to be the most effective in giving effect to the plan.	Accept	
<b>330.193</b>	<b>Andrew and Christine Gore</b>	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 22.8.4 Discretionary Activities.	No reasons provided.	Reject	23
FS1386.424	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework.	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
FS1371.49	Lakeside Development Limited	Oppose	Lakeside Development Limited seeks that the submission by Andrew and Christine in relation to Lakeside Te Kauwhata Precinct be declined.	The provisions in the Lakeside Te Kauwhata Precinct in the Proposed Plan have been well tested through the plan change to the Operative District Plan. The Operative District Plan provisions have effectively been rolled over into the Proposed Plan. Those provisions are considered to be the most effective in giving effect to the plan.	Accept	
330.194	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 22.8.5 Non-Complying Activities.	No reasons provided.	Reject	23
FS1386.425	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
FS1371.50	Lakeside Development Limited	Oppose	Lakeside Development Limited seeks that the submission by Andrew and Christine Gore in relation to Lakeside Te Kauwhata Precinct be declined.	The provisions in the Lakeside Te Kauwhata Precinct in the Proposed Plan have been well tested through the plan change to the Operative District Plan. The Operative District Plan provisions have effectively been rolled over into the Proposed Plan. Those provisions are considered to be the most effective in giving effect to the plan.	Accept	
330.195	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 22.8.6 Earthworks - General.	No reasons provided.	Reject	23
FS1386.426	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is	Accept	



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FS1371.51	Lakeside Development Limited	Oppose	Lakeside Development Limited seeks that the submission by Andrew and Christine Gore in relation to Lakeside Te Kauwhata Precinct be declined.	The provisions in the Lakeside Te Kauwhata Precinct in the Proposed Plan have been well tested through the plan change to the Operative District Plan. The Operative District Plan provisions have effectively been rolled over into the Proposed Plan. Those provisions are considered to be the most effective in giving effect to the plan.	Accept	
330.196	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 22.8.7 Subdivision Lakeside General.	No reasons provided.	Reject	23
FS1386.427	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
FS1371.52	Lakeside Development Limited	Oppose	Lakeside Development Limited seeks that the submission by Andrew and Christine Gore in relation to Lakeside Te Kauwhata Precinct be declined.	The provisions in the Lakeside Te Kauwhata Precinct in the Proposed Plan have been well tested through the plan change to the Operative District Plan. The Operative District Plan provisions have effectively been rolled over	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>into the Proposed Plan. Those provisions are considered to be the most effective in giving effect to the plan.</i>		
695.103	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.8.3 RDI(c)(ii) A and B Restricted Discretionary Activities, to have a 1200m setback apply to the said zones and if an existing pig farm already occurs at that setback, then the effects of that have to be taken into account as well; AND Amend Rule 22.8.3 RDI(c)(ii) A and B Restricted Discretionary Activities, to require any development occurring within that setback to have an enforced Council non complaints covenant applied.	The concern with inequitable distribution rules such as this is that they do not relate to real world operations and realistic assessment of effects. If a consented activity with 500 pigs approved later wishes to expand to 550 pigs in the same location and is 1,320m setback, the setback per pig is just the same as 500 pigs at 1,200m. If the same operator starts a second pig farm at 1,200m setback it would have the same effect as a 1,000 pig operation at 1,200m setback.	Reject	25
FS1387.333	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Accept	
FS1076.5	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	Support	<i>NZPork supports a setback regime for pigs in both intensive and extensive situations. NZPork opposes the threshold numbers which are arbitrary relative to effects. It is assumed this is 500 pigs at one time, which might mean 50 sows plus progeny. A medium sized farm with 400 sows would have 4800 pigs. A more effective and efficient method would be to separately define Intensive and Extensive farming and to provide performance standards around each given the different effects.</i>		Reject	
695.104	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.8.3 RDI(c) (ii) A and B Restricted Discretionary Activities, to include a setback requirement of equivalent distance (1200m) from the Paa Zone.	No reasons provided.	Reject	25

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1387.334	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
695.178	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.5.7.2(a) (i) Earthworks - General to apply a ratio based on the site area i.e. a 1:1 ratio so a 450m2 site would provide for 450m3 of earthworks.	The Proposed District Plan penalises bigger sites for no apparent outcome, especially when a bigger site is likely to be better able to absorb and diffuse effects. Earthworks totals should not cancel each other out, i.e. cut and fill add together.	Reject	10
695.179	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Support	Retain a maximum area of earthworks in Rule 16.5.7.2(a)(i) Earthworks - general	No reasons provided.	Accept	10
695.180	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.5.8.2 PI Height as follows: The maximum height of any building must not exceed <del>8.0m</del> <u>7.5m</u> .	To be consistent with other residential height provisions in the Proposed District Plan. There is no logical planning reason why one area should have an easier requirement than other areas in the absence of specific considerations.	Reject	11
695.181	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.5.8.4 PI Daylight admission as follows: Any building within the Medium Density Precinct identified on the Te Kauwhata Lakeside Precinct Plan 16.5.1(3)(a) shall not protrude through a height control plane rising at an angle of 45 degrees commencing at an elevation of <del>2.53m</del> above ground level at every point of the site boundary, except that this standard does not apply to party walls located along site boundaries.	There is no logical planning reason for this differentiation. All daylight control planes should be made to consistent with each other and that used by other adjoining Councils.	Reject	12

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1371.10	Lakeside Development Limited	Oppose	Lakeside Development Limited seeks that the submission point in relation to the amendment of Rule 16.5.8.4 P1- Daylight admission controls- Medium Density Precinct be declined.	Rule 16.5.8.4 P1 - Daylight admission controls for sites within the Medium Density Precinct of the Lakeside Te Kauwhata Precinct reference to "3m above ground level" provides a consistent approach to daylight admission controls across the district and supports compact urban forms within areas marked for intensification. The Lakeside development does have unique characteristics which warrant a precinct. It is therefore appropriate that there are unique controls which are area specific to Lakeside. While this submitter liberalises some of the controls, LDL accepts that the planning framework as a package and development standards. It considers the integrated nature of development standards but subject to the amendments within the primary LDL submission is the best way to deliver the objectives of the Precinct. Will not promote the sustainable management of resources and will achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991. Will not enable the well-being of the community. Will not meet the reasonably foreseeable need of future generations. Will not enable the efficient use and development of the district's assets. Will not represent the most appropriate means of exercising the Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means.	Accept	
695.182	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.5.8.4 P2 Daylight admission as follows: Any building within the High Density Precinct identified on the Te Kauwhata Lakeside Precinct Plan 16.5.1(3)(a) shall not protrude through a height control plane rising at an angle of 45 degrees commencing at an elevation of 3.5m above ground level at every point of the site boundary within 20m of a street frontage, and 2.53m above ground level at every point on the site boundary greater than 20m from the street frontage; except that this standard does not apply to party walls located along site boundaries.	There is no logical planning reason for this differentiation. All daylight control planes should be made to be consistent with each other and are used by adjoining Councils.	Reject	12
FS1371.11	Lakeside Development Limited	Oppose	Lakeside Development Limited seeks that the submission point in relation to the amendment of Rule 16.5.8.4 P2- Daylight admission controls- High Density Precinct be declined.	Rule 16.5.8.4 P2 - Daylight admission controls for sites within the High Density Precinct of the Lakeside Te Kauwhata Precinct reference to "3m above ground level" provides a	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>consistent approach to daylight admission controls across the district and supports compact urban forms within areas marked for intensification. The Lakeside development does have unique characteristics which warrant a precinct. It is therefore appropriate that there are unique controls which are area specific to Lakeside. While this submitter liberalizes some of the controls, LDL accepts that the planning framework as a package and development standards. It considers the integrated nature of development standards but subject to the amendments within the primary LDL submission is the best way to deliver the objectives of the Precinct. Will not promote the sustainable management of resources and will achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991. Will not enable the well-being of the community. Will not meet the reasonably foreseeable need of future generations. Will not enable the efficient use and development of the district's assets. Will not represent the most appropriate means of exercising the Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means.</p>		
695.183	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.5.8.6 Living Court to be consistent with other Living Court requirements through the Proposed District Plan.	The requirements set out differ widely from dwelling requirements in other parts of the plan. There is no reason why one dwelling of the same capacity should have a different living court requirement of another. There is no specific circumstance why it should be different.	Reject	13
695.184	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.5.8.8 Fences so that all dwelling fencing provisions through the Proposed District Plan are the same.	The requirement differs from Rule 16.3.4 with no logical planning reasons for this. Unnecessary complexity creates confusion and must be avoided.	Accept	15
FS1371.12	Lakeside Development Limited	Oppose	Lakeside Development Limited seeks that the submission made in relation to Fence standards within the Lakeside Te Kauwhata Precinct remains unchanged from how the standard is currently provided for in the Proposed District Plan.	Rule 16.5.8.6 - Living court controls within the Lakeside Te Kauwhata Precinct provides a consistent approach to Living courts, ensuring a reasonable level of on-site amenity for all dwellings, as well as supporting compact urban forms within areas marked for intensification. The Lakeside development does	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>have unique characteristics which warrant a precinct. It is therefore appropriate that there are unique controls which are area specific to Lakeside. While this submitter liberalizes some of the controls, LDL accepts that the planning framework as a package and development standards. It considers the integrated nature of development standards but subject to the amendments within the primary LDL submission is the best way to deliver the objectives of the Precinct. Will not promote the sustainable management of resources and will achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991. Will not enable the well-being of the community. Will not meet the reasonably foreseeable need of future generations. Will not enable the efficient use and development of the district's assets. Will not represent the most appropriate means of exercising the Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means.</p>		
695.185	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.9.1 C1 (a)(v)C Subdivision Lakeside - general to be consistent with Rule 16.4.12 RD1(a)(i) where the minimum lot sizes are the same at 450m2.	The 12m shape factor differs from the 18m in Rule 16.4.12 RD1 (a)(i) but they should be consistent, where the minimum lot sizes are the same at 450m2.	Reject	16
FS1371.13	Lakeside Development Limited	Oppose	Lakeside Development Limited seek that the submission made in relation to subdivision standards within the Lakeside Te Kauwhata Precinct remain unchanged from how the standard is currently provided for in the Proposed District Plan.	<p>Amending Subdivision standards within the Lakeside Te Kauwhata Precinct will not enable the level of residential intensity that is anticipated within the Precinct area. Applying the same subdivision standards to the Lakeside development area will result in the inefficient and ineffective development of the land which is contrary to the objectives for increased residential growth within the area. The Lakeside development does have unique characteristics which warrant a precinct. It is therefore appropriate that there are unique controls which are area specific to Lakeside. While this submitter liberalizes some of the controls, LDL accepts that the planning framework as a package and development standards. It considers the integrated nature of development standards but subject to the amendments within the primary LDL submission is the best way to deliver the</p>	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				objectives of the Precinct. Will not promote the sustainable management of resources and will achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991. Will not enable the well-being of the community. Will not meet the reasonably foreseeable need of future generations. Will not enable the efficient use and development of the district's assets. Will not represent the most appropriate means of exercising the Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means.		
FS1387.350	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
695.190	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.5.5 PI Daylight admission as follows: Any building shall not protrude through a height control plane rising at an angle of 45 degrees commencing at an elevation of 3.5m above ground level at every point of the site boundary where it adjoins a residential zone.	There is no logical planning reason for this differentiation. All daylight control planes should be made to be consistent with each other and that used by adjoining Councils.	Reject	21
FS1371.14	Lakeside Development Limited	Oppose	Lakeside Development Limited seek that the submission made by Sharp Planning Consultants in relation to the Daylight admission control standards as they apply to all development adjoining residential areas within the Lakeside Te Kauwhata Precinct remains unchanged from how the standard is currently provided for in the Proposed District Plan.	Amending daylight control planes within the Lakeside Te Kauwhata Precinct will not enable the level of character and amenity at the interface of residential zones. The Lakeside development area has undergone a comprehensive master planning exercise which has considered the impacts of development on the residential interface in order to achieve the level of development required whilst maintaining a certain level of amenity. Applying the same daylight control standards to	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p><i>the Lakeside development area will result in a built form outcome that is contrary to the anticipated outcomes for the precinct. The Lakeside development does have unique characteristics which warrant a precinct. It is therefore appropriate that there are unique controls which are area specific to Lakeside. While this submitter liberalizes some of the controls, LDL accepts that the planning framework as a package and development standards. It considers the integrated nature of development standards but subject to the amendments within the primary LDL submission is the best way to deliver the objectives of the Precinct. Will not promote the sustainable management of resources and will achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991. Will not enable the well-being of the community. Will not meet the reasonably foreseeable need of future generations. Will not enable the efficient use and development of the district's assets. Will not represent the most appropriate means of exercising the Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means.</i></p>		
695.191	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	No specific decision sought, however submission states Rule 17.5.6 Gross floor area is ultra-vires.	It is an ultra-vires rule. An applicant has no control over the size of buildings on other properties in the zone.	Accept	22
697.235	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.5.1 (2) Application of rules, as follows: (2) The rules that apply to a permitted activity in Rule 17.5.1.2 P1-P178 within the Lakeside Te Kauwhata Precinct as identified on the planning maps are as follows:	Improving accuracy of the rule.	Accept	19
FS1371.16	Lakeside Development Limited	Support	Lakeside Development Limited seeks that the submission made in relation to correcting minor grammatical errors to improve the clarity and accuracy of rules be allowed.	Lakeside Development Limited supports the proposed amendments to the Plan to help improve the clarity and accuracy of rules within the Lakeside Te Kauwhata Precinct. Will promote the sustainable management of resource and will achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991. Will enable the wellbeing of the community. Will meet the reasonably foreseeable need of future generations. Will enable the efficient use and development of the district's assets. Will represent the most	Accept	



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>appropriate means of exercising the Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means.</i>		
FS1387.493	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
697.236	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend 17.5 Specific Area - Lakeside Te Kauwhata Precinct, by replacing all references to the matters identified in the assessment criteria as X, with the correct reference.	Improves clarity of the rules and addresses a placeholder error.	Accept	19
FS1371.17	Lakeside Development Limited	Support	Lakeside Development Limited seeks that the submission made in relation to correcting minor grammatical errors to improve the clarity and accuracy of rules be allowed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lakeside Development Limited supports the proposed amendments to the Plan to help improve the clarity and accuracy of rules within the Lakeside Te Kauwhata Precinct.</li> <li>• Will promote the sustainable management of resource and will achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991.</li> <li>• Will enable the wellbeing of the community.</li> <li>• Will meet the reasonably foreseeable need of future generations.</li> <li>• Will enable the efficient use and development of the district's assets.</li> <li>• Will represent the most appropriate means of exercising the Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means.</li> </ul>	Accept	
FS1387.494	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed,	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</p>		
697.237	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend 17.5 Specific Area - Lakeside Te Kauwhata by replacing all references to CLDC with the correct term "comprehensive land development consent."	Improves clarity of the rules.	Accept	19
FS1387.495	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<p>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</p>	Reject	
FS1371.18	Lakeside Development Limited	Support	Lakeside Development Limited seeks that the submission made in relation to correcting minor grammatical errors to improve the clarity and accuracy of rules be allowed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lakeside Development Limited supports the proposed amendments to the Plan to help improve the clarity and accuracy of rules within the Lakeside Te Kauwhata Precinct.</li> <li>• Will promote the sustainable management of resource and will achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991.</li> <li>• Will enable the wellbeing of the community.</li> <li>• Will meet the reasonably foreseeable need of future generations.</li> <li>• Will enable the efficient use and development of the district's assets.</li> <li>• Will represent the most appropriate means of exercising the Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means.</li> </ul>	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
697.238	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend 17.5 Specific Area - Lakeside Te Kauwhata by replacing all references to CSC with the correct term "Comprehensive Subdivision Consent".	Improves clarity of the rules.	Accept	19
FS1371.19	Lakeside Development Limited	Support	Lakeside Development Limited seeks that the submission made in relation to correcting minor grammatical errors to improve the clarity and accuracy of rules be allowed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lakeside Development Limited supports the proposed amendments to the Plan to help improve the clarity and accuracy of rules within the Lakeside Te Kauwhata Precinct.</li> <li>Will promote the sustainable management of resource and will achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991.</li> <li>Will enable the wellbeing of the community.</li> <li>Will meet the reasonably foreseeable need of future generations.</li> <li>Will enable the efficient use and development of the district's assets.</li> <li>Will represent the most appropriate means of exercising the Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means.</li> </ul>	Accept	
FS1387.496	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
697.239	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend 17.5 Specific Area - Lakeside Te Kauwhata Precinct so all rule references are prefaced by the word "Rule".	Improves accuracy of the rule references.	Accept	19
FS1371.20	Lakeside Development Limited	Support	Lakeside Development Limited seeks that the submission made in relation to correcting minor grammatical errors to improve the clarity and accuracy of rules be allowed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lakeside Development Limited supports the proposed amendments to the Plan to help improve the clarity and accuracy of rules within the Lakeside Te Kauwhata Precinct.</li> <li>Will promote the sustainable management of resource and will achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991.</li> <li>Will enable the wellbeing of the community.</li> <li>Will meet the reasonably</li> </ul>	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				foreseeable need of future generations. • Will enable the efficient use and development of the district's assets. • Will represent the most appropriate means of exercising the Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means.		
FS1387.497	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
697.240	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 17.5.3 DI (b) Discretionary Activities, as follows: <del>(b) The matters over which Council reserves discretion shall be used for assessing discretionary activity applications under this rule.</del>	It is not in accordance with the RMA for a discretionary activity to have matters of discretion restricted.	Accept	19
FS1371.21	Lakeside Development Limited	Support	Lakeside Development Limited seeks that the submission made in relation to correcting minor grammatical errors to improve the clarity and accuracy of rules be allowed.	• Lakeside Development Limited supports the proposed amendments to the Plan to help improve the clarity and accuracy of rules within the Lakeside Te Kauwhata Precinct. • Will promote the sustainable management of resource and will achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991. • Will enable the wellbeing of the community. • Will meet the reasonably foreseeable need of future generations. • Will enable the efficient use and development of the district's assets. • Will represent the most appropriate means of exercising the Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means.	Accept	
697.241	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.5.5 PI Daylight admission, as follows: Any building shall not protrude through a height control plane rising at an angle of 45 degrees	Correcting an error.	Accept	19

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			commencing at an elevation of 3.5m above ground level at every point of the site boundary where it adjoins a residential zone.			
FS1371.22	Lakeside Development Limited	Support	Lakeside Development Limited seeks that the submission made in relation to correcting minor grammatical errors to improve the clarity and accuracy of rules be allowed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lakeside Development Limited supports the proposed amendments to the Plan to help improve the clarity and accuracy of rules within the Lakeside Te Kauwhata Precinct.</li> <li>Will promote the sustainable management of resource and will achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991.</li> <li>Will enable the wellbeing of the community.</li> <li>Will meet the reasonably foreseeable need of future generations.</li> <li>Will enable the efficient use and development of the district's assets.</li> <li>Will represent the most appropriate means of exercising the Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means.</li> </ul>	Accept	
697.242	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.5.5 RDI (b) Daylight admission, as follows: (b) Council's Discretion is restricted to:	Consistency with other restricted discretionary rules.	Accept	19
FS1371.23	Lakeside Development Limited	Support	Lakeside Development Limited seeks that the submission made in relation to correcting minor grammatical errors to improve the clarity and accuracy of rules be allowed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lakeside Development Limited supports the proposed amendments to the Plan to help improve the clarity and accuracy of rules within the Lakeside Te Kauwhata Precinct.</li> <li>Will promote the sustainable management of resource and will achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991.</li> <li>Will enable the wellbeing of the community.</li> <li>Will meet the reasonably foreseeable need of future generations.</li> <li>Will enable the efficient use and development of the district's assets.</li> <li>Will represent the most appropriate means of exercising the Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means.</li> </ul>	Accept	
697.243	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.5.9 RDI (a)(i) Subdivision, as follows: (i) is in accordance with Te Kauwhata Lakeside Precinct Plan 16.5.1(3)(a); the roading network, walkways and cycleways shown on Precinct Plan 16.5.1(3)(b); and the open space shown on Precinct Plan 15.5.2.3(3)(c), as set out in the precinct parameters below; and	Correcting a referencing error.	Accept	19
FS1371.24	Lakeside Development Limited	Support	Lakeside Development Limited seeks that the submission made in relation to correcting minor grammatical errors to improve the clarity and accuracy of rules be allowed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lakeside Development Limited supports the proposed amendments to the Plan to help improve the clarity and accuracy of rules within the Lakeside Te Kauwhata Precinct.</li> <li>Will</li> </ul>	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>promote the sustainable management of resource and will achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991. • Will enable the wellbeing of the community. • Will meet the reasonably foreseeable need of future generations. • Will enable the efficient use and development of the district's assets. • Will represent the most appropriate means of exercising the Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means.</p>		
FS1387.498	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<p>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</p>	Reject	
697.244	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.5.9 NC2 Subdivision, as follows: A CS Comprehensive Subdivision Consent that does not meet any of the parameters-conditions for a discretionary activity outlined in 17.5.9 D1.	Ensuring consistent use of terminology.	Accept	19
FS1371.25	Lakeside Development Limited	Support	Lakeside Development Limited seeks that the submission made in relation to correcting minor grammatical errors to improve the clarity and accuracy of rules be allowed.	<p>• Lakeside Development Limited supports the proposed amendments to the Plan to help improve the clarity and accuracy of rules within the Lakeside Te Kauwhata Precinct. • Will promote the sustainable management of resource and will achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991. • Will enable the wellbeing of the community. • Will meet the reasonably foreseeable need of future generations. • Will enable the efficient use and development of the district's assets. • Will represent the most appropriate means of exercising the Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other</p>	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				means.		
FS1387.499	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
986.123	Pam Butler on behalf of KiwiRail Holdings Limited (KiwiRail)	Support	Retain matter of discretion (a)(iv) Rule 16.5.3 Restricted Discretionary activities as notified.	KiwiRail recently engaged for the proponents of Plan Change 20 Lakeside Precinct and developed a comprehensive set of controls relating to upgrades to the level crossing through Te Kauwhata and seek the retention of RDA criteria assessing any non-compliance with the traffic related standards imposed.	Accept	7
986.124	Pam Butler on behalf of KiwiRail Holdings Limited (KiwiRail)	Support	Retain Rule 16.5.7.1 Noise and vibration - North Island Main Trunk Line (NIMT) as notified.	KiwiRail recently engaged the proponents of Plan Change 20 Lakeside Precinct and developed a comprehensive set of controls relating to noise and vibration and activity controls to the North Island Main Trunk Line (NIMT). These have been included in the Proposed Plan and are supported.	Accept	9
579.9	Simon Ash for Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.5.9.2 D1 (a) (v) Lakeside Comprehensive Subdivision Consent (CS) as follows: (v) Lakeside Walkway is within +0m-20m 30-50m of the location shown on Precinct Plan Rule 16.5.1(3)(c); AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any amendments or consequential changes that are necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the	Update to allow amended alignment.	Accept	17

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			submission.			
FS1388.893	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	