

## Appendix I: Table of submission points

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
18.1	<b>Kevin Hutchinson for Waikato RiverCare Incorporated</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Chapter 8.1 Reserve Provision, to recognise that the development and day-to-day use and maintenance of reserves are managed through Council's reserve management plans which provide for the continuation of reserve activities.	Maintenance is the key management action required to protect and maintain indigenous plant values on Council administered reserves and prevent the spread of weeds, pests into adjoining areas.	Reject	4.3.2
FS1386.14	<i>Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C</i>	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	4.3.2
FS1035.1	<i>Pareoranga Te Kata</i>	Support	<i>Support the submission in full.</i>	<i>• River care supports partnership opportunities with council, not only fencing and the banks of river, but to preserve, protect and restore the entirety of the Waikato River.</i>	Reject	4.3.2
18.2	<b>Kevin Hutchinson for Waikato RiverCare Incorporated</b>	Support	Retain Policy 8.1.3(b)(iv) Esplanade reserves and walkways.	River Care would welcome new partnership opportunities within Council to develop and co-fund planting projects on esplanade reserves. Projects that RiverCare may be in a position to assist Council with include the Hamilton City Council funded fencing works upstream of Ngaruawahia on the true right bank of the Waikato River and Whatawhata to Ngaruawahia Waipa River esplanade reserves.	Accept	4.6.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1386.15	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.	Reject	4.6.2
18.3	Kevin Hutchinson for Waikato RiverCare Incorporated	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 8.2.2(a)(ii) as follows: (ii) protecting and enhancing significant natural areas <u>as identified in regional and district strategies.</u>	Need to ensure Councils efforts link with co-funders and partner organisations eg Waipa/Waikato Healthy Rivers strategy.	Reject	4.8.2
FS1035.2	Pareoranga Te Kata	Support	Support the submission in full.	• River care supports partnership opportunities with council, not only fencing and the banks of river, but to preserve, protect and restore the entirety of the Waikato River.	Reject	4.8.2
19.2	John Wright for Jet Ski Racing New Zealand Inc	Neutral/Amend	Amend Section C Rules to allow approved and correctly controlled clubs to use Lakes Waahi and Kainui for selected jet ski racing events during the calendar year, excluding shooting months.	There are numerous resources at these reserves and lakes that are available to power boats but exclude jet skis. Running 1 or 2 day events at these venues would allow greater use of the existing facilities and should be considered on application rather than open all year to limit the effects to existing users. Existing conditions limit small events to less than 500 people. This would not need to be altered. Increased turnover for tourism and hospitality providers in the general Hamilton area. 2 day events would attract riders, family and supporters from all over the country. Single day events would give local people something to do in their back yard, rather than travelling to Auckland, Tauranga, Rotorua and further south. Other Council's are supporting local not for profit clubs to use facilities and reserves.	Reject	5.1.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1386.16	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.	Reject	5.1.4
194.1	Neil Barker for Ngaruawahia Golf Club Inc	Neutral/Amend	Add a Permitted or Controlled Activity to Rule 25.1 Land Use - Activities for golf courses and their ancillary uses OR Delete the Reserves Zones from the Proposed District Plan and replace with the approach used by Hamilton City Council which individually classifies recreation spaces according to their purpose.	Golf courses are classed as non-complying activity. Ngaruawahia Golf Club is recognised nationally for the quality of the course and ease of access. The location of the golf club allows for ease of access from both Auckland and Hamilton and is played regularly by those travelling the North Island. The course has long brought visitors to the Waikato district, who in turn spend money at local businesses. Ngaruawahia Golf Club facilities are not only utilised for golf, but community events and fundraisers throughout the year. The site has potential to serve the community in an increased capacity, but is concerned about the flexibility of the plan to allow for this. While the rezoning of the site from Rural to Reserve does not increase restrictions, it does contribute. The submitter seeks to clarify its ability to accommodate future ancillary uses of the golf course as a permitted activity. This may include the formalisation of the existing driving range, which would see low-level buildings and some fencing along Great South Road.	Reject	5.1.4
FS1386.188	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	Reject	5.1.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>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>		
194.2	Neil Barker for Ngaruawahia Golf Club Inc	Neutral/Amend	<p>Amend Chapter 25: Reserve Zone to provide opportunities to develop land for small-scale commercial activities as a Restricted Discretionary Activity, consistent with the objectives of the Reserve Zone - Chapter 8: Reserves. OR Delete the Reserves Zone from the Proposed District Plan and replace with the approach used by Hamilton City Council which individually classifies recreation spaces according to their purpose.</p>	<p>These future initiatives are consistent with what the Proposed District Plan seeks to achieve in the Reserve Zone and what is currently being undertaken on site. The site has potential to serve the community in an increased capacity, but is concerned about the flexibility of the plan to allow for this. The submitter seeks to clarify its ability to accommodate future ancillary uses of the golf course as a permitted activity. This may include the formalization of the existing driving range, which would see low-level buildings and some fencing along Great South Road. This activity is intended for club members, but a small number of fee-paying participants may look to use the facility. If Council considers this to be a commercial activity, then Council should see this as a minor activity and classify it a Restricted Discretionary Activity, rather than a Non-Complying Activity.</p>	Reject	5.1.4
FS1386.189	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	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</p>	Reject	5.1.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>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>		
194.3	Neil Barker for Ngaruawahia Golf Club Inc	Neutral/Amend	Amend Chapter 25: Reserve Zone to allow other recreation activities to be accommodated as Restricted Discretionary Activities, consistent with the objectives of the Reserve Zone - Chapter 8: Reserves. OR Delete the Reserves Zone from the Proposed District Plan and replace with the approach used by Hamilton City Council which individually classifies recreation spaces according to their purpose.	Wish to consider further recreational facilities. These future initiatives are consistent with what the Proposed District Plan seeks to achieve in the Reserve Zone and what is currently being undertaken on site. The site has potential to serve the community in an increased capacity, but is concerned about the flexibility of the plan to allow for this. While the rezoning of the site from Rural to Reserve does not increase restrictions, it does contribute. Future population growth to the north of Hamilton and adjacent to site will see increased demand for sport and recreation. Future development of the site may include, for example, a fitness suite or squash court. These types of uses will benefit the community and Ngaruawahia Golf Club a leading recreation provider in the region, however such activities are currently Non-Complying Activities.	Reject	5.1.4
FS1386.190	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</i>	Reject	5.1.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
194.4	Neil Barker for Ngaruawahia Golf Club Inc	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 25.2.7 Signs to provide for signage on sites with road frontage over 500 metres at a ratio of one non-illuminated sign per 150 metres of road frontage as a controlled activity, with a maximum sign area of 3m2 (or similar wording).	The site has almost 1000 meters of road frontage to this former state highway. The submitter does not seek to swamp the boundary with signage, but see increased flexibility to put more signage up and generate a small amount of revenue to pay for this community asset. They key concern for all Club members when discussing signage is they do not want to see the natural amenity of the area degraded by advertising, because the members value this natural setting too. While two or more signs would be deemed a Restricted Discretionary Activity, this is overly onerous and provision should be made so that the number of signs on a site is dependent on the length of road frontage.	Reject	15.4
781.5	Ministry of Education	Neutral/Amend	Add a new policy to Chapter 8: Reserves to provide for education facilities in reserves as follows: <u>Policy - Education Facilities and Reserves Allow activities which are compatible with the role, function and predominant character of the Reserves, while managing the effects of the activities on the environment, including: Education facilities</u>	There are no policies that currently provide for education facilities in the reserves. Education facilities such as schools, community education, early childhood education, tertiary education institutions, work skills training centres, outdoor education centres and sports training establishments located within reserves are essential social infrastructure.	Reject	9.4
FS1387.1214	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>	Reject	9.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
830.4	Linda Silvester	Oppose	Add provisions in Policy 8.1.3 Esplanade reserves and walkways 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 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.	Reject	4.6.4
FS1387.1340	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.</i> Mercury	Reject	4.6.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				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.		
FS1348.27	Perry International Trading Group Limited	Support	Null	PITGL supports the intent of the submission in that it promotes the provision of new cycleways throughout the District and the implementation of the District's Walking, Cycling and Bridle Trails Strategy. PITGL supports greater enabling of cycle paths throughout the Rural Zone i.e. linking rural communities such as Te Kowhai to the Waikato River Te Awa River Ride. PITGL recognises the benefit of rural recreational opportunities and its ability to promote tourism enterprises along these cycle paths.	Reject	4.6.4
923.3	Waikato District Health Board	Neutral/Amend	Amend Chapter 25: Reserve Zone to add a statement of purpose and anticipated outcomes of corresponding zone or subzone, and where appropriate make links to health and wellbeing considerations.	Currently there are no statements of purpose or descriptions for any of the zones or the intended outcomes to be achieved, leading to a reliance on objectives, policies and explanations within Section B of the Plan, which are based under generic heading topics with little zone based commentary. There is an opportunity to clarify the purpose of a zone and increase understanding of outcomes, and appropriate types of activities for the different environments. The amendments would assist with a clear understanding of the purpose and character of the various zones.	Reject	5.1.4
FS1387.1480	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	Reject	5.1.4



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				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.		
297.47	Dave Glossop for Counties Manukau Police	Neutral/Amend	Add to Policy 8.1.2(c) Provision, use and development of public open space and reserves a new point, as follows: <u>(iii) being safe and conforming to the national guidelines for CPTED</u>	To ensure that there is an obligation to consider CPTED, reducing victimisation, making people safe and feel safe.	Accept in part	4.5.4
FS1386.317	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.	Reject	4.5.4
297.48	Dave Glossop for Counties Manukau Police	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 8.1.3 (b)(ii) Esplanade reserves and walkways as follows: (ii) incorporating safety and security for neighbours and walkway users <u>by conforming to the national guidelines for CPTED;</u>	To ensure that there is an obligation to consider CPTED, reducing victimisation, making people safe and feel safe.	Reject	4.6.4
FS1386.318	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	Reject	4.6.4

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>		
328.10	Paula Dudley	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 8.1.2(b)(iv) Provision, use and development of public open space and reserves, to ensure the relevant style/type of fencing and lighting is negotiated with neighbouring property owner(s).	Historical reserve on the south boundary of the submitter's property - raises concerns for residents/ owners' safety. Currently, no information has been forwarded outlining plan and implementation pre-development and post-development.	Reject	4.5.4
367.13	Liam McGrath for Mercer Residents and Ratepayers Committee	Support	Retain Chapter 8 Reserves.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	4.2.3
FS1386.551	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>	Reject	4.2.3
367.14	Liam McGrath for Mercer Residents and Ratepayers Committee	Support	Retain Section 8.3 Commercial Activities and Temporary Events.	No reasons provided.	Accept	4.7.4
368.15	Ian McAlley	Neutral/Amend	Amend Section 8.2, to clearly state it relates to existing Reserves.	Unclear referencing of outstanding natural landscapes, outstanding natural features, natural character areas and significant natural areas creates uncertainty in terms of being able to effectively assess the issues associated with a particular project. Certainty is required to enable appropriate planning to occur, both for Council and for private landowners/developers to ensure	Reject	4.7.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				that relevant objectives and policies of the District Plan can be administered with both efficiency and certainty.		
<b>368.16</b>	<b>Ian McAlley</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 8.2.2 - Natural Values, to relate to outstanding natural landscapes, outstanding natural features, natural character areas and significant natural areas that are identified on the District Plan Maps.	Unclear referencing of outstanding natural landscapes, outstanding natural features, natural character areas and significant natural areas creates uncertainty in terms of being able to effectively assess the issues associated with a particular project. Certainty is required to enable appropriate planning to occur, both for Council and for private landowners/developers to ensure that relevant objectives and policies of the District Consideration needs to be restricted to those identified items only.	Reject	4.8.4
<b>368.35</b>	<b>Ian McAlley</b>	Support	Retain the extent of reserve proposed near 24 Wayside Road, Te Kauwhata.	The reserve size as shown is considered to be appropriate (subject to final design) for the location and the type of development proposed.	Accept	368.35
<b>405.85</b>	<b>Counties Power Limited</b>	Neutral/Amend	Add the following to Rule 25.4 (a) D1 Subdivision: The subdivision layout and design in regard to how this may impact on the operation, maintenance, upgrading and development of existing infrastructure assets;	To prevent assets becoming landlocked. Similar to Transpower rules	Reject	20.4
<b>433.12</b>	<b>Mischa Davis for Auckland Waikato Fish and Game Council</b>	Support	Retain Policy 8.1.3 Esplanade reserves and walkways, as notified.	This policy encourages Council to acquire esplanade reserves or strips around rivers, lakes and wetlands during subdivision to enable the creation of trails and public access.	Accept	4.6.4
<i>FS1307.4</i>	<i>New Zealand Walking Access Commission</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>WAC supports the inclusion of Esplanade reserves and walkways in the Objectives and Policies section and considers that these are key aspects of ensuring sufficient public access as the district develops.</i>		<i>Accept</i>	<i>4.6.4</i>
<i>FS1223.72</i>	<i>Mercury NZ Limited</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Null</i>		<i>Reject</i>	<i>4.6.4</i>
<b>433.13</b>	<b>Mischa Davis for Auckland Waikato Fish and Game Council</b>	Support	Retain Objective 8.2.1 Natural values, as notified.	This objective supports the maintenance and enhancement of the natural values of public open space, natural reserves and parks.	Accept	4.7.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
433.14	Mischa Davis for Auckland Waikato Fish and Game Council	Support	Retain Policy 8.2.2 Natural values, as notified.	This policy supports the enhancement of the natural environment during the use and development of reserves by all three means described.	Accept in part	4.8.4
499.15	Adrian Morton	Oppose	Amend Policy 8.1.2 Provision, use and development of public open space and reserves, to require that residential development will conform to the Residential Subdivision Urban Design Guidelines in relation to layout around open space and stormwater design features.	Developments need to ensure properties integrate with open space and stormwater devices such as wetland ponds rather than have them fenced in or with properties 'turning' their back to them.	Reject	4.5.4
FS1388.505	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	4.5.4
499.16	Adrian Morton	Oppose	Amend Policy 8.1.3 to add provision for new cycle/walkways, not only in major new developments but to implement to Councils Walking, Cycling and Bridle Trails strategy	1.10.2.3 includes the Strategy as relevant, yet there is no timeframe for implementation of the Strategy. Without support from the District Plan it is unlikely that most of the Strategy will be achieved. 4.1.8 states the Plan will, - "(a) Ensure effective integration within and between new developments and existing areas, including in relation to public open space networks and infrastructure by; (i) Providing 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". 4. 1.10 Policy -	Reject	4.6.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>Tuakau, 4.1.11 Policy - Pokeno, 4.1.12 Policy - Te Kauwhata, 4.1.14 Policy - Taupiri, 4.1.15 Policy - Ngaruawahia, 4.1.16 Policy - Horotiu and 4.1.17 Policy - Te Kowhai all mention walking and cycling provision, though leave the means and locations unclear. 4.1.18 Policy - Raglan is the only town policy not to mention cycling and walking, despite a May 2018 staff report to Council saying, "Raglan has the district's highest walking/cycling communities". For example, 1.4.2.2 mentions, "Revocation of parts of State Highway 1 will offer opportunities for some town centre improvements and cycle/walk ways", yet nowhere in the Plan is it indicated where some' might be, though it is clearly a land use issue. At the last Plan revision, Council said detailed rules for walk/cycleways are not appropriate for a District Plan, yet have expanded to 35 pages the detail in 14.12 about vehicle turning circles, road widths, sight lines, etc. By contrast, there is just a rule about buses having a space for 200 school students and a rule that some new buildings should have cycle parking. On page 42 Raglan Naturally says, "There is strong public support for harbour and coastal walkways." and "Create coastal walkways, eg Raglan to Whale Bay, Whale Bay to Te Toto Gorge." This local support reflects national trends; time use surveys show walking as being ahead of all other active sports and pursuits. European surveys have similar results, so that environmental tourism, encouraging tourists to spend more time walking than driving, could be made a much more valuable asset, giving an economic, as well as health and recreation, impetus to the need to implement policies in recognition of the importance of walking and cycling as noted at 1.4.3.1. The lack of progress indicates that opportunities are</p>		

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				not taken with subdivisions and that more detail needs to be included in the District Plan.		
FS1388.506	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	4.6.4
FS1276.58	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Support	WED seeks that the whole of the submission point be allowed.	New cycle/walkways are supported by the Blueprint and Raglan Naturally. They will help improve health and reduce parking and congestion problems.	Reject	4.6.4
576.22	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	Oppose	Delete Policy 8.2.2 Natural values. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential amendments to address the matters raised in the submission.	The submitters concerns with the policy are that the matters covered by clause (i) and (ii) are addressed in Chapter 3 Natural Environment, and the landscape/character/area overlays are not only on Reserve zoned land. As such, it appears the policy is trying to address two issues which are not necessarily linked. In terms of Clause (iii) the absolute requirement for restoring and linking habitats for indigenous species is opposed given the policy does not provide any recognition of the scale of the habitat or its significance.	Accept in part	4.8.4
662.54	Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd	Oppose	Amend Rule 25.3.4.2 PI (a) Building setback - Waterbodies as follows: (a) Any building must be setback a minimum of: 32 from: (i) the margin of any: lake over 4ha with a bed of 8ha or more AND Amend Rule 25.3.5.2 Building setback- Waterbodies	A wetland as defined under the RMA is broad reaching and covers many features. Having a nominal setback applied to such a wide variation of water features is inappropriate and introduces significant inefficiencies which is contrary to Part 2 of	Accept in part	19.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			to require the following setback for managed wetland to match the amendments sought for other zones: <u>(v) 10m from a managed wetland</u> AND Any consequential amendments.	the RMA and the sustainable management of natural and physical resources. A lake can constitute a large array of waterbodies and therefore a starting point of 4ha should be used before the setback applies.		
FS1387.127	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	19.4
757.16	Karen White	Oppose	Amend Policy 8.1.2 Provision, use and development of public open space and reserves, to include the following: <u>Residential development will conform to the Waikato Urban Design Guidelines 'Residential Subdivision' in relation to layout around open space and stormwater design features.</u>	Developments need to ensure properties integrate with open space and storm water devices rather than have them fenced in or with properties 'turning' their back to them.	Reject	4.5.4
FS1387.1110	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	Reject	4.5.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
757.17	Karen White	Oppose	Add provision for new cycle/walkways, not only in major new developments, to implement Council's Walking, Cycling and Bridle Trails Strategy.	Submission states support for Whaingaroa Environmental Defence's submission in that 4.1.10.2.3 includes the strategy as relevant, yet there is no implementation of the Strategy. Without support from the District Plan it is unlikely that most of the Strategy will be achieved. 4.1.10 Policy- Tuakau, 4.1.11 Policy- Pokeno, 4.1.12 Policy- Te Kauwhata, 4.1.14 Policy- Taupiri, 4.1.15 Policy- Ngaruawahia, 4.1.16 Policy- Horotiu and 4.1.17 Policy- Te Kowhai all mention walking and cycling provision, but leave the means and locations unclear. 4.1.18 Policy- Raglan is the only town policy not to mention cycling and walking, despite a May 2018 staff report to Council saying "Raglan has the district's highest walking/cycling communities." At the last Plan revision Council said detailed rules for walk/cycle ways are not appropriate for a District Plan however contains 35 pages detailing (14.2) about vehicle turning circles, road widths, sight lines etc. By contrast, there is just a rule about bus spaces and a rule for some new buildings to have cycle parking. Page 42 of Raglan Naturally states 'there is strong public support for harbour and coastal walkways' and 'create coastal walkways.' Local support reflects national trends showing walking being ahead of all other active sports and pursuits. Encouraging tourists to walk more than drive could become a valuable asset, giving an economic, health/recreation impetus for policy implementation around the importance of walking. Lack of progress indicates opportunities are not taken with subdivisions. More detail needs to be included in the District Plan.	Reject	4.6.4
FS1387.1111	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</i>	Reject	4.6.4



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. 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>		
FS1276.57	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Support	WED seeks that the whole of the submission be allowed.	New cycle/walkways are supported by the Blueprint and Raglan Naturally. They will help improve health and reduce parking and congestion problems.	Reject	4.6.4
781.17	Ministry of Education	Oppose	<p>Add a new Restricted Discretionary Activity rule to Rule 25.1 Land Use - Activities as follows: <u>25.1.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities (1) The activities listed below are restricted discretionary activities (2) Discretion to grant or decline consent and impose conditions is restricted to the matters of discretion set out in the following table: Activity RDI Education facilities. Council's discretion shall be restricted to the following matters: The extent to which it is necessary to locate the activity in the Reserve Zone. Reverse sensitivity effects of adjacent activities. The extent to which the activity may adversely impact on the transport network. The extent to which the activity may adversely impact on the streetscape. The extent to which the activity may adversely impact on the noise environment.</u></p>	<p>Education facilities are not listed in the Reserve Zone. Education facilities such as schools, community education, tertiary education institutions, work skills training centres, outdoor education centres and sports training establishments within village areas are essential social infrastructure. The submitter requests consistency with their requested definition of 'Education facilities'.</p>	Reject	9.4
FS1387.1221	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</p>	Reject	9.4

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>		
FS1333.24	Fonterra Limited	Oppose	Disallow the relief in respect of the Rototuna Recreation Reserve.	Fonterra is not opposed to the inclusion of the proposed rule subject to it not applying within the Rototuna Recreation Reserve as it would unnecessarily increase the risk of reverse sensitivity effects on the Te Rapa Dairy Manufacturing Site and adjoining Industrial land forming part of the Te Rapa North Strategic Industrial Node.	Reject	9.4
81.225	Waikato Regional Council	Support	Retain Section 8.2 Natural Values.	The submitter supports the enhancement of the natural environment through the provision of reserves.	Reject	4.7.4
81.242	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend the definition of "Conservation Activity" in Chapter 13: Definitions to exclude the establishment of walkways, cycle ways and accessory buildings. AND/OR Amend Rule 25.1.2 P3 Permitted Activities to include appropriate thresholds or activity status for the clearance of indigenous vegetation as a result of establishing walking, cycling tracks or accessory buildings.	In the Reserve Zone, Conservation activities are permitted with no activity specific conditions. The definition for conservation activity includes the establishment of walking and cycle tracks and accessory buildings. Therefore these activities would be permitted with no restrictions on the amount of clearance. The submitter considers that this is inappropriate given the potential effect on indigenous biodiversity.	Accept in part	7.4
FS1051.7	Colette Shona Hanrahan	Support	Seek that the whole submission point be allowed.	<i>It seems ridiculous that there would be no restraints on any clearance of indigenous vegetation. This should never happen. The potential threat on indigenous biodiversity would be huge when one takes into account any litter, contamination, noise etc let alone the fact that indigenous forest is so precious in itself. Building walkways/cycleways/bridleways or accessory buildings should never be considered a conservation activity.</i>	Accept in part	7.4
FS1340.28	TaTa Valley Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	The submission point relates to "Conservation Activities" in which the submitter notes is only referred to in the Reserves Zone. However, this is a proposed activity in the Resort Zone as well. The submitter opposes the exclusion of walkways, cycleways and accessory buildings	Reject	7.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				from the definition.		
FSI342.23	Federated Farmers	Support	Support, in part submission point 81.242. Provisional support is extended but more detail is required to allow a more informed decision to be made.	FFNZ understands the intent of this submission, however the submitter has not included proposed threshold limits or an activity status and as such, we are unable to assess the merits or impact of the proposal.	Accept in part	7.4
81.243	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 25.1.2 P3 Permitted Activities to include appropriate thresholds or activity status for the clearance of indigenous vegetation as a result of establishing walking, cycling tracks or accessory buildings. AND/OR Amend the definition to exclude the establishment of walkways, cycle ways and accessory buildings.	In the Reserve Zone, Conservation activities are permitted with no activity specific conditions. The definition for conservation activity includes the establishment of walking and cycle tracks and accessory buildings. Therefore these activities would be permitted with no restrictions on the amount of clearance. The submitter considers that this is inappropriate given the potential effect on indigenous biodiversity.	Accept in part	7.4
FSI223.61	Mercury NZ Limited	Support	Null	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure perspective.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>	Reject	7.4
831.52	Gabrielle Parson on behalf of Raglan Naturally	Oppose	Amend Rule 25.1.2 P4 (a) Permitted Activities to differentiate between summer events and other events.	Raglan's reserves are increasingly congested in mid-summer and moving events to shoulder seasons, from the summer peak, would help ease the problem.	Reject	8.2.4
942.64	Angeline Greensill for Tainui o Tainui	Support	No specific definition sought, but the submitter supports Objective 8.2.1 Natural Values.	The submitter supports this objective as it provides for public open space, and recreation as well as protection and enhancement of biodiversity and the natural environment. Commercial activities should be discouraged on the reserves.	Accept	4.7.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				Occasionally developers will attempt to vest reserves in Council, but are refused as there are underlying issues of the cost management or the presence of Maori cultural sites which need covenanting.		
<b>942.65</b>	<b>Angeline Greensill for Tainui o Tainui</b>	Neutral/Amend	Retain Policy 8.1.2 Provision, use and development of public open space and reserves. AND Add a new clause to Policy 8.1.2 Provision, use and development of public open space and reserves as follows: <u>(e) Where Council do not wish to manage small scale areas of significance to Maori, vested as a contribution to development, a section 33 vesting to the appropriate iwi should be considered.</u>	The submitter supports the policy as it provides for public open space and recreation as well as protection and enhancement of biodiversity and the natural environment. Commercial activities should be discouraged on the reserves. Occasionally developers will attempt to vest reserves in Council but are refused as there are underlying issues of the cost management or the presence of Maori cultural sites which need covenanting.	Reject	4.5.4
<b>942.66</b>	<b>Angeline Greensill for Tainui o Tainui</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 8.1.3 Esplanade reserves to require that a hui be organised for Ngati Tahinga and Tainui landowners to discuss any proposed before decisions are made.	Tainui has always opposes opening access to West Coast beaches in the north for vehicular access as history has shown that activities are not monitored, rubbish is left, beaches erode, kaimoana is decimated through easy access to traditional food supplies, dotterel nesting sites are disturbed, and sites of significance interfered with. The west coast is known for being rugged, wild and unforgiving, something that should be borne in mind if public access is obtained.	Reject	4.6.4
<b>986.61</b>	<b>Pam Butler on behalf of KiwiRail Holdings Limited (KiwiRail)</b>	Neutral/Amend	Add a new rule to Rule 25.3.5 Building setbacks as follows (or similar amendments to achieve the requested relief): <u>Building setback - railway corridor (a) any new buildings or alterations to an existing building must be setback 5 metres from any designated railway corridor boundary</u> AND Any consequential amendments to link and/or accommodate the requested changes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• KiwiRail seeks that a 5 metre setback apply to all new building development adjacent to operational railway corridor boundaries (i.e. not just sensitive land uses).</li> <li>• Ensuring all new structures in all zones are set back from the rail corridor allows access and maintenance to occur without the landowner or occupier needing to gain access to the rail corridor-potentially compromising their own safety. For these safety reasons setting back buildings from the rail corridor boundary is a means of ensuring people's health and</li> </ul>	Reject	18.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				wellbeing through good design. • Construction of buildings in close proximity to the rail corridor has significant safety risk if it is not managed appropriately in accordance with relevant standards. • A 5m setback allows for vehicular access to the backs of buildings (e.g. a cherry picker) and would also allow scaffolding to be erected safely. This in turn fosters visual amenity as lineside properties can then be regularly maintained. A setback is the most efficient method of ensuring intensification does not result in additional safety issues for activities adjacent to the rail corridor, whilst not restricting the ongoing operation and growth of activity within the rail corridor. • The proposed provisions would require any development within the setback to obtain consent with matters of discretion relating to: (i) location, design and use of the proposed building or structure as it relates to the rail network (ii) impacts on the safe operation, maintenance and development of the rail network (iii) construction and maintenance management.		
FS1031.14	Chorus New Zealand Limited	Oppose	Oppose in part.	These further submissions provide standing for us to work with Kiwi Rail to reach and agreed position regarding appropriate exclusions for telecommunications equipment.	Accept	18.4
FS1032.14	Vodafone New Zealand Limited	Oppose	Oppose in part.	These further submissions provide standing for us to work with Kiwi Rail to reach an agreed position regarding appropriate exclusions for telecommunications equipment.	Accept	18.4
FS1033.14	Spark New Zealand Trading Limited	Oppose	Oppose in part.	These further submissions provide standing for us to work with KiwiRail to reach an agreed position regarding appropriate exclusions for telecommunications equipment.	Accept	18.4
986.70	<b>Pam Butler on behalf of KiwiRail Holdings Limited (KiwiRail)</b>	Neutral/Amend	Add new matters of discretion relating to non-compliance with the 5m Building setback - railway corridor (sought elsewhere in other submission points) in Rule 25.1 Land Use Activities as follows (or similar amendments to achieve the requested relief): <u>1. The size, nature and location of the buildings on the site.</u> <u>2. The extent to which the safety and efficiency of rail and road operations will</u>	• KiwiRail accepts that there will be at times situations where the proposed 5 metre Building setback - railway corridor rule cannot be met, or it is inappropriate to require compliance. • It is noted that some zones have restricted discretionary activity categories and some don't. It's been KiwiRail's policy to seek restricted	Reject	18.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p>be adversely affected. 3. The outcome of any consultation with KiwiRail. 4. Any characteristics of the proposed use that will make compliance unnecessary.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments to link and/or accommodate the requested changes.</p>	<p>discretionary activity status for non-compliance with its noise and vibration performance standards. The criteria allow for a bespoke consideration of site specific effects. • Application for resource consent under this rule can be decided without public notification. KiwiRail are likely to be the only affected person determined in accordance with section 95B of the Resource Management Act 1991.</p>		
986.75	Pam Butler on behalf of KiwiRail Holdings Limited (KiwiRail)	Neutral/Amend	<p>Add a new clause (e) to Policy 8.1.2 Provision, use and development of public open space and reserves as follows (or similar amendments to achieve the requested relief): (e) <u>Manage Reverse sensitivity by providing sufficient setbacks buildings to provide for residents' safety and amenity</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments to link and/or accommodate the requested changes.</p>	<p>• The policies applying to each zone requiring setbacks from the railway corridor should include reference to the purpose of the setback. • Existing and sought changes to the Plans objectives lend sufficient support the need for setbacks for amenity and safety, and the efficient integration of development and infrastructure. • Adding an additional item to these plan sections will also facilitate assessment of situations where the proposed 5 metre Building setback - railway corridor rule cannot be met, or it is inappropriate to require compliance.</p>	Reject	18.4
559.281	Sherry Reynolds on behalf of Heritage New Zealand Lower Northern Office	Support	<p>Add a new cultural and heritage based objective and policy to Chapter 8: Reserves as follows: <u>Objective - Cultural and Heritage Values The cultural and historic heritage values of public open space, natural reserves and parks are maintained and conserved.</u></p> <p><u>Policy - Cultural and Heritage Values (i) Ensure the conservation of cultural and heritage values at the time of the consideration of proposed works through consultation with Tangata Whenua and Heritage New Zealand.</u></p>	<p>The submitter is concerned that Chapter 8: Reserves contains no Objectives and Policies in recognition of cultural or heritage values that are often prevalent within Reserves, particularly Heritage Reserves, and reserves adjacent to river or coastal locations. The submitter acknowledges the role of reserve management plans, however considers that just as natural values are covered by objectives and policies, cultural and heritage values should also be part of the land management processes considered under any Resource Management Act process for these important sites and meet the considerations required under section 6 of the Act.</p>	Reject	4.2.3
FS1388.812	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor	Reject	4.2.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>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>		
680.118	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Oppose	<p>Amend Policy 8.1.3 Esplanade reserves and walkways, as follows: (a) <u>With the exception of subdivision in the Rural Zone, to Acquire</u> esplanade reserves or strips along coasts, rivers, lakes and wetlands during subdivision to enable the creation of trails and public access, particularly in identified high priority areas in Appendix 4.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential changes needed to give effect to this relief.</p>	<p>The submitter is opposed to creation of esplanade reserves or strips where land is being subdivided for the purposes of facilitating farming in the Rural Zone. The disadvantages far outweigh the benefits. Any given member of the public might visit such waterway margins once in their lifetimes, if at all, while farmers have to put up with theft and nuisance on a continual basis. Creation of public access alongside farmland encourages all sorts of problems for farmers, including theft of farm property and stock, and harassment/harm of farm animals by careless dog owners. In addition, unless any such esplanade reserves that are acquired can be responsibly managed for pests and weeds (and unwanted excess vegetation growth blocking waterways), then provision of esplanade reserves ultimately results in land flooding problems for farmers in the vicinity. Where nuisance plants like tobacco weed get established on riparian margins, this can cause adverse effects on water quality through exposing riparian areas to soil erosion when the tobacco weed etc gets swept away in big flood events. Moreover, due to the pattern of existing land fragmentation, any reliance on a requirement to provide esplanade reserves upon subdivision of land almost certainly</p>	Reject	4.6.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>never results in continuous esplanade access along any given river or stream margin. Any access that might otherwise result alongside rivers and streams from such subdivision, ends up at best being intermittent due to the ad-hoc and infrequent timing of rural subdivision. Furthermore, farmers should not have to provide esplanade reserves or strips where they are only seeking boundary relocation or boundary adjustment to enable better practical management of farmland. Any requirement to acquire esplanade reserves or strips should be accompanied by a strategy which identifies waterways where acquisition of esplanade reserves is a priority for the purposes listed in section 229 and 230 of the RMA, in which all the management issues associated with esplanade reserves (such as enabling safe and practical public access, or pest and weed control etc) are provided for in a comprehensive manner in a way that also sits outside the district plan among the Council's other functions under the Local Government Act 2002 and the Reserves Act 1977.</p>		
FS1387.183	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	4.6.4
FS1307.6	New Zealand Walking Access Commission	Oppose	WAC does not support the removal of Objectives and Policies for acquisition of esplanade strips and reserves.		Reject	4.6.4



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<i>The ability to acquire esplanade strips and reserves is central to provision of- and enhancement to- public outdoor access.</i>			
697.318	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Appendix 4 (Esplanade Priority Areas) to ensure legal descriptions are correct and accurately reflect the properties they relate to.	To ensure correct references are detailed.	Accept	24.4
697.405	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 25.3.5 Land Use - Building, as follows: (3) Rule 25.3.5.3 Buildings and structures within the National Grid Yard AND Add the following in Rule 25.3.5 Building setbacks: (3) Rule 25.3.5.3 Buildings and structures within the National Grid Yard AND Add a new rule after Rule 25.3.5.2 as follows: <u>25.3.5.3 Buildings and structures within the National Grid Yard P1 (a) Within the National Grid yard, building alterations and additions to an existing building or structure must comply with the following conditions: (i) Not involve an increase in the building height or footprint; (ii) Comply with the New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safe Distances 34:2001 ISSN 0114-0663 under all National Grid transmission line operating conditions.</u> <u>P2 (a) Within the National Grid yard, the maximum height of fences are 2.5m within 5m from the nearest National Grid Pole or 6m from the nearest National Grid tower. P3 Within the National Grid yard, new buildings and structures that are not for a sensitive land use must comply with the following conditions: (i) Comply with the New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safe Distances 34:2001 ISSN 0114-0663 under all National Grid transmission line operating conditions.</u> (ii) Locate a minimum 12m from the outer visible foundation of any National Grid tower and locate a minimum 12m from any pole and associated stay wire, unless it is: A. A building or structure where Transpower has given written approval in accordance with clause 2.4.1 of the New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safe Distances 34:2001 ISSN 0114-0663. NC1 Any building alterations or additions within the National	Replicate the rule regarding buildings and structure within the National Grid from Chapter 14 into Chapter 25 (where this is relevant to the Reserve Zone) for increased clarity and usability of the Plan.	Reject	18.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p><u>Grid Yard that does not comply with Rule 25.3.5.3 P1. NC2. Any new buildings or structures within the National Grid Yard that does not comply with Rule 25.3.5.3 P2 or P3.</u></p>			
FS1350.121	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Oppose	<p>Disallow in terms of sought relocation of National Grid provisions. Notwithstanding the location of the provisions, Transpower seeks that all amendments sought in its original submission be included.</p>	<p>Related to the original submission by Waikato District Council seeking relocation/replicating of the National Grid provisions into the respective chapters, Transpower supports and prefers a standalone set of provisions (for the reason it avoids duplication and provides a coherent set of rules which submitters can refer to, noting that the planning maps clearly identify land that is subject to the National Grid provisions). A stand-alone set of provisions as provided in the notified plan is also consistent with the National Planning Standards. Irrespective that the proposed plan has not been drafted to align with the National Planning Standards, it would be counterproductive to amend the layout contrary to the intent of the Standards. Standard 7. District wide Matters Standard provides, as a mandatory direction, that 'provisions relating to energy, infrastructure and transport that are not specific to the Special purpose zones chapter or sections must be located in one or more chapters under the Energy, Infrastructure and Transport heading'. Clause 5.(c) makes specific reference to reverse sensitivity effects between infrastructure and other activities. It is not clear from the submission points as to the relationship between chapters 14, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24 and 25 and the National Grid provisions within 14.1.1 provides the zone provisions do not apply to infrastructure and energy activities. As such, any other network utility activities would appear to be subject to the National Grid provisions and this requires further clarification. If council wishes to pursue splitting the National Grid provisions into the respective chapters, a revised full set of provisions would be beneficial to enable Transpower to fully assess the implications and workability of the requested changes. Notwithstanding the location of National Grid provisions within the proposed</p>	Accept	18.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>plan, Transpower seeks the specific changes to provisions as sought in its original submission.</i>		
FS1387.558	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<p>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure.</p> <p>Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</p>	Reject	18.4
697.406	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	<p>Add to Rule 25.3.5 Building Setbacks, as follows: (4) Rule 25.3.5.4 Building setback - Sensitive landuses AND Add after new Rule 25.3.5.3: <u>25.3.5.4 Sensitive land uses P1 (a) Any building for a sensitive land use must be set back a minimum of: (i) 10m from the centre line of any electrical distribution or transmission lines, not associated with the National Grid, that operate at a voltage of up to 110kV; (ii) 12m from the centre of line of any electrical distribution or transmission lines, not associated with the National Grid, that operate at a voltage of 110kV or more. P2 (a) Within the National Grid yard, alterations or additions to a building used for an existing sensitive land use must comply with all the following conditions: (i) Not increase the building height or footprint; and (ii) Comply with the New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safe Distances 34:2001 ISSN 0114-0663 under all National Grid transmission line operating conditions; and (iii) Locate a minimum 12m from the outer visible foundation of any National Grid tower and locate a minimum 12m from any pole and associated stay wire, unless Transpower has given written approval in accordance with clause 2.4.1 of the New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safe Distances 34:2001 ISSN 0114-0663. D1 Any</u></p>	<p>Replicate the rule regarding sensitive landuses from Chapter 14 into Chapter 25 (where this is relevant to the Reserve Zone) for increased clarity and usability of the Plan.</p>	Reject	18.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p><u>building for a sensitive land use that does not comply with Rule 25.3.5.4 P1. NC1 Any activity within the National Grid Yard that does not comply with Rule 25.3.5.4 P2. NC2 Any new building for a sensitive land use within the National Grid Yard NC3 Any change of use of an existing building to a sensitive land use within the National Grid Yard NC4 The establishment of any new sensitive land use within the National Grid Yard</u></p>			
FS1350.122	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Oppose	<p>Disallow in terms of sought relocation of National Grid provisions. Notwithstanding the location of the provisions, Transpower seeks that all amendments sought in its original submission be included.</p>	<p>Related to the original submission by Waikato District Council seeking relocation/replicating of the National Grid provisions into the respective chapters, Transpower supports and prefers a standalone set of provisions (for the reason it avoids duplication and provides a coherent set of rules which submitters can refer to, noting that the planning maps clearly identify land that is subject to the National Grid provisions). A stand-alone set of provisions as provided in the notified plan is also consistent with the National Planning Standards. Irrespective that the proposed plan has not been drafted to align with the National Planning Standards, it would be counterproductive to amend the layout contrary to the intent of the Standards. Standard 7. District wide Matters Standard provides, as a mandatory direction, that 'provisions relating to energy, infrastructure and transport that are not specific to the Special purpose zones chapter or sections must be located in one or more chapters under the Energy, Infrastructure and Transport heading'. Clause 5.(c) makes specific reference to reverse sensitivity effects between infrastructure and other activities. It is not clear from the submission points as to the relationship between chapters 14, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24 and 25 and the National Grid provisions within 14.1.1 provides the zone provisions do not apply to infrastructure and energy activities. As such, any other network utility activities would appear to be subject to the National Grid provisions and this requires further clarification. If council wishes to pursue splitting the National Grid provisions into the respective chapters, a</p>	Accept	18.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>revised full set of provisions would be beneficial to enable Transpower to fully assess the implications and workability of the requested changes. Notwithstanding the location of National Grid provisions within the proposed plan, Transpower seeks the specific changes to provisions as sought in its original submission.</i>		
697.407	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 25.3.1.1 P1 (b) Height - Building general, as follows: (b) Any building must not exceed a maximum height of 5m in any of the following landscape and natural character areas:	The additional wording provides clarity to the rule.	Accept	16.4
697.408	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 25.3.1.1 P2 (b) Height - Building general, as follows: (b) Any floodlight must not exceed a maximum height of 5m in any of the following landscape and natural character areas:	The additional wording provides clarity to the rule.	Accept	16.4
697.410	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 25.3.2 Daylight admission, as follows: P1 Any building must not protrude through a height control plane rising at an angle of 37 degrees commencing at an elevation of 2.5m above ground level at every point of the boundary. RD1 (a) Any building that does not comply with Rule 25.3.2 P1. (b) Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters: (i) Height of the building; (ii) Design and location of the building; (iii) Admission of daylight and sunlight to the site and other site (iv) Extent Level of shading on adjacent any other sites; (iv) Privacy of on other sites; (v) Amenity values of the locality.	Consistency with the equivalent rule in other chapters.	Accept	16.4
697.411	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 25.3.3 Building coverage, as follows: P1 Total building coverage must not exceed 5% of the site D1 A building coverage that does not comply with Rule 25.3.3 P1	Increased clarity of the rule.	Accept	17.4
FS1387.559	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	Reject	17.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure.</p> <p>Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</p>		
697.412	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 25.3.5.2 Building setbacks - Waterbodies, as follows: (a) Any building must be set back a minimum of <del>32</del> <u>26m</u> from: (i) The margin of any lake with a bed area of 8ha or more; (ii) The bank of any river where the river bed has an average width of 3m or more; (iii) Any wetland with an area greater than 1ha. (b) Any building must be set back a minimum of <del>37-31m</del> from the banks of the Waikato River and the Waipa River. (c) Any building must be set back a minimum of: (i) <del>32</del> <u>26m</u> from mean high water springs	Amend the rule so that the setback represents 25m esplanade reserve plus the yard setback for the Waikato and Waipa Rivers, and 20m esplanade plus the yard setback for all other waterbodies.	Reject	19.4
FS1387.560	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<p>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure.</p> <p>Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</p>	Reject	19.4
697.421	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 25.4 Subdivision heading, as follows: 25.4 Subdivision <u>Rules</u>	Additional words "rules" provide clarity.	Accept	20.4
FS1387.561	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<p>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor</p>	Reject	20.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
697.422	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 25.5.3.2 P1 Building - Tamahere Village Green, as follows: (a) Any building in the Tamahere Village Green must comply with the following conditions: (i) Total building coverage must not exceed 170m <sup>2</sup> ; (ii) Height must not exceed 6m. (b) Rule 25.3.1.1 (Height Building-General) does not apply.	Reduce duplication.	Reject	22.4
697.470	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 25.3.5.2 Building setback - Waterbodies, to be consistent in terms of the terminology of structures across all zone chapters.	Consistency with the equivalent rule in other chapters.	Reject	19.4
FS1139.18	Turangawaewae Trust Board	Oppose	Null	Unclear as to what is sought by the submission.	Accept	19.4
FS1108.19	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)	Oppose	Null	Unclear as to what is sought by the submission.	Accept	19.4
742.156	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 25.1.2 P4 Temporary events, except for the amendments sought below AND Add a new condition to Rule 25.1.2 P4 Permitted Activity - Temporary Event, as follows: (g) <u>There is a maximum of 100 vehicle movements per day, and no more than 15% of these are heavy vehicle movements.</u> AND Add a new Restricted Discretionary Activity rule for temporary activities not complying with 25.1.2 P4(g), with discretion restricted to the effects on the safety and efficiency of the transport network; OR	The submitter supports no direct access from a national route or regional arterial road. Temporary events in the Reserve Zone are not subject to Rule 14.12.1.4 which would ensure that, for events exceeding a certain size, any effects on the transport network could be addressed. The submitter therefore seeks that either Rule 25.1.2 is amended to provide maximum traffic generation figures or Rule 14.12.1.4 is amended to provide a threshold for traffic generation in the Reserve Zone.	Reject	8.2.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			Amend Rule 14.12.1.4 Transportation - Permitted Activities, by adding a threshold for traffic generation within the Reserve Zone. AND Request any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the submission.			
FS1387.891	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	8.2.4
742.157	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Retain Rule 25.2.3 PI Glare and artificial light spill, as notified. AND Retain Rule 25.2.3 RD1 Glare and artificial light spill, as notified.	The submitter supports all rules in this section.	Accept in part	13.4
742.158	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Retain Rule 25.2.7.1 PI Signs - General, as notified. AND Retain Rule 25.2.7.1 RD1 Signs - General, as notified.	The submitter supports Rule 25.2.7.1 PI as it allows the Transport Agency to erect signage as a permitted activity. The submitter supports the matters of discretion under RD1, particularly (b)(iii), (b)(iv) and (b)(v), although no reasons have been provided.	Accept	15.4
FS1135.1	Neil Barker for Ngaruawahia Golf Club Inc	Oppose	Null	Disagree in principle, NGC seeks amendment to this aspect of the proposed district plan.	Reject	15.4
742.159	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Retain Rule 25.2.7.1 P2 Signs - General, as notified.	No reasons provided.	Accept	15.4
742.160	Mike Wood for New	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 25.2.7.2 PI Signs- Effects on Traffic,	The submitter supports the intent of Rule	Reject	15.4



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
	<b>Zealand Transport Agency</b>		except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Rule 25.2.7.2 PI (iv) Signs - Effects on Traffic as follows: Contain no more than 40 characters and no more than 6 words, symbols or graphics. AND Request any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the submission.	25.2.7.2 PI but seeks amendment to provide clarification on the maximum amount of words permitted. This will ensure that signage erected does not cause unnecessary visual clutter or affect the efficient, safe and effective functioning of the transport network.		
FS1135.2	Neil Barker for Ngaruawahia Golf Club Inc	Oppose	Null	Disagree in principle, NGC seeks amendment to this aspect of the proposed district plan.	Accept	15.4
<b>742.161</b>	<b>Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency</b>	Support	Retain Rule 25.2.7.2 DI Signs - Effects on Traffic, as notified.	The submitter supports Council having full discretion over signs that do not comply with permitted activity standards.	Accept	15.4
FS1135.3	Neil Barker for Ngaruawahia Golf Club Inc	Oppose	Null	Disagree in principle, NGC seeks amendment to this aspect of the proposed district plan.	Reject	15.4
<b>742.162</b>	<b>Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency</b>	Support	Retain Rule 25.3.5.1 PI Building setbacks - General as notified.	The submitter considers the proposed building setbacks in Rule 25.3.5.1 PI are appropriate.	Accept	18.4
<b>742.163</b>	<b>Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency</b>	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 25.5.2.1 PI Signs- Tamahere Village Green, except for the amendments sought below AND Add a new clause to Rule 25.5.2.1 PI (a) Signs - Tamahere Village Green as follows: <u>(vi) one sign per site.</u> AND Request any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the submission.	The submitter supports Rule 25.5.2.1 PI (a) but seeks further permitted activity standards to ensure that only one sign is permitted on-site so adverse effects on traffic safety are not compromised.	Accept in part	21.4
<b>742.164</b>	<b>Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency</b>	Support	Retain Rule 25.5.2.1 RDI Signs as notified.	The submitter supports Council retaining discretion over matters (b)(ii), (b)(iii), (b)(iv) and (b)(v).	Accept	21.4
<b>923.128</b>	<b>Waikato District Health Board</b>	Support	Retain Reserves Objective 8.1.1 as notified.	Policy is supported as the submitter emphasises the importance of public open space, natural reserves, and recreational opportunities, which can make a positive contribution to community health and wellbeing.	Accept	4.4.5
FS1387.1532	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	Reject	.4.5

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>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>		
923.129	Waikato District Health Board	Support	Retain Policy 8.1.2- Provision, use and development of public open space and reserves as notified.	<p>Policy is supported as current research shows that access to open, and especially green spaces, improves people's health and sense of wellbeing. The use of open spaces to promote physical activity is an important part of addressing these conditions in an urban setting.</p> <p>Opens spaces promote health behaviors by providing an accessible, affordable and enjoyable place to be physically active, which is emphasized within the NZ Urban Design Guide.</p>	Accept in part	4.5.4
FS1387.1533	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<p>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure.</p> <p>Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</p>	Reject	4.5.4
923.130	Waikato District Health Board	Support	Retain Policy 8.1.3 Esplanade reserves and walkways, as notified.	<p>Policy is supported as current research shows that access to open, and especially green spaces, improves people's health and</p>	Accept	4.6.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				sense of wellbeing. The use of open spaces to promote physical activity is an important part of addressing these conditions in an urban setting. Opens spaces promote health behaviors by providing an accessible, affordable and enjoyable place to be physically active, which is emphasized within the NZ Urban Design Guide.		
923.164	Waikato District Health Board	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 25.2.1.1 P1, P2, P3, P4, and D1 Noise - General, as follows: P1 (a) Crowd noise, <u>excluding any amplified sound or music</u> ; (b) Noise generated by emergency generators and emergency sirens. P2 <u>Sound received outside the Reserve Zone, measured in accordance with NZS 6801:2008 and assessed in accordance with NZS 6802:2008, must not exceed the permitted activity noise limits for the zone of the site where sound is received.</u> (a) Noise measured within the notional boundary on any site in the Residential Zone, Village Zone, Country Living Zone and Rural Zone must not exceed: (a) 50dB (LAeq), 7am to 7pm, every day; (ii) 45dB (LAeq), 7pm to 10pm, every day; (iii) 40dB (LAeq) and 65dB (LAm <sub>ax</sub> ), 10pm to 7am the following day; P3 (a) Noise measured within any site in any zone other than the Reserve Zone, Residential Zone, Village Zone, Country Living Zone and Rural Zone must meet the permitted noise levels for that zone. P4 (a) Noise levels shall be measured in accordance with the requirements of NZS 6801:2008 "Acoustics Measurement of Environmental Sound." (b) Noise levels shall be assessed in accordance with the requirements of NZS 6802:2008 "Acoustic Environmental Noise." D1 (a) <u>Sound that is outside the scope of NZS 6802:2008 or a permitted activity standard</u> ; and (b) <u>Sound Noise that does not comply with Rule 25.2.1.1 P1, or P2, P3 or P4.</u>	The proposed noise limits are generally in accordance with guideline values and use current measurement and assessment standards, acoustical metrics, numerical values, time-frames and assessment location. However, the following issues have been identified: - Incorrect terminology has been used in conflict with the standards specified, - No provision has been made for sound sources outside the scope of NZS 6802, - The measurement and assessment standards are an integral part of the noise limits and cannot be a separate permitted activity standard, - An exemption has been made for "crowd noise" but this could potentially permit a wider range of sounds than intended.	Accept in part	12.4
986.103	Pam Butler on behalf of KiwiRail Holdings Limited (KiwiRail)	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 25.2.4.1 P1(a) Earthworks General as follows (or similar amendments to achieve the requested relief): (i) Be located more than 1.5m from <u>infrastructure, including a public sewer, open drain, overland flow path or other service pipe</u>	KiwiRail supports that earthworks are required to be setback from services and network systems. The rail track itself is most susceptible from adverse effects if adjacent earthworks are not adequately set	Reject	15.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			AND Any consequential amendments to link and/or accommodate the requested changes.	back. KiwiRail seeks that rule relating to setbacks in certain zones should be amended to reflect that there should be an earthworks setback of 1.5m from infrastructure, to ensure that the efficient and effective operation of the existing network is maintained.		
FS1176.316	Watercare Services Ltd	Support	Null	Watercare supports the approach in principle, however is seeking additional changes to protect existing infrastructure.	Reject	15.4
986.115	Pam Butler on behalf of KiwiRail Holdings Limited (KiwiRail)	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 25.2.4.1 PI(a)(iv) Earthworks general as follows (or similar amendments to achieve the requested relief): (iv) Areas exposed by the earthworks are <u>stabilized to avoid runoff within 1 month of the cessation</u> <del>re-vegetated to achieve 80% ground cover 6 months of the commencement of the earthworks</del> AND Any consequential amendments to link and/or accommodate the requested changes	KiwiRail also seeks that the rule relating to revegetation in certain zones be amended to include other available methods to stabilise the ground to prevent runoff, including building or hard cover development. As notified, these rules are ambiguous.	Accept in part	15.4
986.122	Pam Butler on behalf of KiwiRail Holdings Limited (KiwiRail)	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 25.2.7.2 PI Signs - Effects on traffic as follows (or similar amendments to achieve the requested relief): (a) Any sign directed at <del>road</del> <u>land transport</u> users must: ... (iii)Not obstruct sight lines of drivers turning into or out of a site entrance and intersections <u>or at a level crossing</u> ; AND Any consequential amendments to link and/or accommodate the requested changes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Signs erected in the City should not have an adverse effect on the safe and efficient functioning of the land transport network, including railways, and the health and safety of road users. Traffic on the railway network will grow, and with more trains the issue of minimizing driver distraction is important to ensure the efficient running of the land transport network.</li> <li>Further, signs should be restricted where they breach the level crossing sightline areas developed from the NZTA Traffic Control Devices Manual 2008, Part 9 Level Crossings as sought in KiwiRail submission 67.</li> <li>It is appropriate to restrict and prevent the placement of signs within required sight lines for vehicles access and intersections, and within the sight lines required for rail crossings.</li> </ul>	Accept in part	15.4
697.1015	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Chapter 25 Reserve Zone heading, as follows: Chapter 25: Reserve Zone <u>-Rules</u>	To assist in clarifying that all of the provisions within the chapter are rules.	Accept	5.1.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1387.770	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	5.1.4
697.1016	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 25(2) Reserve Zone, as follows: The rules that apply to subdivision in the Reserve Zone are contained in Rule 25.4 and the relevant rules in 14 Infrastructure and Energy; and 15 Natural Hazards and Climate Change (Placeholder).	To clarify that the rules in Chapter 14 Infrastructure and Energy and Chapter 15 Natural Hazards and Climate Change apply to subdivision as well as to land use activities.	Accept in part	5.1.4
FS1387.771	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	5.1.4
697.1017	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 25.1.1 PRI Prohibited activities, as follows: Any building, structure, objects or vegetation that obscures the sight lines of the Raglan navigation beacons for vessels entering Whaingaroa (Raglan Harbour) (refer to -as identified in Appendix 7 )(Raglan Navigation Beacon) for vessels entering	Additional clarity with the rule.	Accept	11.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			Raglan Harbour (Whaingaroa).			
FS1387.772	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	11.4
697.1018	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 25.1.2(1) Permitted Activities, as follows: (1) The activities listed below are permitted activities if they meet all the following: (a) Activity-specific conditions; (b) Land Use - Effects rules in Rule 25.2 (unless the activity-specific rule and/or conditions identify a condition(s) that does not apply); (c) Land Use - Building rules in Rule 25.3 (unless the activity-specific rule and/or conditions identify a condition(s) that does not apply); <del>(d) Activity-specific conditions.</del>	The list of rules (a) - (c) should follow the order that they appear.	Accept	6.4
FS1387.773	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	Reject	6.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
<b>697.1019</b>	<b>Waikato District Council</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 25.1.2 P4 Temporary event, as follows: (a) The event occurs no more than 15 times per calendar year <u>consecutive 12 month period:...</u> (d) The site is returned to its <u>original previous condition</u> no more than 3 days after the end of the event:...	Consistency with other chapters.	Accept in part	8.2.4
FS1264.30	Bootleg Brewery	Oppose	<i>Seek that either the submission point is disallowed OR The Matangi site is excluded/exempt from these rules, on the basis effects from the operation of the site on local community are addressed through a bespoke precinct zone, commercial agreement, or effects are negligible and there is no need to apply a restriction.</i>	<i>Bootleg supports a framework which provides for the permissive operation of a brewery with on and off premise, as well as promotes economic growth and regeneration of the site to realise its full potential. The rules unnecessarily restrict or result in additional cost to operators, which there is no significant adverse effect to be managed. The anticipated effects are either negligible or can be managed through commercial outcomes. On this basis, the proposed rules will have a negative effect on economic growth and regeneration of the site, which will benefit the local community.</i>	Accept in part	8.2.4
FS1387.774	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>	Reject	8.2.4
<b>697.1020</b>	<b>Waikato District Council</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 25.1.3 Discretionary activities, as follows: Any permitted activity that does not comply with <u>one or more</u> any activity-specific conditions in Rule 25.1.2	Consistency with other chapters and additional clarity of the rule.	Accept	10.4
<b>697.1021</b>	<b>Waikato District Council</b>	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 25.1.3(D2), Discretionary Activities.	Creates confusion as it mixes activity rules with Land Use - Effects and Land Use -	Accept	10.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1387.775	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	Building rules. <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	10.4
697.1022	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 25.2.1.1 P3 and P4 Noise - General; AND Amend Rule 25.2.1.1 P2, to read as follows: (a) Noise measured within the notional boundary on any site in the Residential Zone, Village Zone, Country Living Zone and Rural Zone must not exceed: (i) 55dB (LAeq), 7am to 7pm every day; (ii) 45dB (LAeq), 7pm to 10pm every day; and (iii) 40dB (LAeq) and 65dB (LAm <sub>ax</sub> ), 10pm to 7am the following day. (b) <u>Noise measured within any site in any zone other than the Reserve Zone, Residential Zone, Village Zone, Country Living Zone and Rural Zone must meet the noise levels permitted for that zone.</u> (c) <u>Noise levels must be measured in accordance with the requirements of NZS 6801:2008 "Acoustics - Measurement of Environmental Sound".</u> (d) <u>Noise levels must be assessed in accordance with the requirements of NZS 6802:2008 "Acoustic-Environmental noise".</u> AND Make consequential amendment to Rule 25.2.1.1 D1, as follows: Noise that does not comply with Rule 25.2.1.1 P1, P2, P3 or P4.	P3 and P4 need to be conditions of P2 as they are the standards which need to be met.	Accept in part	12.4
697.1023	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 25.2.1.2 P1 Noise - Construction, as follows: (a) Construction noise must <u>not exceed</u>	Additional clarity of the rule - construction noise should not exceed the limits, rather	Accept	12.4



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			meet the limits in NZS 6803:1999 (Acoustics - Construction Noise); and...	than meet the limits in the NZ Standard.		
<b>697.1024</b>	<b>Waikato District Council</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 25.2.3 PI Glare and artificial light spill, as follows: (a) Illumination from glare and artificial light spill must not exceed 10 lux measured horizontally and vertically at any other site <u>zoned Residential, Village or Country Living Zone.</u>	Consistency of wording with other chapters. The focus of the rule in the Reserve Zone should be to control light spill outside the Reserve Zone into the residential zones.	Accept in part	13.4
<b>697.1025</b>	<b>Waikato District Council</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 25.2.4(1) Earthworks, as follows: (1) Rule 25.2.4.1 - Earthworks General provides the permitted rules for earthwork activities in the Reserves Zone. <u>This rule does not apply in those areas specified in rules 25.2.4.1A, 25.2.4.2, 25.2.4.3 and 25.2.4.4.</u>	The wording of the rule does not make it clear that the rules in 25.2.4(2) apply instead of the general earthworks rule.	Accept in part	15.4
FS1350.103	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Oppose	<i>Disallow in terms of sought relocation of National Grid provisions. Notwithstanding the location of the provisions, Transpower seeks that all amendments sought in its original submission be included.</i>	<i>Related to the original submission by Waikato District Council seeking relocation/replicating of the National Grid earthworks provisions (submission point 697.6), Transpower's further submission point in response to Submission point 697.6 apply to the earthwork provisions listed. Transpower supports and prefers a standalone set of provisions (for the reason it avoids duplication and provides a coherent set of rules which submitters can refer to, noting that the planning maps clearly identify land that is subject to the National Grid provisions). A stand-alone set of provisions as provided in the notified plan is also consistent with the National Planning Standards. Irrespective that the proposed plan has not been drafted to align with the National Planning Standards, it would be counterproductive to amend the layout contrary to the intent of the Standards. Standard 7. District wide Matters Standard provides, as a mandatory direction, that 'provisions relating to energy, infrastructure and transport that are not specific to the Special purpose zones chapter or sections must be located in one or more chapters under the Energy, Infrastructure and Transport heading'. Clause 5.(c) makes specific reference to reverse</i>	Accept in part	15.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>sensitivity effects between infrastructure and other activities. It is not clear from the submission points as to the relationship between chapters 14, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24 and 25 and the National Grid provisions within 14.1.1 provides the zone provisions do not apply to infrastructure and energy activities. As such, any other network utility activities would appear to be subject to the National Grid provisions and this requires further clarification. If council wishes to pursue splitting the National Grid provisions into the respective chapters, supply of a revised full set of provisions would be beneficial to enable Transpower to fully assess the implications and workability of the requested changes. Notwithstanding the location of National Grid provisions relating to earthworks within the proposed plan, Transpower seeks the specific changes to earthwork provisions as sought in its original submission point 576.55. Note: It is not evident from the summary if there is a submission point applicable for Chapter 17. If so, this further submission covers that point.</p>		
697.1026	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	<p>Add to Rule 25.2.4(2) Earthworks, as follows:  There are specific standards for earthworks within rules: (a) Rule 25.2.4.1A - Earthworks within the National Grid Yard (a b) Rule 25.2.4.2 - Maaori Sites and Maaori Areas of Significance; (b c) Rule 25.2.4.3 - Significant Natural Areas; (c d) Rule 25.2.4.4 - Landscape and Natural Character Areas.  AND  Add new rule after Rule 25.2.4.1, as follows:  25.2.4.1A Earthworks - within the National Grid Yard P1 (a) The following earthworks within the National Grid Yard: (i)Earthworks undertaken as part of domestic cultivation; or repair, sealing or resealing of a road, footpath or driveway; (ii)Vertical holes not exceeding 500mm in diameter that are more than 1.5m from the outer edge of the pole support structure or stay wire. (iii) Earthworks for which a dispensation has been granted by Transpower under New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safe Distances 34:2001 ISSN 0114-0663. P2 (a) Earthworks activities within the National Grid Yard</p>	<p>Replicate the earthworks rule within the National Grid from Chapter 14 into Chapter 25 for increased clarity and usability of the Plan.</p>	Reject	15.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p><u>near National Grid support poles or any stay wires must comply with the following conditions: (i) Do not exceed a depth of 300mm within 2.2m of the pole or stay wire; and (ii) Do not exceed a depth of 750mm between 2.2m and 5m of the pole or stay wire. P3 (a) Earthworks within the National Grid Yard near National Grid support towers (including any tubular steel tower that replaces a steel lattice tower) must comply with all of the following conditions: (i) Do not exceed 300m depth within 6m of the outer edge of the visible foundation of the tower; (ii) Do not exceed 3m between 6m and 12m of the outer edge of the visible foundation of the tower; (iii) Do not compromise the stability of a National Grid support structure; (iv) Do not result in the loss of access to any National Grid support structure; and (v) Must be less than the minimum ground to conductor clearance distances in Table 4 of the New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safe Distances 34:2001 ISSN 0114-0663. RD1 (a) Earthworks within the National Grid Yard that do not comply with one or more of the conditions of Rules 25.2.4.1A P1, P2 or P3. (b) Discretion is restricted to: (i) Impacts on the operation, maintenance, upgrading and development of the National Grid; (ii) The risk to the structural integrity of the affected National Grid support structure(s); (iii) Any impact on the ability of the National Grid owner (Transpower) to access the National Grid; (iv) The risk of electrical hazards affecting public or individual safety, and the risk of property damage.</u></p>			
FS1350.104	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Oppose	<p><i>Disallow in terms of sought relocation of National Grid provisions. Notwithstanding the location of the provisions, Transpower seeks that all amendments sought in its original submission be included.</i></p>	<p><i>Related to the original submission by Waikato District Council seeking relocation/replicating of the National Grid earthworks provisions (submission point 697.6), Transpower's further submission point in response to Submission point 697.6 apply to the earthwork provisions listed. Transpower supports and prefers a standalone set of provisions (for the reason it avoids duplication and provides a coherent set of rules which submitters can refer to, noting that the planning maps clearly identify land that is subject to the National Grid provisions). A stand-alone set of provisions as provided in</i></p>	Accept	15.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p><i>the notified plan is also consistent with the National Planning Standards. Irrespective that the proposed plan has not been drafted to align with the National Planning Standards, it would be counterproductive to amend the layout contrary to the intent of the Standards. Standard 7. District wide Matters Standard provides, as a mandatory direction, that 'provisions relating to energy, infrastructure and transport that are not specific to the Special purpose zones chapter or sections must be located in one or more chapters under the Energy, Infrastructure and Transport heading'. Clause 5.(c) makes specific reference to reverse sensitivity effects between infrastructure and other activities. It is not clear from the submission points as to the relationship between chapters 14, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24 and 25 and the National Grid provisions within 14.1.1 provides the zone provisions do not apply to infrastructure and energy activities. As such, any other network utility activities would appear to be subject to the National Grid provisions and this requires further clarification. If council wishes to pursue splitting the National Grid provisions into the respective chapters, supply of a revised full set of provisions would be beneficial to enable Transpower to fully assess the implications and workability of the requested changes. Notwithstanding the location of National Grid provisions relating to earthworks within the proposed plan, Transpower seeks the specific changes to earthwork provisions as sought in its original submission point 576.55. Note: It is not evident from the summary if there is a submission point applicable for Chapter 17. If so, this further submission covers that point.</i></p>		
697.1027	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 25.2.4.1 Earthworks - general, as follows: (a) Earthworks ( <u>excluding the importation of fill material</u> ) within a site must meet all of the following <u>conditions</u> : (i) Be located more than 1.5m from a public sewer, open drain, overland flow path or other service pipe; (ii) Not exceed a volume of more than 250m <sup>3</sup> <del>and</del> (iii) Not exceed an area of more than 1,000m <sup>2</sup> <u>over any single</u>	This rule appears to be different from other zone chapter rules. The additional words are required to provide clarity and consistency with the other zones, reflecting activities that occur in the reserves zone. Also enabling the importation of fill for a building platform as a permitted activity.	Accept in part	15.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p><del>consecutive 12 month period</del> within a site; (iv) The height of the resulting cut, filled areas or fill batter face in stable ground, not including any surcharge, does not exceed 1.5m, with a maximum slope of 1:2 (1 vertical to 2 horizontal); (v) <u>Earthworks are set back at least 1.5m from all boundaries;</u> (vi) Areas exposed by earthworks are re-vegetated to achieve 80% ground cover within 6 months of the commencement of the earthworks; (vii) Sediment resulting from the earthworks is retained on the site through implementation and maintenance of erosion and sediment controls; (viii) <del>Does</del> not divert or change the nature of natural water flows, water bodies or established drainage paths; and (ix) <del>Do not result in the site being unable to be serviced by gravity sewers.</del> P2 <u>Earthworks for the purpose of creating a building platform within a site using imported fill material.</u> P23 (a) <u>Earthworks for purposes other than creating a building platform within a site, using imported fill material (excluding cleanfill) must meet all of the following conditions. The importation of fill material to a site must meet all of the following conditions, in addition to the conditions in P1.</u> (i) <del>Must</del> Does not exceed a total volume of 500m<sup>3</sup> per site and a depth of 1m; (ii) <del>Is fit for compaction;</del> (iii) The <del>slope height</del> height of the resulting batter face filled area in stable ground <del>does must</del> not exceed 1.5m with a maximum slope of 1:2 (1m vertical to 2m horizontal); (iv) Fill material is setback at least 1.5m from all boundaries; (v) <del>Does not restrict the ability for land to drain;</del> (vi) <del>Is not located within 3m of a property boundary, with the exception of the following: A. Landscaping bunds; (b) Where a retaining wall exists, the fill is placed to the same level as the retaining wall.</del> (v) Areas exposed by filling are revegetated to achieve 80% ground cover within 6 months of the commencement of the earthworks; (vi) Sediment resulting from the filling is retained on the site through implementation and maintenance of erosion and sediment controls; (vii) <u>Do not divert or change the nature of natural water flows, water bodies or established drainage paths.</u> RD1 (a) Earthworks that do not comply with Rule 25.2.4.1 P1 or P23. (b) Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters: (i) Amenity</p>			

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			values and landscape effects; (ii) Volume, extent and depth of earthworks; (iii) Nature of fill material; (iv) Contamination of fill material; (v) Location of the earthworks to waterways, significant indigenous vegetation and habitat; (vi) Compaction of the fill material; (vii) Volume and depth of fill material; (viii) Protection of the Hauraki Gulf Catchment Area; (ix) Geotechnical stability; (x) Flood risk, including natural water flows and established drainage paths (xi) Land instability, erosion and sedimentation; (xii) Proximity to underground services and service connections. <u>NCI Importation of cleanfill to a site</u>			
<b>697.1037</b>	<b>Waikato District Council</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 25.2.7.1 P2(a)(viii) Signs - general, as follows: (viii) The sign is <u>for the purpose of identification and interpretation</u> <del>not attached to</del> of a Maaori site of significance listed in Schedule 30.3 (Maaori Sites of Significance) <del>except for the purpose of identification and interpretation;</del>	Re-wording this rule provides clarity.	Accept in part	15.4
FS1323.92	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	<i>That the amendments sought are declined.</i>	<i>HNZPT considers that the proposed amendment does not provide clarity as a sign should not be located on a site of significance. The addition proposed has the potential to cause adverse effects to these items.</i>	Reject in part	15.4