

Appendix I: Table of submission points

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
<b>NZDF</b>						
796.3	New Zealand Defence Force	Neutral/Amend	Add a permitted activity rule for temporary military training activities within a general district wide chapter that applies across all zones, subject to appropriate noise standards; OR Add a new permitted activity rule as shown below for temporary military training activities to the following chapters: Chapter 16 Residential Zone Chapter 17 Business Zone Chapter 18 Business Town Centre Zone Chapter 19 Business Zone Tamahere Chapter 20 Industrial Zone Chapter 21 Industrial Zone Heavy Chapter 22 Rural Zone Chapter 23 Country Living Zone Chapter 24 Village Zone Chapter 25 Reserve Zone Chapter 26 Hampton Downs Motor Sport Recreation Zone Chapter 27 Te Kowhai Airpark Zone Chapter 28 Rangitahi Peninsula Zone P* Temporary military training activities Activity-specific conditions The activity must comply with the permitted activity noise standards for temporary military training activities.	Due to temporary and specialised nature of temporary military training activities, the submitter considers it generally appropriate that those activities be exempt from other rules in other chapters such as transportation and structures. As the Proposed District Plan is currently drafted, temporary military training activities would be a non-complying activity as they are not provided for as a permitted, restricted discretionary, discretionary or prohibited activity. Considered inappropriate and onerous. A permitted activity status would have little or no environmental effects, such as search and rescue operations or small construction tasks undertaken for training purposes would require resource consent as a non-complying activity, which is not effects-based or a good resource management process. The submitter must undertake training in order to fulfil statutory obligations under the Defence Act. Including provision for temporary military training activities as a permitted activity provides certainty that such activities can occur when required, while providing adequate protection of the environment through compliance with noise standards.	Accept in part	4
FS1385.51	Mercury Limited NZ for Mercury B	Oppose	Oppose	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure perspective. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept in part	4
FS1339.180	NZTE Operations Limited	Not Stated	Not Stated	NZTE is neutral to the extent that any relief arising from the submission is consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.	Accept in part	4
796.4	New Zealand Defence Force	Neutral/Amend	Add permitted activity noise standards in a general district-wide chapter that applies across all zones for temporary military training activities (see Attachment 2 to the submission for specific standards); OR Add new permitted activity noise standards for temporary military training activities (see Attachment 2 to the	There are currently no permitted activity standards relating to temporary military training activities. The submitter has prepared noise standards specific to temporary military training activities and has requested that these standards be included in the Waikato	Accept in part	4

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			submission for specific standards) to the following chapters: Chapter 16 Residential Zone Chapter 17 Business Zone Chapter 18 Business Town Centre Zone Chapter 19 Business Zone Tamahere Chapter 20 Industrial Zone Chapter 21 Industrial Zone Heavy Chapter 22 Rural Zone Chapter 23 Country Living Zone Chapter 24 Village Zone Chapter 25 Reserve Zone Chapter 26 Hampton Downs Motor Sport Recreation Zone Chapter 27 Te Kowhai Airpark Zone Chapter 28 Rangitahi Peninsula Zone	District Plan. See Attachment 3 in the submission for an explanation of the standards.		
<b>FS1385.52</b>	Mercury Limited Mercury B	NZ for Oppose	Oppose		<i>Accept in part</i>	4
<b>FS1339.181</b>	NZTE Operations Limited	Not Stated	Not Stated	NZTE does not support or oppose this submission.	<i>Accept in part</i>	4
796.5	New Zealand Defence Force	Neutral/Amend	Add a controlled activity rule within a general district wide chapter of the District Plan for temporary military training activities that do not meet Permitted Activity standards; OR Add a new controlled activity rule as shown below for temporary military training activities that do not meet the permitted activity standards to the following chapters: Chapter 16 Residential Zone Chapter 17 Business Zone Chapter 18 Business Town Centre Zone Chapter 19 Business Zone Tamahere Chapter 20 Industrial Zone Chapter 21 Industrial Zone Heavy Chapter 22 Rural Zone Chapter 23 Country Living Zone Chapter 24 Village Zone Chapter 25 Reserve Zone Chapter 26 Hampton Downs Motor Sport Recreation Zone Chapter 27 Te Kowhai Airpark Zone Chapter 28 Rangitahi Peninsula Zone C* Any temporary military training activities that do not comply with the permitted activity noise standard. Council's discretion shall be restricted to the following matters: (a) Noise effects	The submitter must undertake training to fulfil its statutory obligations under the Defence Act 1990. A controlled activity status provides a level of certainty to the submitter that an activity can proceed. Allows Council discretion to ensure relevant effects (being noise) are appropriately managed. In determining what conditions to impose, Council should limit its discretion to effects relating to the permitted activity noise standards only.	<i>Accept in part</i>	4
<b>FS1385.53</b>	Mercury Limited Mercury B	NZ for Oppose	Oppose		<i>Accept in part</i>	4
<b>FS1339.182</b>	NZTE Operations Limited	Not Stated	Not Stated	NZTE does not support or oppose this submission.	<i>Accept in part</i>	4
<b>GMO</b>						
525.3	Gillian Marie	Neutral/Amend	Amend the Proposed District Plan to required all consent applications to be automatically publicly notified, regardless of whether the application is regarding genetically modified organisms or not.	Provisions are allowed under the Resource Management Act 1991 and pursuant to the ruling in Federated Farmers of New Zealand v Northland Regional Council [2015] NZEnC 89. Release of GMOs has a potential to cause significant adverse effects on the environment, including the following: Biological or ecosystem harm Harm to tangata whenua cultural values such as mauri and tikanga Harm to the cultural values and lifestyle decisions of	<i>Reject</i>	5

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>people and communities at a local level concerning what constitutes their wellbeing Harm from GMO contamination to existing or potential forms of land use including farming, bee keeping, forestry and other primary production activities dependant on an uncontaminated environmental brand. Adverse effects to these land uses could include: loss of organic and GMO-free certification, reputational damage, loss of markets and premiums paid for GMO free produce and loss of livelihood. The Waikato has three major milk suppliers which have a GMO Free requirement for the milk products. The ability to control the grass genetic pollution is a major concern. There are several organic producers in Waikato Conditions of consent may be breached by poor management, human error, natural events. Once GMOs have been released they would be very difficult, if not impossible to eradicate. The GE Free status of the district potentially would be lost permanently along with the market advantage of that status. This along with the potential health hazards to all living things as the long term impact of GMO's has not been ascertained. Application of integrated management and precautionary approach to GMOs under the RMA is the best technique for managing potential adverse effects. It is consistent with the sustainable management purpose and Part II of the RMA to establish district plan provisions that manage the release, location and management of GMOs where they have the potential to adversely affect the environment.</p>		
<b>FS1192.12</b>	<i>J H &amp; R Cotman</i>	Oppose	Disallow this whole submission point	<p>Provisions regulating GMOs are out of scope. Claims of harm are not scientifically credible. The issues raised in the submission are already considered (using a precautionary approach) by the Environmental Protection Authority. After that, any residual issues can be managed using provisions in the Biosecurity Act (Pest Management Strategies) or the RMA by the WDC when they are known. Another level of regulation as proposed will undermine Waikato's position as a leader in agricultural science, will erode scientific capability, reduce economic opportunities and will limit access to new technologies to address climate change, predator control, water quality and competitiveness.</p>	Accept	5
<b>FS1199.10</b>	<i>New Zealand Forest Research Institute</i>	Oppose	We seek that the whole of the original submissions to be disallowed on the basis that they are based on claimed facts and assumptions and conclusions that cannot be supported by the evidence as demonstrated and detailed in the attached documents: (i) Pollution (ii) IS NZ GE Free (iii) Pesticide (iv) Inter-Council Working Party (v) Co-existence (vi) Benefits	<p>GM is polluting and contaminating and by false implication that the Waikato and New Zealand are currently GE free GM has no benefits GM is a risk the environment GM cannot co-exist with other activities That the EPA is not equipment to manage GMOs That Waikato District Council should follow Northland Regional Council and the recommendations of the Inter-Council Working Party That GMOs are causing problems with pesticides; and in the case of GE Free NZ have cited science papers proving harm.</p>	Accept	5

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				We wish to submit evidence in replay showing that all of the above claims are false.		
FS1212.12	David Stewart Bull	Oppose	Disallow the whole submission point.	<p>Genetically modified organisms (GMO) are regulated by the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) under the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act. Any use of a GMO must first obtain approval from the EPA. Approval for field trials, conditional release and full release requires public consultation. Thus there is plenty of opportunity for those oppose to GMOs to make submissions and have their voice heard. Matters which are raised by the submitters are already considered by the EPA. The Council should make no rules until it knows the risks which it considers have not been addressed by the EPA. This will depend on the nature of the organism and the genetic changes which have been made and should be assessed on a case by case basis. Only then should the council consider rules which it could make under the Biosecurity Act or Resource Management Act. Regulatory and science organisations around the world consider that the approved use of genetic modification to be no more risky than conventional breeding. Genetic modification has been used in other parts of the world with no scientifically credible incident of harm to human health or the environment attributable to genetic modification. Led by AgResearch Ruakura, the Waikato has been a leader in agricultural science and innovation. Implementing policies and rules in a blanket fashion as requested by the submitters would: Undermine the Waikato's leadership in agricultural science and innovation. Limit the opportunity to use new genetic technologies such as gene editing to: Address climate change, water quality and predator control; Improve productivity; Innovate to create new products, enhance the attributes and health outcomes of food; as well as Remediate the environment, manage our biosecurity risks and incursions. I do not consider genetic modification is the only answer to all these issues but we will need all the tools in the toolbox if we are to make meaningful and timely progress.</p>	Accept	5
FS1214.12	Forest Owners Association	Oppose	Disallow this whole submission point.	<p>Out of scope Inserting provisions into the District Plan is out of scope as there is no mention of genetic modification in the notified proposed district plan, thus To provide a proper process a separate plan change should be undertaken at a future time. A plan change could be sponsored by the proponents or by the Council itself Unnecessary and inappropriate duplication of the Environmental Protection Authority under HSNO The Environmental Protection Agency currently regulates the use of GMOs under the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act. Decisions are made on a case by case basis. New Zealand's management of genetically modified organisms is</p>	Accept	5

Submission number	Submitter	Support/ oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>considered one of the most conservative regulatory regimes in the world. Advice to government suggests that it is too conservative. Any use of GMO must first obtain approval from the EPA. The EPA is required to exercise a precautionary approach in its decision making therefore it is unlikely there would be any residual risk to manage. Issues of safety (including environmental safety), adverse effects on areas such as markets, effects on Maori and local iwi, other adverse effects, risks (risk mitigation) and management are considered by the EPA. Approval for field trials, conditional release and full release requires public consultation. Thus there is plenty of opportunity for those opposed to GMOs to make submissions and have their voice heard. Matters which are raised by the submitters are already considered by the EPA. Jurisdiction and control of effects by the council The courts have clarified that councils do have the jurisdiction to place controls on organisms which are GMOs. The court has not clarified if councils can prohibit GMOs as a class or put in place rules simply on the basis an organism is a GMO, nor that there is justification in doing so. Tools already exist (e.g. pest management strategies under the Biosecurity Act) for councils to manage any particular GMO which is economically useful but unwanted in the wrong place as it does with wilding pines, wilding kiwifruit, feral goats, deer and pigs. The Council should make no rules until it knows the risks which it considers have not been addressed by the EPA. This will depend on the nature of the organism and the genetic changes which have been made and should be assessed on a case by case basis. Only then should the council consider rules which it could make under the Biosecurity Act or Resource Management Act. Thus it is more efficient: To address any (unlikely) residual risk of an effect when that risk/effect is known using current tools, Than to put in place prohibitive rules which would require a plan change to undo. New Genetic Technologies and Gene editing Genetic technologies are developing rapidly. While the traditional methods of genetic modification involve the insertion of whole genes into an organism more recent techniques (often termed "gene editing"), allow changes to be made in a far more precise way. These techniques are explained in a series of information papers put out by the Royal Society of New Zealand. A simple analogy is that if the genetic code is a book, traditional GM is akin to inserting a sentence (possibly on an unrelated topic) randomly into the pages; gene editing is like using the find-and-replace function on a word processor. Some of these edits can be as small as a single letter. The genetic code in an organism runs into billions of letters. Gene editing, where it changes only one or two</p>		

Submission number	Submitter	Support/ oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>letters of that genetic code in a precise and targeted way compares favorably with traditional (non GM) methods such as mutagenesis where thousands of random mutations are created by exposing a plant or seed to radiation or chemicals in order to speed up the natural process of mutation. Gene editing does, in fact, introduce fewer changes than either mutagenesis or traditional breeding using pollen crosses. Mutagenesis is unregulated whereas gene editing is regulated in New Zealand as genetic modification. It is not possible to tell a gene edited organism from a non GM organism produced through traditional breeding or mutagenesis making identification in breeding programmes or the market difficult. A number of countries have (USA, Brazil, Japan, Sweden, Australia) deregulated certain gene editing techniques where the outcome could have been achieved through traditional breeding. The use of Genetic Modification in Modern Society The approved use of genetic modification has a history of safe use in medicine for 35 years and food production for 20 to 25 years. No scientifically credible incident of harm to human health or the environment attributable to genetic modification. Regulatory and science organisations around the world consider that the approved use of genetic modification to be no more risky than conventional breeding. The use of Genetic Modification in the New Zealand Environment New Zealand is not GMO free. There have already been five GMO releases into the environment approved since the passing of the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act (Animal vaccines and human therapeutics). These releases have presented no issues. AgResearch have been running GM field trials for many years without the need for rules from the District Council. Loss of Science Capability Led by Ruakura (AgResearch), the Waikato has been a leader in agricultural science and innovation. If the WDC were to impose rules on genetic modification in addition to those required under the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms act it will make research harder and more expensive in the Waikato District and there is a risk that the Waikato District will lose scientific capability to other regions. Blanket provisions not appropriate Implementing policies and rules in a blanket fashion as requested by the submitters would: Undermined the Waikato's leadership in agricultural science and innovation. Limit the opportunity to use new genetic technologies such as gene editing to: Address climate change, water quality and predator control; Improve productivity; Innovate to create new products, enhance the attributes and health outcomes of food; as well as Remediate</p>		

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				the environment or manage our biosecurity risks and incursions. For instance, within the forest industry, as well as providing potential opportunities to increase the productivity of key species there are also opportunities to address the problem of wilding pines, potentially rapidly identify, isolate and breed kauri with resistance to kauri dieback, develop genetic solutions to exotic pest animal species that currently cause significant biodiversity loss, involve high costs and dispersal of chemical toxins to maintain current (unsatisfactory) levels of control.		
FS1225.12	BIOTech Zealand	New Oppose	Disallow this whole submission point.	DR Oppose this submission point for the reasons set out in the attached pages which include: GMOs are out of scope. Claims of harm are scientifically credible. The issues raised in the submission are already considered (using a precautionary approach) by the Environmental Protection Authority. After that, any residual issues can be managed using provisions in the Biosecurity Act (Pest Management Strategies). Another unnecessary level of regulation as proposed will undermine Waikato's position as a leader in agricultural science, will erode scientific capability, reduce economic opportunities and will limit access to new technologies to address climate change, predator control, water quality and competitiveness.	Accept	5
FS1295.12	Life Sciences Network Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow this whole submission point.	DR The LSN opposes this submission point for the reasons set out in the attached pages which include: GMOs are out of scope. Claims of harm are not scientifically credible. The issues raised in the submission are already considered (using a precautionary approach) by the Environmental Protection Authority. After that, any residual issues can be managed using provisions in the Biosecurity Act (Pest Management Strategies) Another unnecessary level of regulation as proposed will undermine Waikato's position as a leader in agricultural science, will erode scientific capability, reduce economic opportunities and will limit access to new technologies to address climate change, predator control, water quality and competitiveness.	Accept	5
FS1320.12	Livestock Improvement Corporation	Oppose	Disallow this whole submission point.	LIC opposes this submission point for the following reasons: Claims of harm are not scientifically credible. The issues raised in the submission are already considered (using a precautionary approach) by the Environmental Protection Authority. After that, any residual issues can be managed using provisions in the Biosecurity Act (Pest Management Strategies). Another unnecessary level of regulation as proposed will undermine Waikato's position as a leader in agricultural science, will erode scientific capability, reduce economic opportunities and will limit access to new technologies to address climate change, predator control, water quality and competitiveness.	Accept	5
FS1343.14	Bruce Cameron	Oppose	Disallow this whole submission point.	My reason for opposing this submission point are: Provisions regulating GMOs are out of scope. Claims of harm are not scientifically credible. The issues	Accept	5

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				raised in the submission are already considered (using a precautionary approach) by the Environmental Protection. After that, any residual issues can be managed using provisions in the Biosecurity Act (Pest Management Strategies) or the RMA by the WDC when they are known. Another level of regulation as proposed will undermine Waikato's position as a leader in agricultural science, will erode scientific capability, reduce economic opportunities and will limit access to new technologies to address climate change, predator control, water quality and competitiveness.		
<b>FS1342.270</b>	<i>Federated Farmers</i>	Oppose	Disallow this whole submission point.	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3.	Accept	5
553.10	Malibu Hamilton	Neutral/Amend	Amend the Proposed District Plan to require public notification of all consents, whether the rules are on genetically modified organisms, or any other matter.	No reasons provided.	Reject	5
<b>FS1276.123</b>	<i>Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society</i>	Support	WED seeks that the whole submission point be allowed.	These submissions support submission point 780.30 in WED's submission. This strong call from Raglan submitters, for public notification of all consents, indicates the need for effective rules to protect Raglan's character, which may include notification.	Reject	5
<b>FS1388.787</b>	<i>Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E</i>	Oppose		At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	5
638.3	Nora van der Voorden	Neutral/Amend	Amend the Proposed Waikato District Plan to require consents which require exemption from plan rules to be automatically publicly notifiable, whether the rules are on Genetically Modified Organisms, or any other matter.	There is currently a major push in Aotearoa to adopt GE technology, citing competition from other countries attempting to be lower cost producers. Industry lobby pressure is being applied to the public and EPA to process experiments in containment to actual release into the environment without robust regulations on release. Therefore it is crucial that protective mechanisms are included in the Proposed District Plan to reduce potential liability. Concerned about potential risks posed by release of GMOs into the environment. GMOs have the potential to adversely affect ecological, economic and resource management values, and the social and cultural wellbeing of people, communities and Tangata whenua. Release of GMOS have potential to cause significant adverse effects on the environment. Regardless of the care given to crafting consent conditions for GMOs, there inevitably remains a risk (albeit small) that conditions may be breached by	Reject	5

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				poor management, human error, natural events and even sabotage of projects. Once GMOs are released into the environment, they would be difficult, if not impossible, to eradicate. 'GE Free' status of a district would likely be lost as well as their market advantages. Application of integrated management and precautionary approach to GMOs under the RMA is best available technique for managing potential adverse effects posed by GMOs within region. It is consistent with sustainable management purpose and Part II of the RMA to establish district plan provisions that manage the release, location and management of GMOs where they have the potential to adversely affect the environment and other land use activities. Numerous significant adverse effects on the environment which would include biological or ecosystem harm, cultural values, contamination to existing farming, reputational damage and loss of markets and premiums paid for GMO free produce.		
<b>FS1276.125</b>	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Support	WED seeks that the whole submission be allowed.	These submissions support submission point 780.30 in WED's submission. This strong call from Raglan submitters, for public notification of all consents, indicates the need for effective rules to protect Raglan's character, which may include notification.	Reject	5
651.4	Jon Muller for GE Free New Zealand	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, but submission supports Rural Resources - IA.6 Issues, Objectives and Policies in the Operative District Plan which ensure that rural actions do not constrain or compromise existing lawfully-established productive rural activities.	Concerned over the lack of any consideration of genetically-modified organisms in the Proposed District Plan.	Reject	5
<b>FS1192.21</b>	J H & R Cotman	Oppose	Disallow this whole submission point.	Provisions regulating GMOs are out of scope. Claims of harm are not scientifically credible. The issues raised in the submission are already considered (using a precautionary approach) by the Environmental Protection Authority. After that, any residual issues can be managed using provisions in the Biosecurity Act (Pest Management Strategies) or the RMA by the WDC when they are known. Another level of regulation as proposed will undermine Waikato's position as a leader in agricultural science, will erode scientific capability, reduce economic opportunities and will limit access to new technologies to address climate change, predator control, water quality and competitiveness.	Accept	5
<b>FS1199.19</b>	New Zealand Forest Research Institute	Oppose	We seek that the whole of the original submissions to be disallowed on the basis that they are based on claimed facts and assumptions and conclusions that cannot be supported by the evidence as demonstrated and detailed in the attached documents: (i) Pollution (ii) IS NZ GE Free (iii) Pesticide (iv) Inter-Council Working Party (v) Co-existence (vi) Benefits	GM is polluting and contaminating and by false implication that the Waikato and New Zealand are currently GE free GM has no benefits GM is a risk to the environment GM cannot co-exist with other activities That the EPA is not equipped to manage GMOs That Waikato District Council should follow Northland Regional Council and the recommendations of the Inter-Council Working Party That GMOs are causing problems with pesticides; and in the case of GE Free NZ have cited science papers proving harm. We wish to submit evidence in reply showing that all of the above claims are false.	Accept	5

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1212.21	David Stewart Bull	Oppose	Disallow the whole submission point.	<p>Genetically modified organisms (GMO) are regulated by the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) under the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act. Any use of a GMO must first obtain approval from the EPA. Approval for field trials, conditional release and full release requires public consultation. Thus there is plenty of opportunity for those oppose to GMOs to make submissions and have their voice heard. Matters which are raised by the submitters are already considered by the EPA. The Council should make no rules until it knows the risks which it considers have not been addressed by the EPA. This will depend on the nature of the organism and the genetic changes which have been made and should be assessed on a case by case basis. Only then should the council consider rules which it could make under the Biosecurity Act or Resource Management Act. Regulatory and science organisations around the world consider that the approved use of genetic modification to be no more risky than conventional breeding. Genetic modification has been used in other parts of the world with no scientifically credible incident of harm to human health or the environment attributable to genetic modification. Led by AgResearch Ruakura, the Waikato has been a leader in agricultural science and innovation. Implementing policies and rules in a blanket fashion as requested by the submitters would: Undermine the Waikato's leadership in agricultural science and innovation. Limit the opportunity to use new genetic technologies such as gene editing to: Address climate change, water quality and predator control; Improve productivity; Innovate to create new products, enhance the attributes and health outcomes of food; as well as Remediate the environment, manage our biosecurity risks and incursions. I do not consider genetic modification is the only answer to all these issues but we will need all the tools in the toolbox if we are to make meaningful and timely progress.</p>	Accept	5
FS1214.21	Forest Owners Association	Oppose	Disallow this whole submission point.	<p>Out of scope Inserting provisions into the District Plan is out of scope as there is no mention of genetic modification in the notified proposed district plan, thus To provide a proper process a separate plan change should be undertaken at a future time. A plan change could be sponsored by the proponents or by the Council itself Unnecessary and inappropriate duplication of the Environmental Protection Authority under HSNO The Environmental Protection Agency currently regulates the use of GMOs under the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act. Decisions are made on a case by case basis. New Zealand's management of genetically modified organisms is considered one of the most conservative regulatory regimes in the world. Advice to government suggests</p>	Accept	5

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>that it is too conservative. Any use of GMO must first obtain approval from the EPA. The EPA is required to exercise a precautionary approach in its decision making therefore it is unlikely there would be any residual risk to manage. Issues of safety (including environmental safety), adverse effects on areas such as markets, effects on Maori and local iwi, other adverse effects, risks (risk mitigation) and management are considered by the EPA. Approval for field trials, conditional release and full release requires public consultation. Thus there is plenty of opportunity for those opposed to GMOs to make submissions and have their voice heard. Matters which are raised by the submitters are already considered by the EPA. Jurisdiction and control of effects by the council The courts have clarified that councils do have the jurisdiction to place controls on organisms which are GMOs. The court has not clarified if councils can prohibit GMOs as a class or put in place rules simply on the basis an organism is a GMO, nor that there is justification in doing so. Tools already exist (e.g. pest management strategies under the Biosecurity Act) for councils to manage any particular GMO which is economically useful but unwanted in the wrong place as it does with wilding pines, wilding kiwifruit, feral goats, deer and pigs. The Council should make no rules until it knows the risks which it considers have not been addressed by the EPA. This will depend on the nature of the organism and the genetic changes which have been made and should be assessed on a case by case basis. Only then should the council consider rules which it could make under the Biosecurity Act or Resource Management Act. Thus it is more efficient: To address any (unlikely) residual risk of an effect when that risk/effect is known using current tools, Than to put in place prohibitive rules which would require a plan change to undo. New Genetic Technologies and Gene editing Genetic technologies are developing rapidly. While the traditional methods of genetic modification involve the insertion of whole genes into an organism more recent techniques (often termed "gene editing"), allow changes to be made in a far more precise way. These techniques are explained in a series of information papers put out by the Royal Society of New Zealand. A simple analogy is that if the genetic code is a book, traditional GM is akin to inserting a sentence (possibly on an unrelated topic) randomly into the pages; gene editing is like using the find-and-replace function on a word processor. Some of these edits can be as small as a single letter. The genetic code in an organism runs into billions of letters. Gene editing, where it changes only one or two letters of that genetic code in a precise and targeted way compares favorably with traditional (non GM)</p>		

Submission number	Submitter	Support/ oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>methods such as mutagenesis where thousands of random mutations are created by exposing a plant or seed to radiation or chemicals in order to speed up the natural process of mutation. Gene editing does, in fact, introduce fewer changes than either mutagenesis or traditional breeding using pollen crosses. Mutagenesis is unregulated whereas gene editing is regulated in New Zealand as genetic modification. It is not possible to tell a gene edited organism from a non GM organism produced through traditional breeding or mutagenesis making identification in breeding programmes or the market difficult. A number of countries have (USA, Brazil, Japan, Sweden, Australia) deregulated certain gene editing techniques where the outcome could have been achieved through traditional breeding. The use of Genetic Modification in Modern Society The approved use of genetic modification has a history of safe use in medicine for 35 years and food production for 20 to 25 years. No scientifically credible incident of harm to human health or the environment attributable to genetic modification. Regulatory and science organisations around the world consider that the approved use of genetic modification to be no more risky than conventional breeding. The use of Genetic Modification in the New Zealand Environment New Zealand is not GMO free. There have already been five GMO releases into the environment approved since the passing of the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act (Animal vaccines and human therapeutics). These releases have presented no issues. AgResearch have been running GM field trials for many years without the need for rules from the District Council. Loss of Science Capability Led by Ruakura (AgResearch), the Waikato has been a leader in agricultural science and innovation. If the WDC were to impose rules on genetic modification in addition to those required under the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms act it will make research harder and more expensive in the Waikato District and there is a risk that the Waikato District will lose scientific capability to other regions. Blanket provisions not appropriate Implementing policies and rules in a blanket fashion as requested by the submitters would: Undermined the Waikato's leadership in agricultural science and innovation. Limit the opportunity to use new genetic technologies such as gene editing to: Address climate change, water quality and predator control; Improve productivity; Innovate to create new products, enhance the attributes and health outcomes of food; as well as Remediate the environment or manage our biosecurity risks and incursions. For instance, within the forest industry, as</p>		

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				well as providing potential opportunities to increase the productivity of key species there are also opportunities to address the problem of wilding pines, potentially rapidly identify, isolate and breed kauri with resistance to kauri dieback, develop genetic solutions to exotic pest animal species that currently cause significant biodiversity loss, involve high costs and dispersal of chemical toxins to maintain current (unsatisfactory) levels of control.		
FS1225.21	BIOTech New Zealand	Oppose	Disallow this whole submission point.	Oppose this submission point for the reasons set out in the attached pages which include: GMOs are out of scope. Claims of harm are scientifically credible. The issues raised in the submission are already considered (using a precautionary approach) by the Environmental Protection Authority. After that, any residual issues can be managed using provisions in the Biosecurity Act (Pest Management Strategies). Another unnecessary level of regulation as proposed will undermine Waikato's position as a leader in agricultural science, will erode scientific capability, reduce economic opportunities and will limit access to new technologies to address climate change, predator control, water quality and competitiveness.	Accept	5
FS1295.21	Life Sciences Network Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow this whole submission point.	The LSN opposes this submission point for the reasons set out in the attached pages which include: GMOs are out of scope. Claims of harm are not scientifically credible. The issues raised in the submission are already considered (using a precautionary approach) by the Environmental Protection Authority. After that, any residual issues can be managed using provisions in the Biosecurity Act (Pest Management Strategies) Another unnecessary level of regulation as proposed will undermine Waikato's position as a leader in agricultural science, will erode scientific capability, reduce economic opportunities and will limit access to new technologies to address climate change, predator control, water quality and competitiveness.	Accept	5
FS1320.21	Livestock Improvement Corporation	Oppose	Disallow this whole submission point.	LIC opposes this submission point for the following reasons: Claims of harm are not scientifically credible. The issues raised in the submission are already considered (using a precautionary approach) by the Environmental Protection Authority. After that, any residual issues can be managed using provisions in the Biosecurity Act (Pest Management Strategies). Another unnecessary level of regulation as proposed will undermine Waikato's position as a leader in agricultural science, will erode scientific capability, reduce economic opportunities and will limit access to new technologies to address climate change, predator control, water quality and competitiveness.	Accept	5
FS1343.23	Bruce Cameron	Support	Disallow this whole submission point.	Provisions regulating GMOs are out of scope. Claims of harm are not scientifically credible. The issues raised in the submission are already considered (using a precautionary approach) by the Environmental Protection Authority. After that, any residual issues can be	Reject	5

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				managed using provisions in the Biosecurity Act (Pest Management Strategies) or the RMA by the WDC when they are known. Another level of regulation as proposed will undermine Waikato's position as a leader in agricultural science, will erode scientific capability, reduce economic opportunities and will limit access to new technologies to address climate change, predator control, water quality and competitiveness.		
<b>FS1342.279</b>	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow this whole submission point.	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3.	Accept	5
733.3	Dave Currie	Neutral/Amend	Amend the Proposed District Plan to require all consents to be publically notified, whether the rules are on genetically modified organisms or not.		Reject	5
<b>FS1199.26</b>	New Zealand Forest Research Institute	Oppose	We seek that the whole of the original submissions to be disallowed on the basis that they are based on claimed facts and assumptions and conclusions that cannot be supported by the evidence as demonstrated and detailed in the attached documents: (i) Pollution (ii) IS NZ GE Free (iii) Pesticide (iv) Inter-Council Working Party (v) Co-existence (vi) Benefits	GM is polluting and contaminating and by false implication that the Waikato and New Zealand are currently GE free GM has no benefits GM is a risk to the environment GM cannot co-exist with other activities That the EPA is not equipment to manage GMOs That Waikato District Council should follow Northland Regional Council and the recommendations of the Inter-Council Working Party That GMOs are causing problems with pesticides; and in the case of GE Free NZ have cited science papers proving harm. We wish to submit evidence in replay showing that all of the above claims are false.	Accept	5
<b>FS1276.126</b>	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Society Inc.	Support	WED seeks that the whole submission point be allowed.	These submissions support submission point 780.30 in WED's submission. This strong call from Raglan submitters, for public notification of all consents, indicates the need for effective rules to protect Raglan's character, which may include notification.	Reject	5
744.3	Peter McCallum	Neutral/Amend	Amend the Proposed District Plan to require all consent applications to be automatically publically notified, regardless of whether the application is regarding genetically modified organisms or not.	Provisions allowed under the Resource Management Act 1991 and pursuant to the ruling in Federated Farmers of New Zealand v Northland Regional Council [2015] NZEnC 89. Release of GMOs has a potential to cause significant adverse effects on the environment, including the following: 1. Biological or ecosystem harm 2. Harm to tangata whenua cultural values such as mauri and tikanga 3. Harm to the cultural values and lifestyle decisions of people and communities at a local level concerning what constitutes their wellbeing 4. Harm from GMO contamination to existing or potential forms of land use including farming, forestry and other primary production activities dependant on an uncontaminated environmental brand. 5. Adverse effects to these land uses could include: loss of organic and GMO-free certification, reputational damage, loss of markets and premiums paid for GMO free produce and loss of livelihood. Conditions of consent may be breached by poor management, human error, natural events. Once GMOs have been released they would be very difficult, if not impossible to eradicate. Application of integrated management and precautionary approach to GMOs under the RMA is the	Reject	5

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				best technique for managing potential adverse effects. It is consistent with the sustainable management purpose and Part II of the RMA to establish district plan provisions that manage the release, location and management of GMOs where they have the potential to adversely affect the environment.		
FS1192.30	J H & R Cotman	Oppose	Disallow this whole submission point.	Provisions regulating GMOs are out of scope. Claims of harm are not scientifically credible. The issues raised in the submission are already considered (using a precautionary approach) by the Environmental Protection Authority. After that, any residual issues can be managed using provisions in the Biosecurity Act (Pest Management Strategies) or the RMA by the WDC when they are known. Another level of regulation as proposed will undermine Waikato's position as a leader in agricultural science, will erode scientific capability, reduce economic opportunities and will limit access to new technologies to address climate change, predator control, water quality and competitiveness.	Accept	5
FS1199.29	New Zealand Forest Research Institute	Oppose	We seek that the whole of the original submissions to be disallowed on the basis that they are based on claimed facts and assumptions and conclusions that cannot be supported by the evidence as demonstrated and detailed in the attached documents: (i) Pollution (ii) IS NZ GE Free (iii) Pesticide (iv) Inter-Council Working Party (v) Co-existence (vi) Benefits	GM is polluting and contaminating and by false implication that the Waikato and New Zealand are currently GE free GM has no benefits GM is a risk the environment GM cannot co-exist with other activities That the EPA is not equipment to manage GMOs That Waikato District Council should follow Northland Regional Council and the recommendations of the Inter-Council Working Party That GMOs are causing problems with pesticides; and in the case of GE Free NZ have cited science papers proving harm. We wish to submit evidence in replay showing that all of the above claims are false.	Accept	5
FS1212.30	David Stewart Bull	Oppose	The whole submission point be disallowed.	Genetically modified organisms (GMO) are regulated by the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) under the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act. Any use of a GMO must first obtain approval from the EPA. Approval for field trials, conditional release and full release requires public consultation. Thus there is plenty of opportunity for those oppose to GMOs to make submissions and have their voice heard. Matters which are raised by the submitters are already considered by the EPA. The Council should make no rules until it knows the risks which it considers have not been addressed by the EPA. This will depend on the nature of the organism and the genetic changes which have been made and should be assessed on a case by case basis. Only then should the council consider rules which it could make under the Biosecurity Act or Resource Management Act. Regulatory and science organisations around the world consider that the approved use of genetic modification to be no more risky than conventional breeding. Genetic modification has been used in other parts of the world with no scientifically credible incident of harm to human health or the environment attributable to genetic modification. Led by AgResearch Ruakura, the	Accept	5

Submission number	Submitter	Support/ oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>Waikato has been a leader in agricultural science and innovation. Implementing policies and rules in a blanket fashion as requested by the submitters would: Undermine the Waikato's leadership in agricultural science and innovation. Limit the opportunity to use new genetic technologies such as gene editing to: Address climate change, water quality and predator control; Improve productivity; Innovate to create new products, enhance the attributes and health outcomes of food; as well as Remediate the environment, manage our biosecurity risks and incursions. I do not consider genetic modification is the only answer to all these issues but we will need all the tools in the toolbox if we are to make meaningful and timely progress.</p>		
FS1214.29	Forest Owners Association	Oppose	Disallow this whole submission point.	<p>Out of scope Inserting provisions into the District Plan is out of scope as there is no mention of genetic modification in the notified proposed district plan, thus To provide a proper process a separate plan change should be undertaken at a future time. A plan change could be sponsored by the proponents or by the Council itself Unnecessary and inappropriate duplication of the Environmental Protection Authority under HSNO The Environmental Protection Agency currently regulates the use of GMOs under the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act. Decisions are made on a case by case basis. New Zealand's management of genetically modified organisms is considered one of the most conservative regulatory regimes in the world. Advice to government suggests that it is too conservative. Any use of GMO must first obtain approval from the EPA. The EPA is required to exercise a precautionary approach in its decision making therefore it is unlikely there would be any residual risk to manage. Issues of safety (including environmental safety), adverse effects on areas such as markets, effects on Maori and local iwi, other adverse effects, risks (risk mitigation) and management are considered by the EPA. Approval for field trials, conditional release and full release requires public consultation. Thus there is plenty of opportunity for those opposed to GMOs to make submissions and have their voice heard. Matters which are raised by the submitters are already considered by the EPA. Jurisdiction and control of effects by the council The courts have clarified that councils do have the jurisdiction to place controls on organisms which are GMOs. The court has not clarified if councils can prohibit GMOs as a class or put in place rules simply on the basis an organism is a GMO, nor that there is justification in doing so. Tools already exist (e.g. pest management strategies under the Biosecurity Act) for councils to manage any particular GMO which is economically useful but</p>	Accept	5

Submission number	Submitter	Support/ oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>unwanted in the wrong place as it does with wilding pines, wilding kiwifruit, feral goats, deer and pigs. The Council should make no rules until it knows the risks which it considers have not been addressed by the EPA. This will depend on the nature of the organism and the genetic changes which have been made and should be assessed on a case by case basis. Only then should the council consider rules which it could make under the Biosecurity Act or Resource Management Act. Thus it is more efficient: To address any (unlikely) residual risk of an effect when that risk/effect is known using current tools, Than to put in place prohibitive rules which would require a plan change to undo. New Genetic Technologies and Gene editing Genetic technologies are developing rapidly. While the traditional methods of genetic modification involve the insertion of whole genes into an organism more recent techniques (often termed “gene editing”), allow changes to be made in a far more precise way. These techniques are explained in a series of information papers put out by the Royal Society of New Zealand. A simple analogy is that if the genetic code is a book, traditional GM is akin to inserting a sentence (possibly on an unrelated topic) randomly into the pages; gene editing is like using the find-and-replace function on a word processor. Some of these edits can be as small as a single letter. The genetic code in an organism runs into billions of letters. Gene editing, where it changes only one or two letters of that genetic code in a precise and targeted way compares favorably with traditional (non GM) methods such as mutagenesis where thousands of random mutations are created by exposing a plant or seed to radiation or chemicals in order to speed up the natural process of mutation. Gene editing does, in fact, introduce fewer changes than either mutagenesis or traditional breeding using pollen crosses. Mutagenesis is unregulated whereas gene editing is regulated in New Zealand as genetic modification. It is not possible to tell a gene edited organism from a non GM organism produced through traditional breeding or mutagenesis making identification in breeding programmes or the market difficult. A number of countries have (USA, Brazil, Japan, Sweden, Australia) deregulated certain gene editing techniques where the outcome could have been achieved through traditional breeding. The use of Genetic Modification in Modern Society The approved use of genetic modification has a history of safe use in medicine for 35 years and food production for 20 to 25 years. No scientifically credible incident of harm to human health or the environment attributable to genetic modification. Regulatory and science organisations around the world consider that the approved use of genetic modification to be no more</p>		

Submission number	Submitter	Support/ oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>risky than conventional breeding. The use of Genetic Modification in the New Zealand Environment New Zealand is not GMO free. There have already been five GMO releases into the environment approved since the passing of the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act (Animal vaccines and human therapeutics). These releases have presented no issues. AgResearch have been running GM field trials for many years without the need for rules from the District Council. Loss of Science Capability Led by Ruakura (AgResearch), the Waikato has been a leader in agricultural science and innovation. If the WDC were to impose rules on genetic modification in addition to those required under the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms act it will make research harder and more expensive in the Waikato District and there is a risk that the Waikato District will lose scientific capability to other regions. Blanket provisions not appropriate Implementing policies and rules in a blanket fashion as requested by the submitters would: Undermined the Waikato's leadership in agricultural science and innovation. Limit the opportunity to use new genetic technologies such as gene editing to: Address climate change, water quality and predator control; Improve productivity; Innovate to create new products, enhance the attributes and health outcomes of food; as well as Remediate the environment or manage our biosecurity risks and incursions. For instance, within the forest industry, as well as providing potential opportunities to increase the productivity of key species there are also opportunities to address the problem of wilding pines, potentially rapidly identify, isolate and breed kauri with resistance to kauri dieback, develop genetic solutions to exotic pest animal species that currently cause significant biodiversity loss, involve high costs and dispersal of chemical toxins to maintain current (unsatisfactory) levels of control.</p>		
FS1225.30	BIOTech New Zealand	Oppose	Disallow this whole submission point.	<p>Oppose this submission point for the reasons set out in the attached pages which include: GMOs are out of scope. Claims of harm are scientifically credible. The issues raised in the submission are already considered (using a precautionary approach) by the Environmental Protection Authority. After that, any residual issues can be managed using provisions in the Biosecurity Act (Pest Management Strategies). Another unnecessary level of regulation as proposed will undermine Waikato's position as a leader in agricultural science, will erode scientific capability, reduce economic opportunities and will limit access to new technologies to address climate change, predator control, water quality and competitiveness.</p>	Accept	5

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1295.30	Life Sciences Network Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow this whole submission point.	The LSN opposes this submission point for the reasons set out in the attached pages which include: GMOs are out of scope. Claims of harm are not scientifically credible. The issues raised in the submission are already considered (using a precautionary approach) by the Environmental Protection Authority. After that, any residual issues can be managed using provisions in the Biosecurity Act (Pest Management Strategies) Another unnecessary level of regulation as proposed will undermine Waikato's position as a leader in agricultural science, will erode scientific capability, reduce economic opportunities and will limit access to new technologies to address climate change, predator control, water quality and competitiveness.	Accept	5
FS1320.30	Livestock Improvement Corporation	Oppose	Disallow this whole submission point.	LIC opposes this submission point for the following reasons: Claims of harm are not scientifically credible. The issues raised in the submission are already considered (using a precautionary approach) by the Environmental Protection Authority. After that, any residual issues can be managed using provisions in the Biosecurity Act (Pest Management Strategies). Another unnecessary level of regulation as proposed will undermine Waikato's position as a leader in agricultural science, will erode scientific capability, reduce economic opportunities and will limit access to new technologies to address climate change, predator control, water quality and competitiveness.	Accept	5
FS1343.32	Bruce Cameron	Oppose	Disallow the whole submission point.	Provisions regulating GMOs are out of scope. Claims of harm are not scientifically credible. The issues raised in the submission are already considered (using a precautionary approach) by the Environmental Protection Authority. After that, any residual issues can be managed using provisions in the Biosecurity Act (Pest Management Strategies) or the RMA by the WDC when they are known. Another level of regulation as proposed will undermine Waikato's position as a leader in agricultural science, will erode scientific capability, reduce economic opportunities and will limit access to new technologies to address climate change, predator control, water quality and competitiveness.	Accept	5
FS1276.127	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Society Inc.	Support	WED seeks that the whole submission point be allowed.	These submissions support submission point 780.30 in WED's submission. This strong call from Raglan submitters, for public notification of all consents, indicates the need for effective rules to protect Raglan's character, which may include notification.	Reject	5
FS1342.288	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow this whole submission point.	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3.	Accept	5
755.3	Jade Penn	Neutral/Amend	Amend the Proposed Waikato District Plan to require consents which would require exemption from plan rules, to be automatically be publicly notifiable, whether the rules are on Genetically Modified Organisms or any other matter.	Submitter has concerns around the potential risks posed by Genetically Modified Organism release into the environment. Genetically Modified Organisms have the potential to adversely affect ecological, economic, and resource management values, and the social and cultural wellbeing of people, communities and tangata whenua. Regardless of the care taken to crafting	Reject	5

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				consent conditions for Genetically Modified Organisms there inevitably remains a risk, even if small. Such conditions may be breached by poor management, human error, natural events and sabotage of projects. Once Genetically Modified Organisms have been released into the environment they would be very difficult, near impossible, to eradicate and "GE Free" status and market advantages may be lost permanently. Application of integrated management and a precautionary approach to Genetically Modified Organisms under the RMA is the best available technique for managing the potential adverse effects posed by Genetically Modified Organisms within the region.		
FS1192.33	J H & R Cotman	Oppose	Disallow this whole submission point.	Provisions regulating GMOs are out of scope. Claims of harm are not scientifically credible. The issues raised in the submission are already considered (using a precautionary approach) by the Environmental Protection Authority. After that, any residual issues can be managed using provisions in the Biosecurity Act (Pest Management Strategies) or the RMA by the WDC when they are known. Another level of regulation as proposed will undermine Waikato's position as a leader in agricultural science, will erode scientific capability, reduce economic opportunities and will limit access to new technologies to address climate change, predator control, water quality and competitiveness.	Accept	5
FS1199.32	New Zealand Forest Research Institute	Oppose	We seek that the whole of the original submissions to be disallowed on the basis that they are based on claimed facts and assumptions and conclusions that cannot be supported by the evidence as demonstrated and detailed in the attached documents: (i) Pollution (ii) IS NZ GE Free (iii) Pesticide (iv) Inter-Council Working Party (v) Co-existence (vi) Benefits	GM is polluting and contaminating and by false implication that the Waikato and New Zealand are currently GE free GM has no benefits GM is a risk the environment GM cannot co-exist with other activities That the EPA is not equipment to manage GMOs That Waikato District Council should follow Northland Regional Council and the recommendations of the Inter-Council Working Party That GMOs are causing problems with pesticides; and in the case of GE Free NZ have cited science papers proving harm. We wish to submit evidence in replay showing that all of the above claims are false.	Accept	5
FS1212.33	David Stewart Bull	Oppose	Disallow the whole submission point.	Genetically modified organisms (GMO) are regulated by the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) under the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act. Any use of a GMO must first obtain approval from the EPA. Approval for field trials, conditional release and full release requires public consultation. Thus there is plenty of opportunity for those oppose to GMOs to make submissions and have their voice heard. Matters which are raised by the submitters are already considered by the EPA. The Council should make no rules until it knows the risks which it considers have not been addressed by the EPA. This will depend on the nature of the organism and the genetic changes which have been made and should be assessed on a case by case basis. Only then should the council consider rules which it could make under the Biosecurity Act or	Accept	5

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>Resource Management Act. Regulatory and science organisations around the world consider that the approved use of genetic modification to be no more risky than conventional breeding. Genetic modification has been used in other parts of the world with no scientifically credible incident of harm to human health or the environment attributable to genetic modification. Led by AgResearch Ruakura, the Waikato has been a leader in agricultural science and innovation. Implementing policies and rules in a blanket fashion as requested by the submitters would: Undermine the Waikato's leadership in agricultural science and innovation. Limit the opportunity to use new genetic technologies such as gene editing to: Address climate change, water quality and predator control; Improve productivity; Innovate to create new products, enhance the attributes and health outcomes of food; as well as Remediate the environment, manage our biosecurity risks and incursions. I do not consider genetic modification is the only answer to all these issues but we will need all the tools in the toolbox if we are to make meaningful and timely progress.</p>		
FS1214.32	Forest Owners Association	Oppose	Disallow this whole submission point.	<p>Out of scope Inserting provisions into the District Plan is out of scope as there is no mention of genetic modification in the notified proposed district plan, thus To provide a proper process a separate plan change should be undertaken at a future time. A plan change could be sponsored by the proponents or by the Council itself Unnecessary and inappropriate duplication of the Environmental Protection Authority under HSNO The Environmental Protection Agency currently regulates the use of GMOs under the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act. Decisions are made on a case by case basis. New Zealand's management of genetically modified organisms is considered one of the most conservative regulatory regimes in the world. Advice to government suggests that it is too conservative. Any use of GMO must first obtain approval from the EPA. The EPA is required to exercise a precautionary approach in its decision making therefore it is unlikely there would be any residual risk to manage. Issues of safety (including environmental safety), adverse effects on areas such as markets, effects on Maori and local iwi, other adverse effects, risks (risk mitigation) and management are considered by the EPA. Approval for field trials, conditional release and full release requires public consultation. Thus there is plenty of opportunity for those opposed to GMOs to make submissions and have their voice heard. Matters which are raised by the submitters are already considered by the EPA. Jurisdiction and control of effects by the council The courts have</p>	Accept	5

Submission number	Submitter	Support/ oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>clarified that councils do have the jurisdiction to place controls on organisms which are GMOs. The court has not clarified if councils can prohibit GMOs as a class or put in place rules simply on the basis an organism is a GMO, nor that there is justification in doing so. Tools already exist (e.g. pest management strategies under the Biosecurity Act) for councils to manage any particular GMO which is economically useful but unwanted in the wrong place as it does with wilding pines, wilding kiwifruit, feral goats, deer and pigs. The Council should make no rules until it knows the risks which it considers have not been addressed by the EPA. This will depend on the nature of the organism and the genetic changes which have been made and should be assessed on a case by case basis. Only then should the council consider rules which it could make under the Biosecurity Act or Resource Management Act. Thus it is more efficient: To address any (unlikely) residual risk of an effect when that risk/effect is known using current tools, Than to put in place prohibitive rules which would require a plan change to undo. New Genetic Technologies and Gene editing Genetic technologies are developing rapidly. While the traditional methods of genetic modification involve the insertion of whole genes into an organism more recent techniques (often termed "gene editing"), allow changes to be made in a far more precise way. These techniques are explained in a series of information papers put out by the Royal Society of New Zealand. A simple analogy is that if the genetic code is a book, traditional GM is akin to inserting a sentence (possibly on an unrelated topic) randomly into the pages; gene editing is like using the find-and-replace function on a word processor. Some of these edits can be as small as a single letter. The genetic code in an organism runs into billions of letters. Gene editing, where it changes only one or two letters of that genetic code in a precise and targeted way compares favorably with traditional (non GM) methods such as mutagenesis where thousands of random mutations are created by exposing a plant or seed to radiation or chemicals in order to speed up the natural process of mutation. Gene editing does, in fact, introduce fewer changes than either mutagenesis or traditional breeding using pollen crosses. Mutagenesis is unregulated whereas gene editing is regulated in New Zealand as genetic modification. It is not possible to tell a gene edited organism from a non GM organism produced through traditional breeding or mutagenesis making identification in breeding programmes or the market difficult. A number of countries have (USA, Brazil, Japan, Sweden, Australia) deregulated certain gene editing techniques where the outcome could have been achieved through traditional breeding. The use</p>		

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>of Genetic Modification in Modern Society The approved use of genetic modification has a history of safe use in medicine for 35 years and food production for 20 to 25 years. No scientifically credible incident of harm to human health or the environment attributable to genetic modification. Regulatory and science organisations around the world consider that the approved use of genetic modification to be no more risky than conventional breeding. The use of Genetic Modification in the New Zealand Environment New Zealand is not GMO free. There have already been five GMO releases into the environment approved since the passing of the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act (Animal vaccines and human therapeutics). These releases have presented no issues. AgResearch have been running GM field trials for many years without the need for rules from the District Council. Loss of Science Capability Led by Ruakura (AgResearch), the Waikato has been a leader in agricultural science and innovation. If the WDC were to impose rules on genetic modification in addition to those required under the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms act it will make research harder and more expensive in the Waikato District and there is a risk that the Waikato District will lose scientific capability to other regions. Blanket provisions not appropriate Implementing policies and rules in a blanket fashion as requested by the submitters would: Undermined the Waikato's leadership in agricultural science and innovation. Limit the opportunity to use new genetic technologies such as gene editing to: Address climate change, water quality and predator control; Improve productivity; Innovate to create new products, enhance the attributes and health outcomes of food; as well as Remediate the environment or manage our biosecurity risks and incursions. For instance, within the forest industry, as well as providing potential opportunities to increase the productivity of key species there are also opportunities to address the problem of wilding pines, potentially rapidly identify, isolate and breed kauri with resistance to kauri dieback, develop genetic solutions to exotic pest animal species that currently cause significant biodiversity loss, involve high costs and dispersal of chemical toxins to maintain current (unsatisfactory) levels of control.</p>		
FS1225.33	BIOTech New Zealand	Oppose	Disallow this whole submission point.	Oppose this submission point for the reasons set out in the attached pages which include: GMOs are out of scope. Claims of harm are scientifically credible. The issues raised in the submission are already considered (using a precautionary approach) by the Environmental Protection Authority. After that, any residual issues can be managed using provisions in the	Accept	5

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				Biosecurity Act (Pest Management Strategies). Another unnecessary level of regulation as proposed will undermine Waikato's position as a leader in agricultural science, will erode scientific capability, reduce economic opportunities and will limit access to new technologies to address climate change, predator control, water quality and competitiveness.		
<b>FS1295.33</b>	Life Sciences Network Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow this whole submission point.	The LSN opposes this submission point for the reasons set out in the attached pages which include: GMOs are out of scope. Claims of harm are not scientifically credible. The issues raised in the submission are already considered (using a precautionary approach) by the Environmental Protection Authority. After that, any residual issues can be managed using provisions in the Biosecurity Act (Pest Management Strategies) Another unnecessary level of regulation as proposed will undermine Waikato's position as a leader in agricultural science, will erode scientific capability, reduce economic opportunities and will limit access to new technologies to address climate change, predator control, water quality and competitiveness.	Accept	5
<b>FS1320.33</b>	Livestock Improvement Corporation	Oppose	Disallow this whole submission point.	LIC opposes this submission point for the following reasons: Claims of harm are not scientifically credible. The issues raised in the submission are already considered (using a precautionary approach) by the Environmental Protection Authority. After that, any residual issues can be managed using provisions in the Biosecurity Act (Pest Management Strategies). Another unnecessary level of regulation as proposed will undermine Waikato's position as a leader in agricultural science, will erode scientific capability, reduce economic opportunities and will limit access to new technologies to address climate change, predator control, water quality and competitiveness.	Accept	5
<b>FS1343.35</b>	Bruce Cameron	Oppose	Disallow the whole submission point.	Provisions regulating GMOs are out of scope. Claims of harm are not scientifically credible. The issues raised in the submission are already considered (using a precautionary approach) by the Environmental Protection. After that, any residual issues can be managed using provisions in the Biosecurity Act (Pest Management Strategies) or the RMA by the WDC when they are known. Another level of regulation as proposed will undermine Waikato's position as a leader in agricultural science, will erode scientific capability, reduce economic opportunities and will limit access to new technologies to address climate change, predator control, water quality and competitiveness.	Accept	5
<b>FS1276.128</b>	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Society Inc.	Support	WED seeks that the whole submission point be allowed.	These submissions support submission point 780.30 in WED's submission. This strong call from Raglan submitters, for public notification of all consents, indicates the need for effective rules to protect Raglan's character, which may include notification.	Reject	5
<b>FS1342.291</b>	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow this whole submission point.	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3.	Accept	5

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
780.30	John Lawson (Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Incorpora on behalf of Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Incorporated Society	Neutral/Amend	Amend the Proposed District Plan to require consents requiring exemption from plan rules to be automatically publicly notified, whether the rule is on genetically modified organisms or not.	Several Councils have passed resolutions that there should be no further development and field-testing of transgenic organisms envisaged for agriculture, horticulture and forestry in their areas until the risk potential has been adequately identified and evaluated and a strict liability regime put in place. The submission raises concern regarding liability and potential cost to ratepayers as well as the implications under the Resource Management Act. Submission also raises concerns regarding harm to farmers, clean green image, irreversible impacts from GMO's, scientific uncertainty, lack of demand for GE food from main markets, transgenic pollution. Wants GE experiments and releases prohibited except in Ruakura. Conventional and organic reproductive crops must be protected and integrity of heritage seeds is critical. No mention is made of the hazards of genetically modified substances in the Proposed District Plan. GE poses risks to our environment, economy and public health.	Reject	5
FS1208.9	Rangitahi Limited	Oppose	Seek that the whole of the submission point be disallowed.	Section 95A of the RMA establishes the effects-based steps that a consent authority must follow to determine whether to publicly notify an application for a resource consent. A rule requiring all resource consents within Raglan to be publicly notified would result in significant costs and delays to applicants and is not necessary or appropriate.	Accept	5
FS1269.72	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Oppose		Housing New Zealand opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission.	Accept	5
FS1342.209	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow submission point 780.30.	FFNZ opposes this submission. Notification principles are well settled in the RMA and case law, and will provide for any application to be notified if it is appropriate to do so.	Accept	5
788.10	Susan Hall	Neutral/Amend	Amend the Proposed District Plan so that consents which would require exemption from plan rules should automatically be publicly notifiable, whether the rules are on Genetically Modified Organisms, or any other matter.	No reasons provided.	Reject	5
FS1192.46	J H & R Cotman	Oppose	Disallow this whole submission point.	Provisions regulating GMOs are out of scope. Claims of harm are not scientifically credible. The issues raised in the submission are already considered (using a precautionary approach) by the Environmental Protection Authority. After that, any residual issues can be managed using provisions in the Biosecurity Act (Pest Management Strategies) or the RMA by the WDC when they are known. Another level of regulation as proposed will undermine Waikato's position as a leader in agricultural science, will erode scientific capability, reduce economic opportunities and will limit access to new technologies to address climate change, predator control, water quality and competitiveness.	Accept	5

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1199.46	New Zealand Forest Research Institute	Oppose	We seek that the whole of the original submissions to be disallowed on the basis that they are based on claimed facts and assumptions and conclusions that cannot be supported by the evidence as demonstrated and detailed in the attached documents: (i) Pollution (ii) IS NZ GE Free (iii) Pesticide (iv) Inter-Council Working Party (v) Co-existence (vi) Benefits	GM is polluting and contaminating and by false implication that the Waikato and New Zealand are currently GE free GM has no benefits GM is a risk the environment GM cannot co-exist with other activities That the EPA is not equipment to manage GMOs That Waikato District Council should follow Northland Regional Council and the recommendations of the Inter-Council Working Party That GMOs are causing problems with pesticides; and in the case of GE Free NZ have cited science papers proving harm. We wish to submit evidence in replay showing that all of the above claims are false.	Accept	5
FS1212.46	David Stewart Bull	Oppose	Disallow the whole submission point.		Accept	5
FS1214.46	Forest Owners Association	Oppose	Disallow this whole submission point.	<p>Out of scope Inserting provisions into the District Plan is out of scope as there is no mention of genetic modification in the notified proposed district plan, thus To provide a proper process a separate plan change should be undertaken at a future time. A plan change could be sponsored by the proponents or by the Council itself Unnecessary and inappropriate duplication of the Environmental Protection Authority under HSNO The Environmental Protection Agency currently regulates the use of GMOs under the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act. Decisions are made on a case by case basis. New Zealand's management of genetically modified organisms is considered one of the most conservative regulatory regimes in the world. Advice to government suggests that it is too conservative. Any use of GMO must first obtain approval from the EPA. The EPA is required to exercise a precautionary approach in its decision making therefore it is unlikely there would be any residual risk to manage. Issues of safety (including environmental safety), adverse effects on areas such as markets, effects on Maori and local iwi, other adverse effects, risks (risk mitigation) and management are considered by the EPA. Approval for field trials, conditional release and full release requires public consultation. Thus there is plenty of opportunity for those opposed to GMOs to make submissions and have their voice heard. Matters which are raised by the submitters are already considered by the EPA. Jurisdiction and control of effects by the council The courts have clarified that councils do have the jurisdiction to place controls on organisms which are GMOs. The court has not clarified if councils can prohibit GMOs as a class or put in place rules simply on the basis an organism is a GMO, nor that there is justification in doing so. Tools already exist (e.g. pest management strategies under the Biosecurity Act) for councils to manage any particular GMO which is economically useful but unwanted in the wrong place as it does with wilding</p>	Accept	5

Submission number	Submitter	Support/ oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p> <span style="font-size: 48px; opacity: 0.2; position: absolute; top: 50%; left: 50%; transform: translate(-50%, -50%); pointer-events: none;">DRAFT</span>             pines, wilding kiwifruit, feral goats, deer and pigs. The Council should make no rules until it knows the risks which it considers have not been addressed by the EPA. This will depend on the nature of the organism and the genetic changes which have been made and should be assessed on a case by case basis. Only then should the council consider rules which it could make under the Biosecurity Act or Resource Management Act. Thus it is more efficient: To address any (unlikely) residual risk of an effect when that risk/effect is known using current tools, Than to put in place prohibitive rules which would require a plan change to undo. New Genetic Technologies and Gene editing Genetic technologies are developing rapidly. While the traditional methods of genetic modification involve the insertion of whole genes into an organism more recent techniques (often termed “gene editing”), allow changes to be made in a far more precise way. These techniques are explained in a series of information papers put out by the Royal Society of New Zealand. A simple analogy is that if the genetic code is a book, traditional GM is akin to inserting a sentence (possibly on an unrelated topic) randomly into the pages; gene editing is like using the find-and-replace function on a word processor. Some of these edits can be as small as a single letter. The genetic code in an organism runs into billions of letters. Gene editing, where it changes only one or two letters of that genetic code in a precise and targeted way compares favorably with traditional (non GM) methods such as mutagenesis where thousands of random mutations are created by exposing a plant or seed to radiation or chemicals in order to speed up the natural process of mutation. Gene editing does, in fact, introduce fewer changes than either mutagenesis or traditional breeding using pollen crosses. Mutagenesis is unregulated whereas gene editing is regulated in New Zealand as genetic modification. It is not possible to tell a gene edited organism from a non GM organism produced through traditional breeding or mutagenesis making identification in breeding programmes or the market difficult. A number of countries have (USA, Brazil, Japan, Sweden, Australia) deregulated certain gene editing techniques where the outcome could have been achieved through traditional breeding. The use of Genetic Modification in Modern Society The approved use of genetic modification has a history of safe use in medicine for 35 years and food production for 20 to 25 years. No scientifically credible incident of harm to human health or the environment attributable to genetic modification. Regulatory and science organisations around the world consider that the approved use of genetic modification to be no more risky than conventional breeding. The use         </p>		

Submission number	Submitter	Support/ oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>of Genetic Modification in the New Zealand Environment New Zealand is not GMO free. There have already been five GMO releases into the environment approved since the passing of the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act (Animal vaccines and human therapeutics). These releases have presented no issues. AgResearch have been running GM field trials for many years without the need for rules from the District Council. Loss of Science Capability Led by Ruakura (AgResearch), the Waikato has been a leader in agricultural science and innovation. If the WDC were to impose rules on genetic modification in addition to those required under the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms act it will make research harder and more expensive in the Waikato District and there is a risk that the Waikato District will lose scientific capability to other regions. Blanket provisions not appropriate Implementing policies and rules in a blanket fashion as requested by the submitters would: Undermined the Waikato's leadership in agricultural science and innovation. Limit the opportunity to use new genetic technologies such as gene editing to: Address climate change, water quality and predator control; Improve productivity; Innovate to create new products, enhance the attributes and health outcomes of food; as well as Remediate the environment or manage our biosecurity risks and incursions. For instance, within the forest industry, as well as providing potential opportunities to increase the productivity of key species there are also opportunities to address the problem of wilding pines, potentially rapidly identify, isolate and breed kauri with resistance to kauri dieback, develop genetic solutions to exotic pest animal species that currently cause significant biodiversity loss, involve high costs and dispersal of chemical toxins to maintain current (unsatisfactory) levels of control.</p>		
FS1225.47	BIOTech New Zealand	Oppose	Disallow this whole submission point.	<p>Oppose this submission point for the reasons set out in the attached pages which include: GMOs are out of scope. Claims of harm are scientifically credible. The issues raised in the submission are already considered (using a precautionary approach) by the Environmental Protection Authority. After that, any residual issues can be managed using provisions in the Biosecurity Act (Pest Management Strategies). Another unnecessary level of regulation as proposed will undermine Waikato's position as a leader in agricultural science, will erode scientific capability, reduce economic opportunities and will limit access to new technologies to address climate change, predator control, water quality and competitiveness.</p>	Accept	5

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1295.47	Life Sciences Network Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow this whole submission point.	The LSN opposes this submission point for the reasons set out in the attached pages which include: GMOs are out of scope. Claims of harm are not scientifically credible. The issues raised in the submission are already considered (using a precautionary approach) by the Environmental Protection Authority. After that, any residual issues can be managed using provisions in the Biosecurity Act (Pest Management Strategies) Another unnecessary level of regulation as proposed will undermine Waikato's position as a leader in agricultural science, will erode scientific capability, reduce economic opportunities and will limit access to new technologies to address climate change, predator control, water quality and competitiveness.	Accept	5
FS1320.47	Livestock Improvement Corporation	Oppose	Disallow this whole submission point.	LIC opposes this submission point for the following reasons: Claims of harm are not scientifically credible. The issues raised in the submission are already considered (using a precautionary approach) by the Environmental Protection Authority. After that, any residual issues can be managed using provisions in the Biosecurity Act (Pest Management Strategies). Another unnecessary level of regulation as proposed will undermine Waikato's position as a leader in agricultural science, will erode scientific capability, reduce economic opportunities and will limit access to new technologies to address climate change, predator control, water quality and competitiveness.	Accept	5
FS1343.49	Bruce Cameron	Oppose	Disallow the whole submission point.	Provisions regulating GMOs are out of scope. Claims of harm are not scientifically credible. The issues raised in the submission are already considered (using a precautionary approach) by the Environmental Protection Authority. After that, any residual issues can be managed using provisions in the Biosecurity Act (Pest Management Strategies) or the RMA by the WDC when they are known. Another level of regulation as proposed will undermine Waikato's position as a leader in agricultural science, will erode scientific capability, reduce economic opportunities and will limit access to new technologies to address climate change, predator control, water quality and competitiveness.	Accept	5
FS1276.129	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Society Inc.	Support	WED seeks that the whole submission point be allowed.	These submissions support submission point 780.30 in WED's submission. This strong call from Raglan submitters, for public notification of all consents, indicates the need for effective rules to protect Raglan's character, which may include notification.	Reject	5
FS1276.135	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Society Inc.	Support	WED seeks that the whole submission point be allowed.	WED supports all activities that do not comply with the District Plan being publicly notified in order to protect the character of Raglan.	Reject	5
FS1342.305	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow this whole submission point.	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3.	Accept	5

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
830.12	Linda Silvester	Add new provisions to Chapter 20 Industrial Zone to include energy efficiency policies and rules (see submission for wording)	Add new provisions to Chapter 20 Industrial Zone to include energy efficiency policies and rules (see submission for wording)	The Proposed District Plan only makes passing reference to climate change and says nothing about coal, gas and oil's effect on global warming. It is disappointing that Stage 2 of the Proposed District Plan is to be published in 2019 and that it is not possible to consider it in context with this part of the Plan. Section 1.9.5 reflects the Resource Management Act requirements around climate change and renewable energy.	Reject	7
FS1276.177	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Support	WED seeks that the whole of the submission point be allowed.	Reasons for WED's support are that climate change issues can't be separated from the rest of the plan. Section 5.2.9 of the RMA states "Development should be designed and located to avoid or mitigate the predicted effects of global climate change on natural hazards, especially increased flooding, erosion, fire, and storms. Where there is incomplete information, a precautionary approach should be taken." Section 5.3.8 of the RMA states "Scientific opinion differs about the possible impacts of global impacts of global climate change, but majority opinion predicts that the effects could include a greater frequency and intensity of extreme weather events. Increased storms, floods and droughts may occur. The extent of these is uncertain and a precautionary approach is taken, because of the high potential for harm."	Reject	7
FS1387.1344	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose		At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	7
830.20	Linda Silvester	Neutral/Amend	Amend the Proposed District Plan to require public notification of resource consent applications, regardless of whether the rules are Genetically Modified Organisms or any other matter.	Several Councils have passed resolutions that there should be no further development and field-testing of transgenic organisms envisaged for agriculture, horticulture and forestry in their areas until the risk potential has been adequately identified and evaluated and a strict liability regime put in place. As central government has failed to put in place a strict liability regime for GMOs, liability for clean-ups, removal and elimination of escaped GE organisms, could lie with ratepayers. The Law Commission said "It is possible that environmental damage caused by GMOs could be dealt with under the RMA." The duty in itself is not	Reject	5

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				enforceable, but in Part XII of the RMA there are powers to issue an abatement. The continuing use of Genetic Engineering will also harm other farmers through tarnishing our clean green image and could potentially bring an end to conventional farming. Organic farmers will be affected more by the image loss. There should be no further development and field testing of transgenic organisms envisaged for agriculture, horticulture and forestry in the district.		
FS1192.58	J H & R Cotman	Oppose	Disallow this whole submission point.	Provisions regulating GMOs are out of scope. Claims of harm are not scientifically credible. The issues raised in the submission are already considered (using a precautionary approach) by the Environmental Protection Authority. After that, any residual issues can be managed using provisions in the Biosecurity Act (Pest Management Strategies) or the RMA by the WDC when they are known. Another level of regulation as proposed will undermine Waikato's position as a leader in agricultural science, will erode scientific capability, reduce economic opportunities and will limit access to new technologies to address climate change, predator control, water quality and competitiveness.	Accept	5
FS1199.58	New Zealand Forest Research Institute	Oppose	We seek that the whole of the original submissions to be disallowed on the basis that they are based on claimed facts and assumptions and conclusions that cannot be supported by the evidence as demonstrated and detailed in the attached documents: (i) Pollution (ii) IS NZ GE Free (iii) Pesticide (iv) Inter-Council Working Party (v) Co-existence (vi) Benefits	GM is polluting and contaminating and by false implication that the Waikato and New Zealand are currently GE free GM has no benefits GM is a risk the environment GM cannot co-exist with other activities That the EPA is not equipment to manage GMOs That Waikato District Council should follow Northland Regional Council and the recommendations of the Inter-Council Working Party That GMOs are causing problems with pesticides; and in the case of GE Free NZ have cited science papers proving harm. We wish to submit evidence in replay showing that all of the above claims are false.	Accept	5
FS1212.58	David Stewart Bull	Oppose	Disallow the whole submission point.	Genetically modified organisms (GMO) are regulated by the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) under the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act. Any use of a GMO must first obtain approval from the EPA. Approval for field trials, conditional release and full release requires public consultation. Thus there is plenty of opportunity for those oppose to GMOs to make submissions and have their voice heard. Matters which are raised by the submitters are already considered by the EPA. The Council should make no rules until it knows the risks which it considers have not been addressed by the EPA. This will depend on the nature of the organism and the genetic changes which have been made and should be assessed on a case by case basis. Only then should the council consider rules which it could make under the Biosecurity Act or Resource Management Act. Regulatory and science organisations around the world consider that the approved use of genetic modification to be no more risky than conventional breeding. Genetic modification has been used in other parts of the world	Accept	5

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>with no scientifically credible incident of harm to human health or the environment attributable to genetic modification. Led by AgResearch Ruakura, the Waikato has been a leader in agricultural science and innovation. Implementing policies and rules in a blanket fashion as requested by the submitters would: Undermine the Waikato's leadership in agricultural science and innovation. Limit the opportunity to use new genetic technologies such as gene editing to: Address climate change, water quality and predator control; Improve productivity; Innovate to create new products, enhance the attributes and health outcomes of food; as well as Remediate the environment, manage our biosecurity risks and incursions. I do not consider genetic modification is the only answer to all these issues but we will need all the tools in the toolbox if we are to make meaningful and timely progress.</p>		
FS1214.58	Forest Owners Association	Oppose	Disallow this whole submission point.	<p>Out of scope Inserting provisions into the District Plan is out of scope as there is no mention of genetic modification in the notified proposed district plan, thus To provide a proper process a separate plan change should be undertaken at a future time. A plan change could be sponsored by the proponents or by the Council itself Unnecessary and inappropriate duplication of the Environmental Protection Authority under HSNO The Environmental Protection Agency currently regulates the use of GMOs under the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act. Decisions are made on a case by case basis. New Zealand's management of genetically modified organisms is considered one of the most conservative regulatory regimes in the world. Advice to government suggests that it is too conservative. Any use of GMO must first obtain approval from the EPA. The EPA is required to exercise a precautionary approach in its decision making therefore it is unlikely there would be any residual risk to manage. Issues of safety (including environmental safety), adverse effects on areas such as markets, effects on Maori and local iwi, other adverse effects, risks (risk mitigation) and management are considered by the EPA. Approval for field trials, conditional release and full release requires public consultation. Thus there is plenty of opportunity for those opposed to GMOs to make submissions and have their voice heard. Matters which are raised by the submitters are already considered by the EPA. Jurisdiction and control of effects by the council The courts have clarified that councils do have the jurisdiction to place controls on organisms which are GMOs. The court has not clarified if councils can prohibit GMOs as a class or put in place rules simply on the basis an organism is a GMO, nor that there is justification in doing so.</p>	Accept	5

Submission number	Submitter	Support/ oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>Tools already exist (e.g. pest management strategies under the Biosecurity Act) for councils to manage any particular GMO which is economically useful but unwanted in the wrong place as it does with wilding pines, wilding kiwifruit, feral goats, deer and pigs. The Council should make no rules until it knows the risks which it considers have not been addressed by the EPA. This will depend on the nature of the organism and the genetic changes which have been made and should be assessed on a case by case basis. Only then should the council consider rules which it could make under the Biosecurity Act or Resource Management Act. Thus it is more efficient: To address any (unlikely) residual risk of an effect when that risk/effect is known using current tools, Than to put in place prohibitive rules which would require a plan change to undo.</p> <p>New Genetic Technologies and Gene editing Genetic technologies are developing rapidly. While the traditional methods of genetic modification involve the insertion of whole genes into an organism more recent techniques (often termed “gene editing”), allow changes to be made in a far more precise way. These techniques are explained in a series of information papers put out by the Royal Society of New Zealand. A simple analogy is that if the genetic code is a book, traditional GM is akin to inserting a sentence (possibly on an unrelated topic) randomly into the pages; gene editing is like using the find-and-replace function on a word processor. Some of these edits can be as small as a single letter. The genetic code in an organism runs into billions of letters. Gene editing, where it changes only one or two letters of that genetic code in a precise and targeted way compares favorably with traditional (non GM) methods such as mutagenesis where thousands of random mutations are created by exposing a plant or seed to radiation or chemicals in order to speed up the natural process of mutation. Gene editing does, in fact, introduce fewer changes than either mutagenesis or traditional breeding using pollen crosses. Mutagenesis is unregulated whereas gene editing is regulated in New Zealand as genetic modification. It is not possible to tell a gene edited organism from a non GM organism produced through traditional breeding or mutagenesis making identification in breeding programmes or the market difficult. A number of countries have (USA, Brazil, Japan, Sweden, Australia) deregulated certain gene editing techniques where the outcome could have been achieved through traditional breeding. The use of Genetic Modification in Modern Society The approved use of genetic modification has a history of safe use in medicine for 35 years and food production for 20 to 25 years. No scientifically credible incident of harm to human health or the environment attributable</p>		

Submission number	Submitter	Support/ oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>to genetic modification. Regulatory and science organisations around the world consider that the approved use of genetic modification to be no more risky than conventional breeding. The use of Genetic Modification in the New Zealand Environment New Zealand is not GMO free. There have already been five GMO releases into the environment approved since the passing of the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act (Animal vaccines and human therapeutics). These releases have presented no issues. AgResearch have been running GM field trials for many years without the need for rules from the District Council. Loss of Science Capability Led by Ruakura (AgResearch), the Waikato has been a leader in agricultural science and innovation. If the WDC were to impose rules on genetic modification in addition to those required under the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms act it will make research harder and more expensive in the Waikato District and there is a risk that the Waikato District will lose scientific capability to other regions. Blanket provisions not appropriate Implementing policies and rules in a blanket fashion as requested by the submitters would: Undermined the Waikato's leadership in agricultural science and innovation. Limit the opportunity to use new genetic technologies such as gene editing to: Address climate change, water quality and predator control; Improve productivity; Innovate to create new products, enhance the attributes and health outcomes of food; as well as Remediate the environment or manage our biosecurity risks and incursions. For instance, within the forest industry, as well as providing potential opportunities to increase the productivity of key species there are also opportunities to address the problem of wilding pines, potentially rapidly identify, isolate and breed kauri with resistance to kauri dieback, develop genetic solutions to exotic pest animal species that currently cause significant biodiversity loss, involve high costs and dispersal of chemical toxins to maintain current (unsatisfactory) levels of control.</p>		
FS1225.59	BIOTech New Zealand	Oppose	Disallow this whole submission point.	<p>Oppose this submission point for the reasons set out in the attached pages which include: GMOs are out of scope. Claims of harm are scientifically credible. The issues raised in the submission are already considered (using a precautionary approach) by the Environmental Protection Authority. After that, any residual issues can be managed using provisions in the Biosecurity Act (Pest Management Strategies). Another unnecessary level of regulation as proposed will undermine Waikato's position as a leader in agricultural science, will erode scientific capability, reduce economic opportunities and will limit access to</p>	Accept	5

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				new technologies to address climate change, predator control, water quality and competitiveness.		
<b>FS1295.59</b>	Life Sciences Network Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow this whole submission point.	The LSN opposes this submission point for the reasons set out in the attached pages which include: GMOs are out of scope. Claims of harm are not scientifically credible. The issues raised in the submission are already considered (using a precautionary approach) by the Environmental Protection Authority. After that, any residual issues can be managed using provisions in the Biosecurity Act (Pest Management Strategies) Another unnecessary level of regulation as proposed will undermine Waikato's position as a leader in agricultural science, will erode scientific capability, reduce economic opportunities and will limit access to new technologies to address climate change, predator control, water quality and competitiveness.	Accept	5
<b>FS1320.59</b>	Livestock Improvement Corporation	Oppose	Disallow this whole submission point.	LIC opposes this submission point for the following reasons: Claims of harm are not scientifically credible. The issues raised in the submission are already considered (using a precautionary approach) by the Environmental Protection Authority. After that, any residual issues can be managed using provisions in the Biosecurity Act (Pest Management Strategies). Another unnecessary level of regulation as proposed will undermine Waikato's position as a leader in agricultural science, will erode scientific capability, reduce economic opportunities and will limit access to new technologies to address climate change, predator control, water quality and competitiveness.	Accept	5
<b>FS1343.61</b>	Bruce Cameron	Oppose	Disallow the whole submission point.	Provisions regulating GMOs are out of scope. Claims of harm are not scientifically credible. The issues raised in the submission are already considered (using a precautionary approach) by the Environmental Protection. After that, any residual issues can be managed using provisions in the Biosecurity Act (Pest Management Strategies) or the RMA by the WDC when they are known. Another level of regulation as proposed will undermine Waikato's position as a leader in agricultural science, will erode scientific capability, reduce economic opportunities and will limit access to new technologies to address climate change, predator control, water quality and competitiveness.	Accept	5
<b>FS1276.132</b>	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Society Inc.	Support	WED seeks that the whole submission point be allowed.	These submissions support submission point 780.30 in WED's submission. This strong call from Raglan submitters, for public notification of all consents, indicates the need for effective rules to protect Raglan's character, which may include notification.	Reject	5
<b>FS1276.140</b>	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Society Inc.	Support	WED seeks that the whole submission point be allowed.	WED supports all activities that do not comply with the District Plan being publicly notified in order to protect the character of Raglan.	Reject	5
<b>FS1342.317</b>	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow this whole submission point.	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3.	Accept	5

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
963.3	June Penn	Oppose	Amend the Proposed District Plan so that all consents/activities that would require exemption from plan rules would be publicly notified, regardless of whether they are on genetically modified organisms or not.	<p>GMOs have the potential to adversely affect ecological, economic, and resource management values, and the social and cultural wellbeing of communities and Tangata whenua. The release of GMOs can cause:</p> <p>Biological/ecosystem harm      Harm to Tangata whenua values      Harm to cultural value and lifestyles, concerning the communities wellbeing      Harm to existing or potential forms of land use.      The effects on land uses could include:</p> <p>Loss of organic and GMO-free certification      Reputational damage      Loss of markets and premiums paid for GMO-free produce      Loss of livelihood      The Waikato is the centre of dairy offices and farms for the three major suppliers of milk and milk products in the area. Many farmers are highly concerned that their livelihoods will be affected if GMO's are released in the Waikato. Tatua, Fonterra and Miraka Milks have a GMO-free requirement for milk products. Concerns over the ability to control the grass genetic pollution is a major concern and it is important to have precautionary approach to any escape and release of GMOs. No matter how carefully conditions of consent for GMOs are crafted, there is still a risk of poor management, human error, or natural events that aid in breaching conditions. Once GMOs have been released into the environment it will be difficult or impossible to eradicate. For food products, the GE-free status would be permanently lost, along with the market advantages of that status. Application of integrated management and a precautionary approach to GMOs under the RMA is the best available technique for managing the potential adverse effects posed by GMOs within the region. It is consistent with the sustainable management purpose and Part II of the RMA to establish district plan provisions that manage the release, location, and management of GMOs where they have the potential to adversely affect the environment and other land use activities.</p>	Reject	5
FS1192.63	J H & R Cotman	Oppose	Disallow this whole submission point.	Provisions regulating GMOs are out of scope. Claims of harm are not scientifically credible. The issues raised in the submission are already considered (using a precautionary approach) by the Environmental Protection Authority. After that, any residual issues can be managed using provisions in the Biosecurity Act (Pest Management Strategies) or the RMA by the WDC when they are known. Another level of regulation as proposed will undermine Waikato's position as a leader in agricultural science, will erode scientific capability, reduce economic opportunities and will limit access to new technologies to address climate change, predator control, water quality and competitiveness.	Accept	5
FS1199.64	New Zealand Forest Research Institute	Oppose	We seek that the whole of the original submissions to be disallowed on the basis that they are based on claimed facts and assumptions and conclusions that cannot be supported by the evidence as demonstrated and detailed	GM is polluting and contaminating and by false implication that the Waikato and New Zealand are currently GE free      GM has no benefits      GM is a risk to the environment      GM cannot co-exist with other	Accept	5

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			in the attached documents: (i) Pollution (ii) IS NZ GE Free (iii) Pesticide (iv) Inter-Council Working Party (v) Co-existence (vi) Benefits	activities That the EPA is not equipment to manage GMOs That Waikato District Council should follow Northland Regional Council and the recommendations of the Inter-Council Working Party That GMOs are causing problems with pesticides; and in the case of GE Free NZ have cited science papers proving harm. We wish to submit evidence in replay showing that all of the above claims are false.		
<b>FS1212.62</b>	David Stewart Bull	Oppose	Disallow the whole submission point.	<p>Genetically modified organisms (GMO) are regulated by the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) under the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act. Any use of a GMO must first obtain approval from the EPA. Approval for field trials, conditional release and full release requires public consultation. Thus there is plenty of opportunity for those oppose to GMOs to make submissions and have their voice heard. Matters which are raised by the submitters are already considered by the EPA. The Council should make no rules until it knows the risks which it considers have not been addressed by the EPA. This will depend on the nature of the organism and the genetic changes which have been made and should be assessed on a case by case basis. Only then should the council consider rules which it could make under the Biosecurity Act or Resource Management Act. Regulatory and science organisations around the world consider that the approved use of genetic modification to be no more risky than conventional breeding. Genetic modification has been used in other parts of the world with no scientifically credible incident of harm to human health or the environment attributable to genetic modification. Led by AgResearch Ruakura, the Waikato has been a leader in agricultural science and innovation. Implementing policies and rules in a blanket fashion as requested by the submitters would: Undermine the Waikato's leadership in agricultural science and innovation. Limit the opportunity to use new genetic technologies such as gene editing to: Address climate change, water quality and predator control; Improve productivity; Innovate to create new products, enhance the attributes and health outcomes of food; as well as Remediate the environment, manage our biosecurity risks and incursions. I do not consider genetic modification is the only answer to all these issues but we will need all the tools in the toolbox if we are to make meaningful and timely progress.</p>	Accept	5
<b>FS1214.63</b>	Forest Owners Association	Oppose	Disallow this whole submission point.	<p>Out of scope Inserting provisions into the District Plan is out of scope as there is no mention of genetic modification in the notified proposed district plan, thus To provide a proper process a separate plan change should be undertaken at a future time. A plan change could be sponsored by the proponents or by the Council itself Unnecessary and inappropriate duplication of the</p>	Accept	5

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>Environmental Protection Authority under HSNO The Environmental Protection Agency currently regulates the use of GMOs under the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act. Decisions are made on a case by case basis. New Zealand's management of genetically modified organisms is considered one of the most conservative regulatory regimes in the world. Advice to government suggests that it is too conservative. Any use of GMO must first obtain approval from the EPA. The EPA is required to exercise a precautionary approach in its decision making therefore it is unlikely there would be any residual risk to manage. Issues of safety (including environmental safety), adverse effects on areas such as markets, effects on Maori and local iwi, other adverse effects, risks (risk mitigation) and management are considered by the EPA. Approval for field trials, conditional release and full release requires public consultation. Thus there is plenty of opportunity for those opposed to GMOs to make submissions and have their voice heard. Matters which are raised by the submitters are already considered by the EPA. Jurisdiction and control of effects by the council The courts have clarified that councils do have the jurisdiction to place controls on organisms which are GMOs. The court has not clarified if councils can prohibit GMOs as a class or put in place rules simply on the basis an organism is a GMO, nor that there is justification in doing so. Tools already exist (e.g. pest management strategies under the Biosecurity Act) for councils to manage any particular GMO which is economically useful but unwanted in the wrong place as it does with wilding pines, wilding kiwifruit, feral goats, deer and pigs. The Council should make no rules until it knows the risks which it considers have not been addressed by the EPA. This will depend on the nature of the organism and the genetic changes which have been made and should be assessed on a case by case basis. Only then should the council consider rules which it could make under the Biosecurity Act or Resource Management Act. Thus it is more efficient: To address any (unlikely) residual risk of an effect when that risk/effect is known using current tools, Than to put in place prohibitive rules which would require a plan change to undo. New Genetic Technologies and Gene editing Genetic technologies are developing rapidly. While the traditional methods of genetic modification involve the insertion of whole genes into an organism more recent techniques (often termed "gene editing"), allow changes to be made in a far more precise way. These techniques are explained in a series of information papers put out by the Royal Society of New Zealand. A simple analogy is that if the genetic code is a book, traditional GM is</p>		

Submission number	Submitter	Support/ oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>akin to inserting a sentence (possibly on an unrelated topic) randomly into the pages; gene editing is like using the find-and-replace function on a word processor. Some of these edits can be as small as a single letter. The genetic code in an organism runs into billions of letters. Gene editing, where it changes only one or two letters of that genetic code in a precise and targeted way compares favorably with traditional (non GM) methods such as mutagenesis where thousands of random mutations are created by exposing a plant or seed to radiation or chemicals in order to speed up the natural process of mutation. Gene editing does, in fact, introduce fewer changes than either mutagenesis or traditional breeding using pollen crosses. Mutagenesis is unregulated whereas gene editing is regulated in New Zealand as genetic modification. It is not possible to tell a gene edited organism from a non GM organism produced through traditional breeding or mutagenesis making identification in breeding programmes or the market difficult. A number of countries have (USA, Brazil, Japan, Sweden, Australia) deregulated certain gene editing techniques where the outcome could have been achieved through traditional breeding. The use of Genetic Modification in Modern Society The approved use of genetic modification has a history of safe use in medicine for 35 years and food production for 20 to 25 years. No scientifically credible incident of harm to human health or the environment attributable to genetic modification. Regulatory and science organisations around the world consider that the approved use of genetic modification to be no more risky than conventional breeding. The use of Genetic Modification in the New Zealand Environment New Zealand is not GMO free. There have already been five GMO releases into the environment approved since the passing of the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act (Animal vaccines and human therapeutics). These releases have presented no issues. AgResearch have been running GM field trials for many years without the need for rules from the District Council. Loss of Science Capability Led by Ruakura (AgResearch), the Waikato has been a leader in agricultural science and innovation. If the WDC were to impose rules on genetic modification in addition to those required under the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms act it will make research harder and more expensive in the Waikato District and there is a risk that the Waikato District will lose scientific capability to other regions. Blanket provisions not appropriate Implementing policies and rules in a blanket fashion as requested by the submitters would: Undermined the Waikato's leadership in agricultural</p>		

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>science and innovation. Limit the opportunity to use new genetic technologies such as gene editing to: Address climate change, water quality and predator control; Improve productivity; Innovate to create new products, enhance the attributes and health outcomes of food; as well as Remediate the environment or manage our biosecurity risks and incursions. For instance, within the forest industry, as well as providing potential opportunities to increase the productivity of key species there are also opportunities to address the problem of wilding pines, potentially rapidly identify, isolate and breed kauri with resistance to kauri dieback, develop genetic solutions to exotic pest animal species that currently cause significant biodiversity loss, involve high costs and dispersal of chemical toxins to maintain current (unsatisfactory) levels of control.</p>		
<b>FS1225.64</b>	BIOTech Zealand New	Oppose	Disallow this whole submission point.	<p>DR</p> <p>Oppose this submission point for the reasons set out in the attached pages which include: GMOs are out of scope. Claims of harm are scientifically credible. The issues raised in the submission are already considered (using a precautionary approach) by the Environmental Protection Authority. After that, any residual issues can be managed using provisions in the Biosecurity Act (Pest Management Strategies). Another unnecessary level of regulation as proposed will undermine Waikato's position as a leader in agricultural science, will erode scientific capability, reduce economic opportunities and will limit access to new technologies to address climate change, predator control, water quality and competitiveness.</p>	Accept	5
<b>FS1295.64</b>	Life Sciences Network Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow this whole submission point.	<p>The LSN opposes this submission point for the reasons set out in the attached pages which include: GMOs are out of scope. Claims of harm are not scientifically credible. The issues raised in the submission are already considered (using a precautionary approach) by the Environmental Protection Authority. After that, any residual issues can be managed using provisions in the Biosecurity Act (Pest Management Strategies) Another unnecessary level of regulation as proposed will undermine Waikato's position as a leader in agricultural science, will erode scientific capability, reduce economic opportunities and will limit access to new technologies to address climate change, predator control, water quality and competitiveness.</p>	Accept	5
<b>FS1320.64</b>	Livestock Improvement Corporation	Oppose	Disallow this whole submission point.	<p>LIC opposes this submission point for the following reasons: Claims of harm are not scientifically credible. The issues raised in the submission are already considered (using a precautionary approach) by the Environmental Protection Authority. After that, any residual issues can be managed using provisions in the Biosecurity Act (Pest Management Strategies). Another unnecessary level of regulation as proposed will undermine Waikato's position as a leader in agricultural science, will erode scientific capability,</p>	Accept	5

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				reduce economic opportunities and will limit access to new technologies to address climate change, predator control, water quality and competitiveness.		
FS1343.66	Bruce Cameron	Oppose	Disallow the whole submission point.	Provisions regulating GMOs are out of scope. Claims of harm are not scientifically credible. The issues raised in the submission are already considered (using a precautionary approach) by the Environmental Protection. After that, any residual issues can be managed using provisions in the Biosecurity Act (Pest Management Strategies) or the RMA by the WDC when they are known. Another level of regulation as proposed will undermine Waikato's position as a leader in agricultural science, will erode scientific capability, reduce economic opportunities and will limit access to new technologies to address climate change, predator control, water quality and competitiveness.	Accept	5
FS1276.133	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Society Inc.	Support	WED seeks that the whole submission point be allowed.	These submissions support submission point 780.30 in WED's submission. This strong call from Raglan submitters, for public notification of all consents, indicates the need for effective rules to protect Raglan's character, which may include notification.	Reject	5
FS1276.143	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Society Inc.	Support	WED seeks that the whole submission point be allowed.	WED supports all activities that do not comply with the District Plan being publicly notified in order to protect the character of Raglan.	Reject	5
FS1342.322	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow this whole submission point.	My reasons for opposing this submission point are set out under point 245.3.	Accept	5
<b>HCC/ AIO</b>						
535.94	Lance Vervoort for Hamilton City Council	Neutral/Amend	Add the Hamilton City Council 'Area of Interest' map into the Proposed District Plan (as attached to the submission). This could take the form of an overlay; AND Add objectives and policies specific to the 'Area of Interest' which seek to avoid urban subdivision and development in rural zones and provide only for rural land uses in that zone; AND Add a supporting set of rules and methods including deploying a prohibited activity status for certain non-rural land uses and subdivision. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	This Area of interest has been determined to be a rough indicator the area of the City's economic and social influence and represents its various communities of interest. This will enable the submitter to have an enhanced level of control and input into strategic land use planning and resource consenting of land uses within a defined area adjacent to the Hamilton City Council boundary within the Waikato District. The extent of the areas will be fine tuned as further analysis is undertaken. Objectives and policies area sought which ensure that land use within the Area of Interest is controlled and enabled at a rate which is consistent with and prioritises Hamilton City Council's strategic land use plans and urban growth strategies including avoidance of sprawl.	Reject	6
FS1131.2	The Village Church Trust	Oppose	Reject the submission point and the proposed Hamilton City Council 'Area of Interest'.	HCC seeks to add an 'Area of Interest' around Hamilton City together with associated objectives, policies and rules which would severely curtail (or prohibit) certain non-rural land uses and subdivision. This submission is opposed because it is too generic to provide certainty for landowners potentially affected by the Area of Interest. The Village Church in Horsham Downs is located within the Area of Interest. The Village Church Trust is significantly advance with plans to replace its existing church and is reliant upon the	Accept	6

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				ability to undertake a future boundary relocation as part of that development process. The more restrictive controls sought By HCC will prevent people and communities from providing for their social, economic and cultural wellbeing. The approach advocated by HCC is therefore a potentially blunt instrument which does not efficiently meet the purpose and principles of the RMA.		
<b>FS1203.3</b>	<i>Burton Trust</i>	Support	I seek that the part of the submission point that relates to the identification of an Area of Interest/Potential Future Growth Area east of Hamilton be allowed.	The Further Submitter supports the identification of potential future urban growth areas of Hamilton in the Proposed District Plan planning maps and provisions and the further investigation of these areas. The 'Area of Interest' includes the Burton Trust properties which is also in the location of one of the "priority development areas" in the Hamilton-Auckland Corridor Plan.	<i>Reject</i>	6
<b>FS1252.6</b>	<i>AH &amp; DB Finlay Limited</i>	Support	I seek that the part of the submission point that relates to the identification of an Area of Interest/Potential Future Growth Area east of Hamilton be allowed.	The Further Submitter supports the identification of potential future urban growth areas east of Hamilton in the Proposed District Plan planning maps and provisions and the further investigation of these areas. The 'Area of Interest' includes the AH & DB Finlay property which is also in the location of one of the "priority development areas" in the Hamilton – Auckland Corridor Plan. The Further Submitter seeks supporting rules and methods which provides a suitable balance between protecting land for future urban development and enabling reasonable and appropriate subdivision, use and development t of the land for rural and some non-rural purposes in the interim period.	<i>Reject</i>	6
<b>FS1254.6</b>	<i>Wattle Downs Limited</i>	Support	I seek that the part of the submission point that relates to the identification of an Area of Interest/Potential Future Growth Area east of Hamilton be allowed.	The Further Submitter supports the identification of potential future urban growth areas east of Hamilton in the Proposed District Plan planning maps and provisions and the further investigation of these areas. The 'Area of Interest' includes the Wattle Downs property which is also in the location of one of the "priority development areas" in the Hamilton – Auckland Corridor Plan. The Further Submitter seeks supporting rules and methods which provides a suitable balance between protecting land for future urban development and enabling reasonable and appropriate subdivision, use and development t of the land for rural and some non-rural purposes in the interim period.	<i>Reject</i>	6
<b>FS1256.6</b>	<i>Moeraki Farm Limited</i>	Support	I seek that the whole of the submission point be allowed.	The Further Submitter supports the identification of potential future urban growth areas east of Hamilton in the Proposed District Plan planning maps and provisions and the further investigation of these areas. The 'Area of Interest' includes the Moeraki Farm property which is also in the location of one of the "priority development areas" in the Hamilton – Auckland Corridor Plan. The Further Submitter seeks supporting rules and methods which provides a suitable balance between protecting land for future urban development and enabling reasonable and	<i>Reject</i>	6

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				appropriate subdivision, use and development t of the land for rural and some non-rural purposes in the interim period.		
<b>FS1260.6</b>	K Badger and WR Badger Estate	Support	I seek that the part of the submission point that relates to the identification of an Area of Interest/Potential Future Growth Area east of Hamilton be allowed.	The Further Submitter supports the identification of potential future urban growth areas east of Hamilton in the Proposed District Plan planning maps and provisions and the further investigation of these areas. The 'Area of Interest' includes the Badger property which is also in the location of one of the "priority development areas" in the Hamilton –Auckland Corridor Plan. The Further Submitter seeks supporting rules and methods which provides a suitable balance between protecting land for future urban development and enabling reasonable and appropriate subdivision, use and development t of the land for rural and some non-rural purposes in the interim period.	Reject	6
<b>FS1324.6</b>	Robyn Ballard	Support	Support.	(a) The Further Submitter supports the identification of potential future urban growth areas east of Hamilton in the Proposed District Plan planning maps and provisions and the future investigation of these areas. (b) The 'Area of Interest' includes the Finlay property, which is also in the location of one of the "priority development areas" in the Hamilton-Auckland Corridor Plan. (c) The Further Submitter seeks supporting rules and methods which provide a suitable balance between protecting land for future urban development and enabling reasonable and appropriate subdivision, use and development of the land for rural and some non-rural purposes in the interim period.	Reject	6
<b>FS1062.84</b>	Andrew and Christine Gore	Oppose	Disallow submission point 535.94.	• Opposed to further overlay map 'Area of Interest.' • Opposed to use restrictions of rural land. If HCC does not own this they do not have control.	Accept	6
<b>FS1197.25</b>	Bowrock Properties Limited	Oppose	That the submission point is rejected.	Further information is needed from HCC regarding proposed objectives, policies and rules they are seeking for this area. In general, oppose submission point as restricting development for an indefinite period of time (whilst HCC completes an analysis of the economic and social boundaries of Hamilton City) does not align with Part 2, Section 5 of the RMA 1991 as it does not allow for people and communities to provide for their economic wellbeing. Furthermore there are landholdings within the Rural zone that are not economically viable as productive farming units, that are better suited to being zoned Country Living or Village Zone with associated land uses.	Accept	6
<b>FS1311.20</b>	Ethan & Rachael Findlay	Oppose	Oppose submission point 535.94.	To reject the submission point. In general, oppose submission point as unduly restricting development. Rural Zoned land within the relevant area is unviable as a farming unit. Open timeframes are further unhelpful to landowners. The proposed 'Area of Interest' around Hamilton City together with associated objectives, policies and rules would severely curtail (or prohibit) certain non-rural land uses and subdivision. This submission is too generic to provide certainty for	Accept	6

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				landowners potentially affected by the Area of Interest. The more restrictive controls sought by HCC will prevent people and communities from provided for their social, economic and cultural wellbeing. The approach advocated by HCC is therefore a potentially blunt instrument which does not efficiently meet the purposes and principles of the RMA.		
<b>FS1342.132</b>	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow submission point 535.94.	Whilst FFNZ can broadly understand the intent of this submission, not enough detail has been provided to determine how the planning approach may affect farmers whose properties could captured within an 'area of interest' overlay. FFNZ opposes the submission on this basis but if adopted, wish to remain involved as any mapping and planning response is developed.	Accept	6
292.1	David Yzendoorn for David and Barbara Yzendoorn	Oppose	Delete the Urban Expansion Area overlay from the submitter's property at 83 Greenhill Road, Puketaha.	Urban Expansion Area rules unnecessarily restrict development of the subject site, a small residential lot. Is no scope for any development on the property to compromise future urban development, of which policy 5.5.1 indicates as the underlying reason.	Reject	6
<b>FS1379.58</b>	Hamilton City Council	Oppose		HCC opposes the deletion of the UEA overlay. The purpose of the UEA overlay is to prevent fragmentation of land that could hinder efficient future urbanisation of the land.	Accept	6
<b>FS1277.120</b>	Waikato Regional Council	Oppose	Retain zoning as notified.	When determining the extent and location of development, matters such as high class soils, hazards, landscapes and indigenous biodiversity must be taken into consideration. The district plan must give effect to the relevant policies and association implementation methods in the WRPS. It is essential that land use and infrastructure are provided in a coordinated and efficient manner to give effect to WRPS Policies 6.1 and 6.3. Land should not be considered for rezoning to an urban zone without provision for infrastructure.	Accept	6
<b>FS1386.296</b>	Mercury Limited NZ for Mercury C	Oppose		At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	6
330.146	Andrew and Christine Gore	Neutral/Amend	Amend the rules to not prohibit subdivision in the Urban Expansion Policy Area.	No reasons provided.	Accept	6
<b>FS1379.85</b>	Hamilton City Council	Oppose		HCC opposes the amendment of rules that remove the prohibited activity status for subdivision in the UEA.	Reject	6

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				Prohibited activity status is imperative in the UEA to ensure the objectives and policies for this overlay are achieved.		
535.9	Lance Vervoort for Hamilton City Council	Neutral/Amend	Retain Chapter 4 Urban Environment subject to ensuring alignment between objectives, policies, rules and methods, including those that control the type and rate of development use with Hamilton's 'Area of Interest' (shown as a map attached to submission) in order to be consistent with Hamilton City Council's strategic land use plans and urban growth strategies, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Chapter 4 Urban Environment to include objectives and policies which ensure that land use within the 'Area of Interest' (shown as a map attached to submission) is controlled and enabled at a rate which is consistent with and prioritises Hamilton City's strategic land use plans and urban growth strategies including avoidance of urban sprawl, inefficient land use and infrastructure and non-rural land uses. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	Sustainable management requires a cross boundary and integrated approach to strategic land use issues to ensure consistency with Hamilton City Council's strategic land use plans and urban growth strategies.	Accept in part	6
FS1131.3	The Village Church Trust	Oppose	Reject the proposed amendments to Chapter 4 which seek the inclusion of objectives and policies relating to the HCC Area of Interest.	The Village Church Trust oppose amendment to Chapter 4 (Urban Environment) to include objectives and policies relating to land use within the HCC 'Area of Interest'. The Area of Interest with its associated policy framework and rules would potentially be at the expense of the social, economic, cultural needs of Waikato District residents. The approach advocated by HCC is blunt, and potentially undermines the feasibility of a development project already in train by the Village Church Trust. There are other, potentially more efficient mechanisms available to manage urban sprawl and to avoid inefficient land use. It is debatable the extent to which the Area of Interest would effectively and efficiently meet the purpose of the RMA.	Accept in part	6
FS1333.7	Fonterra Limited	Support	Allow the relief.	For the reasons stated in the submission, recognising the need for cross boundary planning to ensure appropriate protection for the Te Rapa Dairy Manufacturing Site and associated industrial land.	Accept in part	6
FS1388.684	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose		At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept in part	6

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
535.27	Lance Vervoort for Hamilton City Council	Neutral/Amend	Retain Chapter 5 Rural Environment subject to ensuring alignment and giving effect to the Hamilton City Council 'Area of Interest' (shown as a map attached to submission) and the supporting objectives, policies, rules and methods. Objectives and policies are sought which ensure that land use within the 'Area of Interest' (shown as a map attached to submission) is controlled and enabled at a rate which is consistent with and prioritises Hamilton City Council's strategic land use plans and urban growth strategies including avoidance of urban sprawl, inefficient use of land and infrastructure and non-rural land uses.	Sustainable management requires a cross boundary and integrated approach to strategic land use issues. Objectives and policies are sought to ensure that land use within Hamilton's 'Area of Interest' is controlled and enabled at a rate which is consistent with the submitter's strategic land use plans and urban growth strategies that address the avoidance of urban sprawl, inefficient land use and infrastructure and non-rural land uses.	Accept in part	6
FS1062.73	Andrew and Christine Gore	Oppose	Disallow submission point 535.27.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The use within the area of interest should not be controlled by HCC. If HCC wants this level they should purchase the land.</li> <li>Owners should not be denied amenity.</li> </ul>	Accept in part	6
FS1388.700	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose		<p>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure.</p> <p>Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</p>	Accept in part	6
535.28	Lance Vervoort for Hamilton City Council	Support	Retain Objective 5.1.1 The rural environment, subject to ensuring alignment and giving effect to Hamilton's 'Area of Interest' and supporting objectives, policies, rules and methods. Objectives and policies are sought to ensure that activities within the 'Area of Interest' are controlled and enabled at a rate which is consistent with Hamilton City Council's strategic land use plans and urban growth strategies that address the avoidance urban sprawl, inefficient land use and non-rural land uses.	The submitter supports the intent of this objective which is to protect rural land.	Accept in part	6
FS1062.74	Andrew and Christine Gore	Oppose	Disallow submission point 535.28.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The use within the area of interest should not be controlled by HCC. If HCC wants this level they should purchase the land.</li> <li>Owners should not be denied amenity.</li> </ul>	Accept in part	6
FS1388.701	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose		<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</p>	Accept in part	6

Submission number	Submitter	Support/ oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				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.		
535.69	Lance Vervoort for Hamilton City Council	Support	Retain Chapter 22: Rural Zone subject to ensuring alignment and giving effect to the submitter's 'Area of Interest' (shown in map attached to submission) and supporting objectives, policies, rules and methods. Objectives and policies are sought which ensure that land use within the 'Area of Interest' (shown in map attached to submission) is controlled and enabled at a rate which is consistent with and prioritises Hamilton City Council's strategic land use plans and urban growth strategies including avoidance of urban sprawl, inefficient use of land and infrastructure and non-rural land uses.	Sustainable management requires a cross boundary and integrated approach to these strategic land use issues. Objectives and policies are therefore required to ensure that land use within Hamilton's 'Area of Interest' is controlled and enabled at a rate which is consistent with Hamilton City Council's strategic land use plans and urban growth strategies that address the avoidance of urban sprawl, inefficient land use and infrastructure and non-rural land uses.	Accept in part	6
FS1062.80	Andrew and Christine Gore	Oppose	Disallow submission point 535.69.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Totally opposed to HCC having such control over land they do not own.</li> <li>• HCC needs to negotiate with land owners, not control.</li> <li>• HCC needs to consult landowners.</li> </ul>	Accept in part	6
FS1157.10	Gordon Downey	Support	Rule 22.1 We support the submission which seeks to protect rural land from incompatible land uses particularly within the Newstead area which is within Hamilton City Councils area of interest identified in the plan attached to their submission.	Allow in full	Accept in part	6
FS1164.15	Tamara Huaki	Support	We support the submission which seeks to protect rural land from incompatible land uses particularly within the Newstead area which is within Hamilton City Councils area of interest identified in the plan attached to their submission.	Allow in full	Accept in part	6
FS1165.11	Pekerangi Kee-Huaki	Support	We support the submission which seeks to protect rural land from incompatible land uses particularly within the Newstead area which is within Hamilton City Councils area of interest identified in the plan attached to their submission.	Allow in full	Accept in part	6
FS1166.11	Jarod Kowhai Huaki	Support	We support the submission which seeks to protect rural land from incompatible land uses particularly within the Newstead area which is within Hamilton City Councils area of interest identified in the plan attached to their submission.	Allow in full	Accept in part	6
FS1388.708	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose		At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and	Accept in part	6

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
535.70	Lance Vervoort for Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Delete the non-rural activities from Rule 22.1.5 NC4 Non-Complying Activities as they relate to the Urban Expansion Area. AND Add these activities to Rule 22.1.1 Prohibited as prohibited activities. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	Land within the Urban Expansion Area needs to be protected from incompatible land use otherwise it will compromise future urban development. This aim is supported by the 2005 Strategic Agreement on Future Urban Boundaries between Hamilton City Council and Waikato District Council. The section 32 analysis offers no sound reasoning as to why the status of these activities is proposed to be non-complying (rather than prohibited as per the Operative Waikato District Plan). Under the Operative Waikato District Plan, the Urban Expansion Policy Area has a number of prohibited activities to ensure that the future development of the areas is not compromised. During the consultation of the draft district plan, the prohibited activity list was reviewed and amended in consultation with HCC staff, increasing the activity status of some activities to a stricter prohibited activity status within the area. The notified Proposed Plan has not retained the prohibited activity status with the exception of subdivision, where an extra lot is created, with all non-rural activities now either non-complying or discretionary activities. The section 32 offers no sound reasoning as to why the activity status has been changed. HCC strongly disagrees with approach and the assumption for how the different non-rural activities were 'allocated' either non-complying or discretionary status. Non-complying activities were because of adverse effects, reverse sensitivity and incompatibility with urban uses in the future. Discretionary activities were applied where the use would be compatible with future urban use. The submitter does not consider this approach satisfactory at all because such activities have the potential to impact on the future ability to comprehensively plan for the area as a whole.	Reject	6
<b>FS1062.81</b>	Andrew and Christine Gore	Oppose	Disallow submission point 535.70.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Totally opposed to HCC having such control over land they do not own.</li> <li>• HCC needs to negotiate with land owners, not control.</li> <li>• HCC needs to consult landowners.</li> </ul>	Accept	6
<b>FS1149.15</b>	Gavin Lovegrove and Michelle Peddie	Support	We support the submission which seeks to protect rural land from incompatible land uses particularly within the Newstead area which is within Hamilton City Councils area of interest identified in the plan attached to their submission.	Allow in full	Reject	6
<b>FS1182.16</b>	Newstead Country Preschool	Not Stated	Support in part.	We support the submission which seeks to protect rural land from incompatible land uses particularly within the Newstead area which is within Hamilton City Council's area of interest identified in the plan attached to their submission. The need for 'prohibited activity status' however is perhaps excessive for the Newstead environment, particularly with regard to the Future Proof land use patterns which inform the Waikato Regional Plan and on which the PWDP must give effect	Reject	6

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				to and which would prevent incompatible land uses regardless of a 'prohibited activity' category.		
<b>FS1183.11</b>	Noel Gordon Smith	Support		We support the submission which seeks to protect rural land from incompatible land uses particularly within the Newstead area which is within Hamilton City Councils area of interest identified in the plan attached to their submission. The need for 'prohibited activity' status however is perhaps excessive for the Newstead environment, particularly with regard to the Future Proof land use patterns which inform the Waikato Regional Plan and on which the PWDP must give effect to and which would prevent incompatible land uses regardless of a 'prohibited activity' category.	Reject	6
<b>FS1204.16</b>	Christian & Natasha McDean	Support		Support the submission which seeks to protect rural land from incompatible land uses particularly within the Newstead area which is within Hamilton City Council's area of interest identified in the plan attached to their submission. The need for 'prohibited activity status' however is perhaps excessive for the Newstead environment, particularly with regard to the Future Proof land use patterns which inform the Waikato Regional Plan and on which the PWDP must give effect to and which would prevent incompatible land uses regardless of a 'prohibited activity' category.	Reject	6
<b>FS1216.14</b>	Newstead Residents Association	Support	Support in part the submission to Rule 22.1 which seeks to protect rural land from incompatible landuses particularly within the Newstead area.	The Newstead area is within Hamilton City Councils area of interest identified in the plan attached to their submission. The need for 'prohibited activity status' however is perhaps excessive for the Newstead environment, particularly with regard to the Future Proof land use patterns which inform the Waikato Regional Plan and on which the PWDP must give effect to and which would prevent incompatible landuses regardless of a 'prohibited activity' category.	Reject	6
<b>FS1280.14</b>	Dennis and Jan Tickelpenny	Support		We support the submission which seeks to protect rural land from incompatible land uses particularly within the Newstead area which is within HCC's area of interest identified in the plan attached to their submission. The need for 'prohibited activity' status however is perhaps excessive for the Newstead environment, particularly with regard to the Future Proof land use patterns which inform the Waikato Regional Plan and on which the PWDP must give effect to and which would prevent incompatible land uses regardless of a 'prohibited activity' category.	Reject	6
<b>FS1388.709</b>	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose		At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to	Accept	6

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				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.		
535.74	Lance Vervoort for Hamilton City Council	Neutral/Amend	Retain Chapter 23: Country Living Zone subject to ensuring alignment and giving effect to the submitter's 'Area of Interest' (shown in map attached to submission) and supporting objectives, policies, rules and methods. Objectives and policies are sought which ensure that land use within the 'Area of Interest' (shown in map attached to submission) is controlled and enabled at a rate which is consistent with and prioritises Hamilton City Council's strategic land use plans and urban growth strategies including avoidance of urban sprawl, inefficient use of land and infrastructure and non-rural land uses.	Sustainable management requires a cross boundary and integrated approach to strategic land use issues. Objectives and policies are sought to ensure that land use within this area if controlled and enabled at a rate which is consistent with Hamilton City Council's strategic land use plans and urban growth strategies that address the avoidance of urban sprawl, inefficient land use and infrastructure and non-rural land uses.	Accept in part	6
FS1197.22	Bowrock Properties Limited	Oppose	That the submission point is rejected.	Recognise the need for coordinated growth. However, small land holdings within the Rural and Country Living zones that are not viable as farming units should be able to be subdivided and developed to ensure economic viability of lots. Restricting development for an indefinite period of time (whilst HCC completes an analysis of the economic and social boundaries of Hamilton City) does not align with Part 2, Section 5 of the RMA 1991 as it does not allow for people and communities to provide for their economic wellbeing.	Accept in part	6
FS1311.17	Ethan & Rachael Findlay	Oppose	Oppose submission point 535.74.	To reject the submission point. To oppose the general intent of submission. Further, unproductive smaller rural lots that are not sustainable for farming activities should not be allowed to be subdivided and developed to ensure economic and efficient use of land area. Open timeframes are further unhelpful to landowners.	Accept in part	6
FS1388.712	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose		At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept in part	6
535.78	Lance Vervoort for Hamilton City Council	Neutral/Amend	Retain Chapter 24: Village Zone subject to ensuring alignment and giving effect to the submitter's 'Area of Interest' and supporting objectives, policies and rules and methods.	Objectives and policies are sought which ensure that land use within the Area of Interest is controlled and enabled at a rate which is consistent with the priorities of Hamilton City Council's strategic land use plans and urban growth strategies including avoidance	Accept in part	6

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				of urban sprawl, insufficient use of land and infrastructure and non-rural land uses. Sustainable management requires a cross boundary and integrated approach to strategic land use issues. Objectives and policies are sought to ensure that land use within this area is controlled and managed at a rate that is consistent with Hamilton City Council's strategic land use plans and urban growth strategies that address the avoidance of urban sprawl, inefficient land use and infrastructure and non-rural land uses.		
<b>FS1388.715</b>	<i>Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E</i>	Oppose		At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	<i>Accept in part</i>	6
535.87	Lance Vervoort for Hamilton City Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend the planning maps by adding an overlay that illustrates the submitters 'Area of Interest' (shown as a map attached to submission) and potentially integrate this with Hamilton's Urban Expansion Area, and if appropriate the mapped Urban Expansion Area can be extended to give effect to the submitters 'Area of Interest' (shown as a map attached to submission). AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	The planning maps need to illustrate Hamilton City Council's 'Area of Interest' to support objectives, policies and rules sought for this area to ensure that land use within this area is controlled and enabled at a rate which is consistent with Hamilton City Council's strategic land use plans and urban growth strategies that address the avoidance of urban sprawl, inefficient land use and infrastructure and inappropriate land uses. Integration of Hamilton's Urban Expansion Area with this mapped 'Area of Interest' could be an efficient method of giving effect to this strategic land use intent.	<i>Reject</i>	6
<b>FS1131.1</b>	<i>The Village Church Trust</i>	Oppose	Reject the submission point and the area proposed Hamilton City Council 'Area of Interest'.	HCC seeks to add an 'Area of Interest' around Hamilton City. Subsequent HCC submission points seek objectives, policies and rules which would severely curtail (or prohibit) certain non-rural land uses and subdivision. This submission is opposed because it focusses primarily on the needs of Hamilton City Council, potentially at the expense of the social, economic, cultural needs of Waikato District residents. The approach advocated by HCC is blunt, and potentially undermines the feasibility of a development project already in train by the Village Church Trust. There are other, potentially more efficient mechanisms available to manage urban sprawl and to avoid inefficient land use. It is debatable the extent to which the Area of Interest would effectively and efficiently meet the purpose of the RMA.	<i>Accept</i>	6

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1197.24	Bowrock Properties Limited	Oppose	That the submission point is rejected.	Further information is needed from HCC regarding proposed objectives, policies and rules they are seeking for this area. In general, oppose submission point as restricting development for an indefinite period of time (whilst HCC completes an analysis of the economic and social boundaries of Hamilton City) does not align with Part 2, Section 5 of the RMA 1991 as it does not allow for people and communities to provide for their economic wellbeing.	Accept	6
FS1311.19	Ethan & Rachael Findlay	Oppose	Oppose submission point 535.87.	To reject the submission point. In general, oppose submission point as unduly restricting development. Rural Zoned land within the relevant area is unviable as a farming unit. Open timeframes are further unhelpful to landowners. This submission focuses primarily on the needs of Hamilton City Council, potentially at the expense of the social, economic, cultural needs of Waikato District residents. The approach advocated by Hamilton City Council is blunt, and there are other potentially more efficient mechanisms available to manage urban sprawl and to avoid inefficient land use. It is debatable the extent to which the Area of Interest would effectively and efficiently meet the purpose of the RMA.	Accept	6
FS1388.717	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose		At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	6
680.75	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Amend Objective 5.5.1 (a) Hamilton's Urban Expansion Area, as follows: (a) Protect land within Hamilton's Urban Expansion Area for future urban development whilst; AND Add to Objective 5.5.1 (a) Hamilton's Urban Expansion Area new clause (i), as follows: (i) Ensuring that existing rural production activities and industrial activities are protected from the effects of reverse sensitivity when locating new residential development. AND Any consequential changes needed to give effect to this relief.	The submitter supports co-ordinated future planning with regards to urban expansion, however this must not be at the expense of lawfully established activities.	Accept in part	6
FS1062.90	Andrew and Christine Gore	Support	Allow submission point 680.75.	• It is important that lawfully established activities can continue. • Land owners should be able to realise their amenity value and not be penalized by future planning.	Accept in part	6
FS1108.59	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato	Support		General support for the submission.	Accept in part	6

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
	Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)					
FS1139.50	Turangawaewae Trust Board	Support		General support for the submission.	Accept in part	6
FS1171.78	Phoebe Watson for Barker & Associates on behalf of T&G Global	Support	Allow the submission to extent consistent with this further submission.	This submission proposes amendments to Objective 5.5.1 (a) Hamilton's Urban Expansion Area. This submission is supported in so far as horticultural activities are included and considered as existing rural production activities. Reverse sensitivity effects arising from new residential development should be avoided in relation to activities within the rural environment undertaken for rural production uses.	Accept in part	6
FS1333.12	Fonterra Limited	Support	Allow the relief.	For the reasons stated in the submission.	Accept in part	6
FS1379.250	Hamilton City Council	Oppose		HCC opposes the relief sought. The intent of the UEA is to protect the land around Hamilton's boundaries for future urban development, while enabling rural activities to continue until such time as comprehensive urban development takes place. The suggested wording by the submitter will not aid in the protection of the land for future urban development.	Accept in part	6
743.1	The Village Church Trust	Oppose	Amend the Urban Expansion Policy Area overlay to include the properties on the southern side of Martin Lane, bounded by the Waikato Expressway to the south and Resolution Drive / Horsham Downs Link Road to the east (Lots 1 and 2 DP 504278, Lot 1 DPS76724, Allotment 479 Kirikiriroa Parish, Lots 1 and 2 DPS 3136, Part Allotment 23 Kirikiriroa Parish, Allotment 248 Komakorau Parish, Section 4 and Section 5 SO 500297) (see map attached to submission); AND Amend the Proposed District Plan as may be necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.	The Village Church in Horsham Downs is located approximately 1.9km north of the Hamilton City boundary. The Church Trust own two contiguous titles with frontage to Martin lane with the combined site having an area of approximately 8,770m'. The church site is zoned 'Rural' in both the Operative and the Proposed Waikato District Plans. The existing Village Church is a single storey structure dating from 1953 with a footprint of approximately 460m². It is bounded to the west by the Community Hall (owned by Waikato District Council) and Horsham Downs School, and to the east by Resolution Drive (Horsham Downs link Road). The southern boundary of the church abuts an approximate 8 hectare parcel of rural land that has become topographically isolated due to construction of the Waikato Expressway and Resolution Drive. The Village Church reached capacity approximately 20 years ago and has had to resort to leasing the adjacent Community Hall on an as-needs basis. The congregation has continued to grow to the point where facilities are once again at capacity. Church elders have determined that a replacement church complex is necessary to meet their growing needs. The Horsham Downs community hub has effectively become an 'island' constrained by roading on four sides. The island contains approximately 8 hectares of residual pasture which is now topographically isolated from the farmland it once joined. Despite its underlying Rural zoning, the size of the residual farmland is too small to be an economic farming unit, and surrounding roads prevent the land from being practically amalgamated with nearby farmland. The UEA on Hamilton City's northernmost boundary should be extended	Reject	6

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				northwards to include the Horsham Downs community hub. The hub already contains three high-use community assets which are more commonly associated with urbanised areas. The community hub lends itself to inclusion within the UEA because it has suitable physical constraints (Waikato Expressway, Resolution Drive and Osborne Road / Martin Lane) to prevent longer term urban sprawl. Those physical constraints are an appropriate demarcation between future urban and rural areas. Extension of the UAE to include the Horsham Down community hub would enable landowners who have been constrained and affected by the roading projects to better provide for their longer term social, economic and cultural wellbeing and to meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations. The transfer of the HTI expansion area to Hamilton City is unlikely to take place in the immediate horizon. Once the boundary is extended, it will facilitate the long-term essential servicing of Horsham Downs in a more efficient and cost-effective manner than can be done at present.		
576.12	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 5.5.2 Activities within Hamilton's Urban Expansion Area, as follows: (a) Manage urban subdivision, use and development within Hamilton's Urban Expansion Area to ensure that future urban development is not compromised, recognising existing Infrastructure within the Area and ensuring the ongoing operation, maintenance, upgrading and development of the Infrastructure is not compromised. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential amendments to address the matters raised in the submission.	Hamilton's Urban Expansion Area is identified on the planning map 27 and features the National Grid 110kV Hamilton - Meremere B Line. The submitter is not opposed to the development of the identified expansion area, subject to recognition of the existing National Grid Infrastructure and imposition of an appropriate National Grid corridor, and recognition that in the future, the existing line may require upgrade or development. Given the presence of the existing National Grid, the submitter seeks amendment to the policy wording to clarify that it is urban development which is to be managed to ensure further urban development is not compromised, and that the ongoing operation, maintenance, upgrading and development of the National Grid is not compromised.	Accept in part	6
FS1388.827	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose		At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept in part	6
<b>Other Matters-General</b>						
246.2	Tony Oosten	Oppose	Delete the ability for Council to apply discretion if applications are not notified.	To stop development that goes against the district plan permitted activity and sets precedence for future	Reject	7

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				requests. An example is the Raglan Wainui Road development.		
<b>FS1276.134</b>	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Society Inc.	Support	WED seeks that the whole of the submission point be allowed.	WED supports all activities that do not comply with the District Plan being publicly notified in order to protect the character of Raglan.	Reject	7
<b>FS1276.190</b>	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Society Inc.	Support	WED seeks that the whole of the submission point be allowed.	The submission highlights the need for the new District Plan to avoid the planning failures, which approved apartments on the corner of Stuart Street and Wainui Road, Raglan. The failures include devolution of power by council, resulting in the lack of any political or public involvement in making the decision, lack of adequate treatment of storm water from a site immediately adjacent to the coastal management area and a shellfish bed, infringement of daylight protections, parking and setback requirements, location of a road junction with poor sightlines and failure to protect views of a heritage building. It also highlights the need for the District Plan to consider the social and economic value of a development. This development for holiday apartments removes much needed permanent accommodation and will exacerbate seasonal parking, traffic and employment problems. Furthermore, WED supports the 'Raglan Naturally' ethos and notes that the Waikato Blueprint, adopted by council in June 2019, aims to "Provide a high-level 'spatial picture' of how the district could progress over the next 30 years, address the community's social, economic and environmental needs, and respond to its regional context. The Blueprint will provide the Waikato District Council with an effective and legible tool to move from vision to strategy, and from strategy to action by setting out specific, prioritised initiatives at the district and social level." And includes these statements: "WDC should work with the Community Board and Raglan Naturally and Tangata Whenua to define, strengthen and communicate Raglan's special identity." The top priority initiatives for Raglan include: -Building a strong identity for the town, -Supporting Raglan Naturally in their prioritised local initiatives such as local food production, energy self sufficiency, alternatives to weed spraying, GE free approaches and education regarding climate change, - Partnering with Raglan Naturally in respect to planning processes.	Reject	7
<b>FS1276.203</b>	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Society Inc.	Support	WED seeks that the whole of the submission point be allowed.	Reasons for WED's support are that all new CBD buildings have been 2 storey, whereas most older buildings are single storey. If allowed to continue this will change Raglan's character.	Reject	7
871.1	Brendon John & Denise Louise Strong	Support	Retain the Residential Zoning of the properties at 10, 12 and 12A Harrisville Road, Tuakau, as notified.	Submitter supports the proposed zoning.	Accept	7

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
<b>FS1387.1417</b>	Mercury Limited Mercury D NZ for	Oppose		At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		7
312.1	Brian Putt for Metro Planning Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Add a site-specific precinct as Appendix 13 for the Whatawhata Arboretum at 635 State Highway 23, Whatawhata which: provides for not more than 10 house sites; protects all identified trees and planting areas on a precinct tree plan; and enables subdivision associated with the approved house sites and the protection of individual or groups of notable trees.	A site-specific precinct for the arboretum is sought because: The property at 635 State Highway 23, Whatawhata is unique as it was planted by acknowledged Waikato foresters 60-80 years ago. The register of trees on this property confirms the notable character of the site which has district significance. The site can not be farmed for pastoral or horticultural purposes without adversely affecting the notable trees and the significant environmental value that the site contributes to the district. The proposed precinct secures the permanent environmental qualities of the site while allowing for a rural residential environment to emerge which maintains and enhances those qualities. The protection of the arboretum within a rural residential environment would achieve the purpose of the RMA, particularly Part 2.	Reject	7
<b>FS1385.5</b>	Mercury Limited Mercury B NZ for	Oppose		At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure perspective. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	7
<b>FS1277.14</b>	Waikato Regional Council	Oppose	Retain zoning as notified.	It is anticipated that the H2A project, including the Hamilton- Waikato Spatial Plan, the Huntly Spatial Plan, and the Pokeno Spatial Plan, will inform decisions about the location, timing and form of future development. Decisions on the rezoning of land within the H2A corridor should be deferred until the relevant	Accept	7

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				component of the corridor plan is complete to avoid undermining this important strategic planning process.		
328.11	Paula Dudley	Neutral/Amend	Amend Section 12.2 How to use and interpret the rules – Categories of Activities, pertaining to controlled activities to offer provisions to property owners who are affected by multiple public developments. AND Amend Section 12.2 How to use and interpret the rules – Categories of Activities, specifically in relation to the ability for council to refuse to grant a controlled activity subdivision if the provisions of s106 of the Resource Management Act apply, to ensure provisions are offered to support property owners faced with unusual circumstances of multiple public developments.	Both the historical reserve on the south boundary of the property (524B State Highway, Tamahere) and a four-lane highway on the west boundary pose additional complications for a potential subdivision. A case-by-case scenario supports property owners faced with unusual circumstances of multiple public developments.	Reject	7
<b>FS1385.6</b>	Mercury Limited Mercury B NZ for	Oppose		At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure perspective. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	7
330.1	Andrew and Christine Gore	Neutral/Amend	Amend the activity status of subdivision to be controlled activities.	No reasons provided.	Reject	7
<b>FS1385.7</b>	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury B	Oppose		At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure perspective. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	7
<b>FS1379.71</b>	Hamilton City Council	Oppose		HCC opposes the submission to make all subdivision a controlled activity, particularly in the Rural Zone within the UEA and HCC's Area of Interest. The purpose of the Rural Zone within the UEA Overlay is to prevent fragmentation of land and more efficiently provide for future urbanisation of the land. Increased subdivision within this Zone/Overlay is contrary to the purpose of the UEA.	Accept	7

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
367.31	Liam McGrath for Mercer Residents and Ratepayers Committee	Neutral/Amend	Add Pukekohe Motorcycle Club, located in Mercer, to Appendix 12 Motorsport and Recreation.	Such activities provide great opportunities to showcase small towns and what highly regarded, high class race tracks can be.	Reject	7
<b>FS1304.9</b>	Gary Bogaart / Meremere Dragway Inc.	Oppose	Meremere Dragway supports the intention of the submission point. Meremere Dragway opposes the Pukekohe Motorcycle club being included in Appendix 12.	It is important to recognise the Pukekohe Motorcycle Club as providing a great opportunity to showcase small towns and what highly regard high class race tracks should be. However, this should be actioned by inserting "Pukekohe Motorcycle Club Specific Area" as a new specific area rather than including the Pukekohe Motorcycle Club as part of Appendix 12.	Accept	7
<b>FS1118.17</b>	Gary Bogaart / Meremere Dragway Inc for Brookfields Lawyers	Oppose	Conditionally support - It is important to recognise the Pukekohe Motorcycle Club as providing a great opportunity to showcase small towns and what highly regarded, high class race tracks should be. However, this should be actioned by inserting "Pukekohe Motorcycle Club Specific Area" as a new specific area rather than including the Pukekohe Motorcycle Club as part of Appendix 12.	Meremere Dragway supports the intention of the submission point. Meremere Dragway opposes the Pukekohe Motorcycle Club being included in Appendix 12.	Accept	7
367.50	Liam McGrath for Mercer Residents and Ratepayers Committee	Neutral/Amend	Add Meremere Dragway, located off SH1 to Appendix 12 Motorsport and Recreation.	Includes Jetsprints. Such activities provide great opportunities to showcase small towns and what highly regarded, high class race tracks can be.	Reject	7
<b>FS1118.18</b>	Gary Bogaart / Meremere Dragway Inc for Brookfields Lawyers	Support	It is important to recognise Meremere Dragway as providing a great opportunity to showcase small towns and what highly regarded, high class race tracks should be. However, this should be actioned by inserting "Drag Way Park Specific Area" as a new specific area (as set out in Meremere Dragway's submission) rather than including Meremere Dragway as part of Appendix 12.	Meremere Dragway supports the intention of the submission point. Meremere Dragway opposes Meremere Dragway being included in Appendix 12.	Accept	7
<b>FS1304.10</b>	Gary Bogaart / Meremere Dragway Inc.	Support	Meremere Dragway supports the intention of the submission point. Meremere Dragway opposes Meremere Dragway being included in Appendix 12.	It is important to recognise Meremere Dragway as providing a great opportunity to showcase small towns and what highly regarded, high class race tracks should be. However, this should be actioned by inserting "Drag Way Park Specific Area" as a new specific area (as set out in Meremere Dragway's submission) rather than including Meremere Dragway as part of Appendix 12.	Accept	7
371.6	Kitty Burton	Not Stated	Retain the existing rail corridor in Matangi.		Accept	7
<b>FS1305.7</b>	Andrew Mowbray	Support	Seek that the whole submission be allowed.	It is very important for the future sensible growth of Matangi there is one community plan in place to cater for the development of the area and it surrounds.	Accept	7
386.6	Pokeno Village Holdings Limited	Not Stated	Add a density target of 8-10 households per hectare for Greenfield development in serviced Waikato District rural Villages and specifically Matangi.	A number of provisions (including but not limited to Rule 16.4.1) refer to "structure plans" and "approved structure plans", however: There is no definition of the term structure plan There is no guidance as to Council's expectations as to what would be required for a structure plan It is unclear whether the term "structure plan" applies to existing adopted structure	Reject	7

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				plans (such as the Pokeno Structure Plan) There is no guidance as to what the approval process is		
FS1202.11	New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Seek that the whole submission be allowed.	It is very important for the future sensible growth of Matangi there is one community plan in place to cater for the development of the area and it surrounds.	Reject	7
404.1	Harry Mowbray for Mowbray Group	Oppose	Add provision for historic railway cottages to be shifted to the property at 452B Tauwhare Road, Matangi.	Will compliment the Matangi History. Will help create a destination. Cottages to be classical exterior, modern interior for Air BnB letting. The land used to have the Matangi Railway Station on it and railway houses. Wishes to put railway houses on this land, with possibly a railway station and early historic cottages.	Accept in part	7
FS1264.2	Bootleg Brewery	Support	Seek that the submission point is allowed.	Bootleg supports regeneration and intensification within Matangi town centre, and land use provisions which provide for the permissive operation of a brewery with on and off premise.	Accept in part	7
FS1305.11	Andrew Mowbray	Support	Seek that the whole submission be allowed.	We are a direct neighbour to the Matangi Factory at 452 Tauwhare Road and support the visions and all the points raised to grow the site into a Business Town Centre by first allowing Industrial zoning and a flexible zoning plan to realise sensible development of the Matangi village and site.	Accept in part	7
FS1323.181	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	That the changes sought are declined	HNZPT is concerned at the unintended consequences that these amendments may have on the existing HNZPT listed NZ Co-operative Dairy Company Limited Factory (former) List Nos 4935 located at 452 Matangi Road and would need to see the suite of associated and estimated effects to confirm their stance.	Accept in part	7
435.9	Jade Hyslop	Oppose	Add new rules in each zone such as follows: Construction of a building or other structure and planting of trees and other vegetation is a permitted activity if: (a) It can be shown that it will not significantly block views of sea, river, bush or hills from neighbouring properties, or (b) Neighbouring property owners confirm in writing that any loss of view does not concern them, or (c) It can be shown that the planted vegetation is of native plants and likely to contribute to reduction of river, or coastal erosion, or (d) It can be shown that the planting would improve views from public places. Any activity that does not comply with a condition for a permitted activity is a discretionary activity.	Sea and other views add many thousands of dollars to the value of properties. Protection of existing ratepayers property rights should take precedence over new rights of developers. Developers should need to get written agreement from neighbors that development doesn't concern them in regards to lost views, unless it consists of native planting to protect land from erosion, hides unsightly development or it is apparent views will not be affected significantly. No requirement in the RMA to protect views, there are no provisions against either. Only 4.7.2 requires 'view sharing,' however only applies to developments needing resource consent of which a great bulk will not.	Reject	7
FS1329.6	Koning Family Trust and Martin Koning	Oppose	Oppose. Disallow inclusion of rules as drafted that seek to protect views from planting and construction.	The proposed rules as drafted cannot be implemented as permitted activity standard as they are unclear and include a degree of subjectivity.	Accept	7
FS1385.11	Mercury Limited for Mercury B	Oppose		At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure perspective. Mercury considers it	Accept	7

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				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.		
435.22	Jade Hyslop	Oppose	Amend the Proposed District Plan to require housing for the elderly in all new developments, not just in Te Kauwhata, e.g. Policy 4.1.12 (b) (i) Te Kauwhata.	Former Lazarus Village is on fairly level ground and close to Raglan's main facilities. Better suited to house Raglan's above average elderly population than most sites in town and should be restored to such use. Without protection, likely the only non-hospital housing for elderly people in Raglan will be permanently lost. 1.12.3 aims for 'A district which provides a wide variety of housing forms which reflects the demands of its ageing population.'	Reject	7
445.2	Heather Perring for BTW Company	Neutral/Amend	Add a new Appendix headed 'Structure Plan Content' into Chapter 29 Appendices, which specifies the type of development rules that can be created within a structure plan (aligned with design guidelines) and which replace other zone rules. This should outline a streamlined process for structure planning and not require the same developer to subdivide as well as build.	This new appendix will enable the district plan to remain efficient, flexible and practical for enabling sufficient growth and ensuring quality outcomes. The appendix needs to outline a streamlined process for structure planning and not require a developer to subdivide and build so that smaller developments/developers also have access and flexibility within each structure plan area. The structure plan is an effective planning tool, and utilised in the way suggested, should not become a tome of planning rules such that the structure plan becomes too restrictive.	Reject	7
FS1202.94	New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Support submission point 445.2.	The successful integration of land use and infrastructure is essential. The Agency is supportive of structure planning as an effective integrated planning tool.	Reject	7
FS1385.12	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury B	Oppose		At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure perspective. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	7
486.2	Louise Whyte	Neutral/Amend	Amend the Proposed District Plan to not allow more unsustainable or environmentally practical waste facilities to be located by the River on the land between Buckland Road, Tuakau and the Waikato River.	The reclaimed alluvial river plains were reclaimed for soil conservation (for rural use) and erosion protection.	Reject	7

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
493.10	Jackie Colliar	Neutral/Amend	Amend the Proposed District Plan to ensure consistency of wording in the rural and residential zones, in relation to the approval process for a Concept Management Plan.	If the underlying zoning will apply, this could create issues for those located in residential and rural zones.	Accept in part	7
<b>FS1035.63</b>	Pareoranga Te Kata	Support	Agree and support the whole submission.	• Engage with Waikato Tainui and mana whenua to ensure that the Tainui Environmental Plan Tai Tunu, Tai Pari, Tai Ao and marae environmental plans have been included in the Waikato District Plan.	Accept in part	7
568.5	JoonYoung Moon	Neutral/Amend	Amend the Proposed District Plan to prevent more waste facilities locating by the Waikato River near Geraghtys Road, Tuakau, (see submission for map of site).	Residents do not want waste facilities adjacent to the Waikato River. Waste facilities are not sustainable nor environmentally friendly.	Reject	7
<b>FS1353.20</b>	Tuakau Proteins Limited	Oppose		TPL is an established activity and it is unclear what type of activities are being referred to in this submission.	Accept	7
570.1	Raymond & Cheryl Higgins	Support	Amend the Proposed District Plan to allow construction of a mini house a little larger than 70m2 on the site at 321 Whiriwhiri Road, Waiuku.	To have a building bigger than a granny flat (i.e. 70m2).	Accept in part	7
572.4	Litania Liava'a	Neutral/Amend	Amend the Proposed District Plan to prevent more waste facilities locating by the Waikato River near Geraghtys Road, Tuakau (see submission for map of site).	Residents do not want waste facilities adjacent to the Waikato River. Waste facilities are not sustainable nor environmentally friendly.	Reject	7
<b>FS1353.22</b>	Tuakau Proteins Limited	Oppose		TPL is an established activity and it is unclear what type of activities are being referred to in this submission.	Accept	7
577.2	Dilworth Trust Board	Not Stated	Not Stated	Add a new 'Specific Area' in Chapter 22 - Rural Zone, to provide for the Dilworth School - Rural Campus facility. See Appendix 2 of the submission for full details of provisions sought for the 'Specific Area'. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan for any further or other consequential relief required to give effect to the relief sought in this submission	Reject	7
<b>FS1388.830</b>	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Not Stated	Oppose		Accept	7
580.20	Andrew Feierabend for Meridian Energy Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend the Proposed District Plan as necessary to address the matters raised in submission.	Various, as outlined in the submission.	Reject	7
588.32	Peter Buchan for Woolworths NZ Ltd	Not Stated	Consider that Pokeno be removed from the Proposed District Plan and not subject to the Proposed District Plan review process. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential or alternative relief to give effect to the specific amendments sought.	The zoning layout for Pokeno would benefit of a broader strategic assessment into how the town centre should develop. Pockets of residentially zoned land dissect Business and Town Centre zoned land. Proposals for alternative focal points for the centre exist along Great South Road and have not been determined through any strategic assessment. A large proportion of Pokeno's residential growth has occurred to the north and the Proposed District Plan has not considered connecting the new community to the existing town centre. Proposed District Plan has not considered a Mixed Use Zone within the settlement to engender more compact growth in the future. It	Reject	7

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				will enable a strategic and comprehensive assessment of the best way to encourage growth in Pokeno, in line with the higher order objectives of the Proposed District Plan.		
<b>FS1261.27</b>	Annie Chen	Oppose	Reject submission point and do not consider removing Pokeno from the Proposed District Plan and the review process.	The strategic development is being moulded as part of the District Plan review process and should continue as-such.	Accept	7
<b>FS1281.30</b>	Pokeno Village Holdings Limited	Support	Support in part.	PVHL supports Woolworths' submission in principle and agree with the majority of their points raised in the PDF submission. PVHL also agree that the zoning layout for the Pokeno Town centre requires a broader strategic assessment, however PVHL does not support the removal of Pokeno from the current PWDP process.	Reject	7
<b>FS1297.37</b>	CSL Trust & Top End Properties Limited	Oppose	Reject submission point and do not consider removing Pokeno from the Proposed District Plan and the review process.	The strategic development of Pokeno is being moulded as part of the District Plan review process and should continue as-such.	Accept	7
<b>FS1297.39</b>	CSL Trust & Top End Properties Limited	Oppose	Reject submission point.	There are no valid or robust reasons for Pokeno to be excluded from the district plan review process.	Accept	7
<b>FS1385.20</b>	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury B	Oppose		At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure perspective. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	7
<b>FS1377.169</b>	Havelock Village Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	There are no valid reasons for Pokeno to be excluded from the district plan review process. Delaying hearing submissions on the Proposed Plan is inefficient and will lead to poor economic, environmental and social outcomes for the District. There are pressing environmental issues that need to be managed.	Accept	7
598.28	Withers Family Trust	Neutral/Amend	Add policies and support for additional residential zoning opportunities to cater for anticipated demand for the next 27 years.	Support sustainable communities and the objective of providing for 13,300-17,500 additional dwellings within the District 2018-2045.	Accept in part	7
<b>FS1377.183</b>	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	HVL supports amendments to the Plan that provide for a greater development potential and a wider variety of densities and zones.	Accept in part	7
<b>FS1388.1023</b>	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose		At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed,	Accept in part	7

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				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.		
678.3	Christine Madsen on behalf of Madsen & Holmes	Support	Retain the right as a permitted activity to maintain the habitat for the benefit of game bird shooters on the submitter's property at Oram Road and 150 Koheroa Road, Mercer (see map included in submission for location).	The submitter refers to their own experience and states that habitats need to be maintained for the benefit of game bird shooters. Refer to submission which contains an excerpt from an articles written by Caithness ('A Summary of the 1991 Waterfowl Shooting Season').	Accept in part	7
695.7	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Add a hierarchy of non-motor vehicle routes for cycling, walking and horse riding.	An adequate width shoulder could be retained for cycling on identified key routes without compromising the road carriage way. There are several examples of roads that are key cycling link 'arterial' routes (see submission, Appendix 2). Providing links to other local roads and avoiding main routes are favoured by cyclists for safety reasons. Cycling is a very popular activity. There are more cyclists than rugby players nowadays. Runners, rowers, gymnasts, rugby, soccer and hockey players and swimmers use cycling to build fitness, as well as triathletes and racing cyclists.	Accept in part	7
749.124	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Neutral/Amend	Add a new chapter that provides for a "Medium Density Residential Zone" with appropriate Land Use - Activities, Land Use - Effects, Land Use - Building and Subdivision provisions as outlined in attachment 3 of the submission. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to enable a number of consequential amendments to give effect to the "Medium Density Residential Zone" sought.	The submitter proposes an additional new Residential Zone to enable apartment, terrace housing and multi-unit developments within close proximity of centres.	Accept	7
FS1387.1043	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose		At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	7
749.153	Housing New Zealand Limited		Amend the extent of Residential Zone, Village Zone and Rural Zone as contained in Attachment 4 of the submission. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan as consequential or additional relief as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission as necessary.	The Proposed District Plan has provided additional land for residential development, and therefore expanded the the urban boundaries of certain towns and villages. The submitter seeks no further area of residential and village zoning is proposed outside of the	Accept in part	7

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				existing urban areas. The submitter supports the compact urban model for concentrating growth in and around existing urban settlements in the district, however, the compact urban model approach is weakened when new land is rezoned for suburban housing at the edges of existing urban settlements. This type of development starts to create urban sprawl and widespread residential suburban homes. The compact model is lost when intensification spreads instead of concentrating in and around existing centres. The consequences of such development leads to commercial services and amenities locating on the edges of urban settlements and therefore reducing amenity and vitality of existing centres. More emphasis and priority needs to be placed on the compact urban model approach.		
FS1316.47	Alstra (2012) Limited	Oppose	Oppose submission point 749.153 and provide relief as per their original submission.	Ngaruawahia is a growing town given the current influx of residents and as such more land is needed to be rezoned for residential purposes. Thus, we consider that the rezoning of the land to Residential is appropriate and will not cause urban sprawl.	Accept in part	7
FS1202.104	New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Support submission point 749.153.	The submitter supports a compact urban model concentrating growth in and around existing urban settlements. The Transport Agency supports this approach.	Accept in part	7
FS1345.117	Genesis Energy Limited	Support		Support for the reasons presented in the submission. Genesis supports provisions that limit urban sprawl, subject to the exact nature of the amendments.	Accept in part	7
FS1387.1060	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose		At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept in part	7
761.19	Lyndendale Farms Limited	Not Stated	Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any consequential amendments that are required to give effect to the submission.	Various reasons outline in the submission.	Reject	7
693.14	Alstra (2012) Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend the Proposed District Plan to protect the two intensive farming properties within the Ngaruawahia Residential Zone from residential development until Alstra decides to cease operations.	The hatching, breeding and rearing of chickens on these sites are proposed to continue for the foreseeable future under contract with Inghams.	Accept in part	7
780.38	John Lawson (Whaingaroa Environmental	Oppose	Amend the Proposed District Plan to require housing for the elderly in all new developments, not just Te Kauwhata (e.g. Policy 4.1.12(b)(i) Te Kauwhata).	Wants the former Lazarus village restored for use of the elderly and thinks that without protection, the only non-hospital housing for elderly people in	Reject	7

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
	Defence Incorpora on behalf of Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Incorporated Society			Raglan will be permanently lost. Refers to Section 1.12.3 "A district which provides a wide variety of housing forms which reflect the demands of its ageing population".		
781.9	Ministry of Education	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.1.2 P5 Permitted Activities as follows: P5 Education facility facilities	Submitter requests consistency with their requested definition of 'Education facilities'.	Reject	7
FS1193.24	Van Den Brink Group	Support	The submission is allowed.	If allowed the amendment would allow for an activity appropriate in a business zone.	Reject	7
FS1387.1215	Mercury Limited NZ for Mercury D	Oppose		At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	7
807.2	Pukekohe Motorcycle Club	Oppose	Add a minimum 300m buffer around the track at 115 Geraghty Maber Road, Tuakau, preventing the establishment of any new activity sensitive to noise. AND Any further or consequential relief to give effect to the relief sought in the submission.	This is to prevent the establishment of activities sensitive to noise. The Tuakau Structure Plan did propose additional residential along Harrisville Road but also included a buffer zone. This buffer is shown in green in Figure 3 of the submission and provided a buffer of some 250m from the motocross track. The use of a buffer is considered an appropriate response to balance the need to protect the existing lawfully established motocross track from the potential reverse sensitivity effects of noise sensitive activities and accords with Policy 5.3.15(a)(iii) and 5.3.15(a)(v) of the Proposed Plan. The current Proposed Plan does not promote sustainable management of resources, will not achieve the purpose of the RMA and are contrary to Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA; The current Proposed Plan will not enable the social and economic wellbeing of the community in the Waikato region. The current Proposed Plan does not represent the most appropriate means of exercising the Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means.	Reject	7

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1200.2	Gerardus Aarts & Yvonne Gemma Aarts	Not Stated	Oppose noise bugger over the land at 111 Harrisville Road. Support a noise bugger for land directly adjoining the Motocross Track.	The submitte has reference to the buffer area (Rural Zone) applied in PC16. It is noted that the site at 111 Harrisville Road was zoned residential under PC16 and was located outside the buffer area identified by PC16. The submitter considers the buffer applied in PC 16 'an appropriate response to protect the existing lawfully established motocross track from the potential reverse sensitivity effects of noise sensitive activities and accords with Policy 5.3.15(a)(iii) and 5.3.15(a)(v) of the Proposed Plan.' The submission indicated the buffer should be 300m however no analysis is provided to support this. We do not support a noise buffer over the site at 111 Harrisville Road as it is located at least 250m from the boundary of the Pukekohe Motocross Track and no analysis is provided to support the proposed 300m buffer.	Reject	7
807.4	Pukekohe Motorcycle Club	Not Stated	Amend Appendix 1: Acoustic Insulation to include reference to the Harrisville Motocross Track and the Noise Control Boundary overlay. AND Add a specific acoustic insulation/ventilation requirement for any new noise sensitive activity along with suitable internal noise levels to be achieved by any new noise sensitive spaces established within the overlay. AND Any further or consequential relief to give effect to the relief sought in the submission.	The current Proposed Plan does not promote sustainable management of resources, will not achieve the purpose of the RMA and are contrary to Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA; The current Proposed Plan will not enable the social and economic wellbeing of the community in the Waikato region The current Proposed Plan does not represent the most appropriate means of exercising the Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means.	Reject	7
FS1200.4	Gerardus Aarts & Yvonne Gemma Aarts	Support	Support in part.	The location of the Noise Control Boundary needs to be determined. The submitter has not supplied any assessment to support the 500m Noise Control Boundary. In principal we support the identification of a Noise Control Boundary as a more appropriate response than changing the zoning of the site at 111 Harrisville Road. The comments made in submission point 1200.3 are applicable to this submission.	Reject	7
807.6	Pukekohe Motorcycle Club	Not Stated	Add any other suitable provisions to the plan to control, restrict or prevent development on land adjacent to the motocross track at 115 Geraghty Maber Road, Tuakau without sufficient consideration of the potential for reverse sensitivity effects on the ongoing operation and intensification of the current activity, and any further or consequential relief to give full effect to all previous submission points. AND Any further or consequential relief to give effect to the relief sought in the submission.	The current Proposed Plan does not promote sustainable management of resources, will not achieve the purpose of the RMA and are contrary to Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA The current Proposed Plan will not enable the social and economic wellbeing of the community in the Waikato region The current Proposed Plan does not represent the most appropriate means of exercising the Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means.	Reject	7
FS1200.6	Gerardus Aarts & Yvonne Gemma Aarts	Oppose	Oppose submission point 807.6	The comments made in submission point 1200.3 are applicable to this submission.	Accept	7
825.38	John Lawson	Oppose	Amend the Proposed District Plan to require housing for the elderly is required in all new developments, not just Te Kauwhata (e.g. Policy 4.1.12(b)(i) Te Kauwhata).	Wants the former Lazarus village restored for use of the elderly and thinks that without protection, the only non-hospital housing for elderly people in Raglan will be permanently lost. Refers to Section 1.12.3 "A district which provides a wide variety of housing forms which reflect the demands of its ageing population".	Reject	7

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1371.35	Lakeside Development Limited	Oppose	Lakeside Development Limited seek that the submission made in relation to requiring all new development to provide for elderly housing not to be adopted.	Requiring elderly housing to be a part of all new developments may result in the development of elderly housing in areas not considered appropriate within the context of the area. Will not promote the sustainable management of resources and will not achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991. Will not enable the wellbeing of the community. Will not meet the reasonably foreseeable need of future generations. Will not enable the efficient use and development of the district's assets. Will not represent the most appropriate means of exercising the Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means.	Accept	7
827.26	New Zealand Steel Holdings Ltd	Oppose	Delete Rule 12.3 Additional Matters of Control, Matters of Discretion and Matters for Discretionary and Non-Complying Activities	Additional matters of control or discretion are extremely broad, many of them unnecessary as they duplicate Council's powers under the RMA. Some effectively extend Council's control or discretion to a level anticipated as part of a discretionary or non-complying activity.	Reject	7
943.71	McCracken Surveys Limited	Not Stated	Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.	Various reasons as outlined in the submission.	Reject	7
945.54	First Gas Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential amendments as required to achieve the relief sought.	Various, as outlined in the submission.	Reject	7
493.35	Jackie Colliar	Not Stated	Put the District Plan review process on hold so that outcomes of the blueprinting exercise can be accommodated I the District Plan, including the development of structure plans	The submitter is pleased that structure plans were referenced in various parts of the proposed district plan, however there appears to be an absence of structure plans when attempting to locate them in the plan. The submitter understands a 'Blueprinting' exercise is currently underway and will provide the basis for any future structure plans. Whilst submission supports this initiative, especially considering the growth challenges that the district faces in the north; the timing of this process is unfortunate and would have been more effective if the process had been undertaken pre the notification of the Proposed District Plan. The submitter is concerned that the Blueprinting exercise and potential structure plans will require plan change processes to implement as part of the district plan. Locations such as Huntly, Mercer and Pokeno are in need of high-level planning assessment and it is disappointing that resource and time be required to get these guiding plans part of the district plan. The submitter is also of the opinion that any structure plans or Blueprinting exercises should recognise Waikato-tainui tikanga and Maatauranga Maori, to reflect the districts rich Maaori heritage.	Reject	7
FS1035.88	Pareoranga Te Kata	Support	Agree and support the whole submission.	• Engage with Waikato Tainui and mana whenua to ensure that the Tainui Environmental Plan Tai Tunu, Tai Pari, Tai Ao and marae environmental plans have been included in the Waikato District Plan.	Reject	7
FS1261.44	Annie Chen	Oppose	Reject submission point and do not delay the review of the District Plan.	Incorporating any updates to documents such as the Future Proof Strategy and Waikato Regional Policy	Accept	7

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				Statement can be done as a Council-initiated Plan Change.		
FS1281.17	Pokeno Village Holdings Limited	Support	Support in part.	PVHL supports this submission and are of the view that the outcomes of the blueprinting exercise should be implemented by methods in the PWDP. This includes any changes in zoning around the Pokeno Town Centre and providing for activities such as a supermarket and other businesses. However, PVHL do not support putting the PWDP process on hold.	Reject	7
FS1308.72	The Surveying Company	Oppose		We oppose the submission as it seeks to place the District Plan Review process on hold. Waikato District Council has already withdrawn the Tuakau Structure Plan to align with the Waikato District Plan resulting in a significant delay of live zoning in Tuakau. In addition, the Waikato District jurisdiction operates under two outdated Plans and these Plans need to be merged for consistency.	Accept	7
FS1377.119	Havelock Village Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	Delaying hearing submissions on the Proposed Plan is inefficient and will lead to poor economic, environmental and social outcomes for the District. There are pressing environmental issues that need to be managed. Structure plans are not an essential precursor to development.	Accept	7
81.16	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Chapter 4, Chapter 16, the Planning Maps and any other provisions that are proposed for unserviced urban residential areas where there is uncertainty about the funding, staging and timing for infrastructure provision. The amendments should establish a stronger objective, policy and rule framework than is proposed, in order to ensure that activities of an urban nature, including subdivision, is not provided for prior to structure planning processes being undertaken and without certainty about the funding, timing and staging of infrastructure provision.	The submitter is concerned that the provisions of Section 4.1 Strategic Direction do not adequately address how subdivision and development activities will be managed where a 'live' residential zoning is proposed for unserviced land within urban towns and villages. This concern also applies to other objectives and policies in Section 4 relating to residential activities and to rules contained in Section 16: Residential. Of particular concern are locations such as Tuakau, Pokeno and Horotiu. Submitter considers that the planning framework proposed for these areas does not give effect to the WRPS' direction on ensuring an integrated, staged approach to infrastructure and development. It is likely to enable development that undermines the ability to coordinate the adequate provision of network and community infrastructure to support growth. Submitter suggests that that an alternative method to 'live' zoning of these areas should be considered, to more appropriately manage land where a live zone has been applied, but where there is no existing or planned supporting infrastructure. Without limiting the scope of any amendments, submitter suggests that options to be considered include: Retention of the operative plan's rural zoning of these areas, with an overlay similar to the 'Hamilton Urban expansion' overlay proposed in the plan, Application of the urban zone, but with an overlay that would signal that while particular areas are considered appropriate particular activities, e.g. industrial or residential, additional subdivision and development will not be considered until there is certainty about infrastructure provisions, Creation	Accept	7

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				of a new Urban Expansion Zone that would have its own suite of provisions for management of landuse and subdivision activities.		
FS1062.5	Andrew and Christine Gore	Oppose	Disallow overlays that prevent development, and put the land holding pattern for unreasonable disadvantage to land owners.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is important that policies do not deny landowners the opportunity to realise their own investments.</li> </ul>	Reject	7
FS1176.2	Watercare Services Ltd	Support		Watercare supports this submission point as clear guidance is required as to the sequencing of development in areas zoned/earmarked for growth and the necessity for infrastructure capacity to be planned/available to service development in an efficient and cost effective manner.	Accept	7
FS1202.1	New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Support submission point 81.16	Successful integration of land use and infrastructure planning and implementation is essential to achieve liveable communities. The Transport Agency is supportive of structure planning as an effective integrated planning tool.	Accept	7
FS1281.2	Pokeno Village Holdings Limited	Support	Support.	PVHL supports this submission point as the PWDP does not give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development Capacity or the Waikato Regional Policy Statement. Proposed development must be supported by appropriate infrastructure or information which identifies the location, scale, funding, type and staging of infrastructure required to service the area.	Accept	7
FS1377.2	Havelock Village Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	HVL supports integrated development and amendments to the proposed plan that better achieve that outcome. However, there are a number of different mechanisms that can be included in the PWDP to achieve that outcome including development standards and triggers for release of live zoned residential land or the creation of a future urban zone/deferred zone. Structure plans are not an essential precursor to development.	Reject	7
FS1335.17	Greig Metcalfe for CKL	Oppose		The extent and live status of the proposed Village Zone in Te Kowhai should be retained to accommodate housing demand in the Waikato District and the Council's obligations under the NPS.	Reject	7
FS1342.11	Federated Farmers	Support	Allow the submission point 81.16.	FFNZ agrees with the intent of this submission. WDC needs to be upfront and transparent about these issues to ensure informed decisions can be made.	Accept	7
FS1379.12	Hamilton City Council	Support		The submission seeks outcomes that more strongly address how subdivision and development activities will be managed where a 'live' zoning approach is now applied. HCC agrees that the Plan should be strengthened in this regard. The submission also seeks to retain the operative plan's rural zoning rules for areas such as Horotiu where infrastructure servicing requirements/provisions are unclear. It is important that the outcomes of the Hamilton to Auckland Corridor work is taken into account in the consideration of the zoning changes.	Accept	7

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1308.141	The Surveying Company	Support		<p>Infrastructure provision and development of infrastructure can sit alongside the District Plan. There is no need to stage live zoning within the District Plan as properties can be live zoned and developed where infrastructure is available. Structure Planning and a staged growth approach will delay the provision of land for development. There is a range of non-statutory mechanisms that can be used to determine the provision of infrastructure for live zoned properties. We do not believe that the use of 'future urban' zones or 'urban expansion' overlays are the best option in land use in the interim period until the land is rezoned through a structure Plan process. Rezoning of land in Tuakau has already been delayed by a Council decision to withdraw the Tuakau Structure Plan. Deferring live zoning to prepare a Structure Plan for Tuakau would further delay live zoning of land, much of which was identified for growth 10 years ago by the Franklin District Growth Strategy. Landowners and developers in Tuakau are experiencing 'consultation burnout' despite 10 years of consultation no additional land has been live zoned. It is inefficient and unsustainable to delay live zoning any further.</p>	Accept	7
81.22	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Add assessment criteria to earthwork and fill activities to allow the consideration of effects on pest and disease management.	<p>There is potential for a number of activities to exacerbate the spread of pest plants and diseases, e.g. earthworks and filling. The spread of such pests and diseases poses a risk to the regional economy as well as indigenous biodiversity. While the Regional Pest Management Plan provides controls around the management of pests and diseases, it is important to recognise that activities controlled by the Proposed Plan may also have implications in terms of biosecurity.</p>	Reject	7
FS1223.8	Mercury Limited NZ	Support		<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	7
FS1342.45	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow submission point 81.22.	<p>FFNZ opposes the submission; it is not specific as to what the assessment criteria is, and when it will be triggered. We are unable to assess the impacts of this proposal on farming activities.</p>	Accept	7
81.100	Waikato Regional Council	Support	Retain Schedule 30.5 Urban Allotment.	<p>The submitter supports the approach of identification and mapping of SNAs. This approach provides landowners with greater certainty and assists</p>	Reject	7

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				with achieving Policy 11.2 of WRPS. The submitter also supports the inclusion of Schedule 30.5 which contains a schedule of SNAs on urban environment allotments.		
198.19	Katherine Wilson for Property Council New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Retain the minimum density of 12-15 households per hectare in Residential zones and 8-10 households per hectare in Village zones. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to have a mixed typology across the district.	The submitter supports these figures but wishes to see a mixed typology across the district. A well-designed neighborhood will incorporate a variety of housing typologies to accommodate the differing needs of its community. A key benefit of mixed typologies is a reduction in land space used. Adelaide has an average site area of less than 300m2. In comparison, medium density housing in New Zealand has an average of less than 350m2 per unit. Introducing townhouses and apartment developments would support a key concern within the Plan of encroaching on rich soils, as less land space is required for these types of developments. Setting a minimum lot size, e.g. 5000m2 for lifestyle blocks, works against that objective.	Accept in part	7
FS1269.3	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Oppose		Housing New Zealand opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission.	Accept in part	7
FS1386.215	Mercury Limited NZ for Mercury C	Oppose		At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept in part	7
297.2	Dave Glossop for Counties Manukau Police	Support	Retain Section 1.12.5 Community well-being specifically the wording "a high level of... personal safety and the potential for crime is recognised in the design of (these) public places". AND Amend Section 1.12.5 Community well-being to include conforming to the four principles of CPTED and the seven qualities of safer places contained within the National Guidelines for Crime Prevention through Environmental Design in New Zealand.	To prevent victimisations caused by crime and road related offending, injury or death To make people safe and feel safe.	Reject	7
FS1005.6	Tamahere Eventide Home Trust - Atawhai Assisi Retirement Village	Oppose	Disallow submission point 297.2.	Oppose the amendments sought that require retirement villages to 'conform' with the national guidelines for CPTED. This approach is too onerous. A retirement village should only be required to 'consider' the CPTED guidelines where practicable. Retain Policy 4.2.19(a) as notified.	Accept	7
FS1004.16	Tamahere Eventide Home Trust - Tamahere	Oppose	Disallow submission point 297.2.	Oppose the amendments sought that require retirement villages to 'conform' with the national guidelines for CPTED. This approach is too onerous. A	Accept	7

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
	Eventide Retirement Village			retirement village should only be required to 'consider' the CPTED guidelines. Retain Policy 4.2.19(a) as notified.		
<b>FS1386.307</b>	Mercury Limited NZ for Mercury C	Oppose		At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	7
302.36	Jeremy Talbot for Barker & Associates Limited on behalf of EnviroWaste New Zealand Limited	Support	Retain Rule 4.6.5 Recognition of industrial activities outside of urban areas insofar as it gives effect to the relief sought.	The submitter supports the intention of the policy to recognize and provide for existing industrial activities; however, this is not reflected in the Land Use provisions.	Accept	7
<b>FS1386.352</b>	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose		At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	7
371.7	Kitty Burton	Not Stated	Add a density target of 8-10 households per hectare for Greenfield development in serviced Waikato District rural Villages and specifically Matangi.		Reject	7
<b>FS1305.8</b>	Andrew Mowbray	Support	Seek that the whole submission be allowed.	It is very important for the future sensible growth of Matangi there is one community plan in place to cater for the development of the area and it surrounds.	Accept	7
372.12	Steve van Kampen for Auckland Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Section 1.5 What does this mean for Waikato district strategic objectives and directions? to include a strategic recognition regarding reverse sensitivity.	No reason provided.	Reject	7
<b>FS1388.3</b>	Mercury Limited NZ for Mercury E	Oppose		At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or	Accept	7

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
<b>FS1168.15</b>	Horticulture New Zealand	Support	Accept submission.	The submitter seeks that new sections are added to the Plan to provide strategic direction for reverse sensitivity and high class soils. These are important issues that need to be addressed in the Plan.	Reject	7
<b>FS1340.49</b>	TaTa Valley Limited	Support	Support.	The submitter supports submission point 372.12 in that providing a strategic direction regarding reverse sensitivity would make it clear as to how reverse sensitivity is to be handled in the Waikato District.	Reject	7
<b>FS1342.64</b>	Federated Farmers	Support	Allow submission point 372.12, in part. Develop the strategic recognition in collaboration with interested parties.	FFNZ understands the intent of this submission and wishes to remain involved as any strategic recognition of reverse sensitivity is developed. Reverse sensitivity related matters significantly affect FFNZ members.	Reject	7
403.5	Doug Nicholson	Oppose	Amend Rule 18.1.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities and review the rules in consultation with 10 Baird Avenue, Te Kauwhata.	There are rules which contradict each other. The new rules do not lend themselves to current trends in developments the Town Centre is looking for. 10 Baird Avenue is the submitters' residential home, and they would not be able to do anything that they regard as 'lifestyle block' ownership improvements (such as a barn for a tractor). The Plan restricts development to business with residential only allowed above ground floor, but cannot be done unless the indicative road is made into a permanent road. This may not happen for a long time, as the submitter does not own the road, only have right of use. The only choice under these new rules would be to sell now to someone who is happy as it is, or wants to land bank, or sit 'in limbo' waiting for someone to come and want to buy the block plus the neighbours block to develop into shops etc., which could be 7-20 years away. The rules devalue the land.	Reject	7
<b>FS1388.144</b>	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose		At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and	Accept	7

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
405.74	Counties Power Limited	Neutral/Amend	Add a clause to Rule 23.3.3 DI Buildings and structures in Landscape and Natural Character Areas so that where there are existing overhead lines, the location of the dwelling must comply with the requirements of NZECP34:2001.	Works must comply with NZECP34:2001.	Reject	7
433.27	Mischa Davis for Auckland Waikato Fish and Game Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.3.3 DI Buildings and structures in Landscapes and Natural Character Areas, as follows: (a) Any building or structure that is not a maimai that is located within any: ... AND/OR Any alternative relief to address the issues and concerns raised in the submission.	Supports an appropriate buffer between any development and freshwater. Maimai should be exempt from this rule because they need to be located in Landscape and Natural Character Areas for access to game birds. Maimai are controlled by the Building Act 2004 and consistency with the Waikato Regional Plan is required which permits maimai subject to them not exceeding an area of 10m <sup>2</sup> and a height of 2.5m measured from floor level.	Reject	7
553.16	Malibu Hamilton	Support	Retain Rule 17.2.5.2 Earthworks – Maori Sites and Maori Areas of Significance.	The New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010 in Policy (d) recognises Tangata whenua needs for papakāinga, marae. The Waikato Regional Policy Statement, 2016 also has Policy 6.4 Marae and papakāinga provisions. The Future Proof Strategy Planning for Growth November 2017 has Priority 15 that seeks developments of papakāinga housing that meets the needs and aspirations in the sub-region. RMA sections 6(e), 7(a), and 8 set out legal obligations when managing the natural and physical resources of the region to Tangata whenua.	Accept in part	7
553.18	Malibu Hamilton	Support	Retain Rule 18.2.4.2 Earthworks – Maori Sites and Maori Areas of Significance.	The New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010 in Policy (d) recognises Tangata whenua needs for papakāinga, marae. The Waikato Regional Policy Statement, 2016 also has Policy 6.4 Marae and papakāinga provisions. The Future Proof Strategy Planning for Growth November 2017 has Priority 15 that seeks developments of papakāinga housing that meets the needs and aspirations in the sub-region. RMA sections 6(e), 7(a), and 8 set out legal obligations when managing the natural and physical resources of the region to Tangata whenua.	Accept in part	7
563.2	Andrew Mowbray	Neutral/Amend	Amend the provisions to enable placement of cottages and railway houses on the property at 452 Tauwhare Road, Matangi.	Density of houses would be significantly beyond what is presently allowed. Matangi community happy with proposal. Would like to get the land designated for this to happen. See full submission for Powerpoint.	Accept in part	7
<b>FS1264.8</b>	Bootleg Brewery	Support	Seeks that the submission point is allowed. However, that Council considers the relief in the form of a bespoke precinct zone, which contemplates all of the activities that this submitter and land owner seek.	Bootleg supports regeneration and intensification within Matangi town centre, and land use provisions which provide for the permissive operation of a brewery with on and off premise.	Accept in part	7
578.9	Ports of Auckland Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 20.3.IPI Building height, as follows: (a) The maximum height of a building must not exceed: (i) 15m; or (ii) 10m if located on Tregowath Lane and within 50m of the Residential Zone in Huntly. (iii) within the Horotiu Industrial Park: A. it is located in Stage 1, Stage 2, Stage 3A or Stage 3B, and is: 1. more than 400m from Horotiu Road; and 2. height does not exceed 25m; and 3. height	The Proposed District Plan seeks to reduce the permitted height from 25m to 15m within the Horotiu Industrial Park. In the context of the 130 ha site such a reduction is significant. Opposes as it will not provide for an efficient use of the industrial site. Seeks the retention of the existing building height controls for the Horotiu Industrial Park.	Accept in part	7

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			does not exceed 15m over 90% of the site; and B. height does not exceed 10m within 50m of Horotiu Road boundary. OR Add a new section 20.6 within Chapter 20 Industrial Zone, specifically providing for the Horotiu Industrial Park (see Schedule 2 of the submission for specific provisions). AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make alternative or consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.			
578.13	Ports of Auckland Limited	Not Stated	Add a new restricted discretionary activity rule in Rule 20.3.1 Building height to specifically address activities within the Horotiu Industrial Park that do not comply with the permitted activity rules requested in this submission. The new rule will read: (a) Any activity that does not comply with Rules 20.3.1 P2 and P3. (b) Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters: (i) the extent to which the visual amenities of the residential Zone are maintained. OR Add a new section 20.6 within Chapter 20 Industrial Zone, specifically providing for the Horotiu Industrial Park (see Schedule 2 of the submission for specific provisions). AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make alternative or consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.	The Operative District Plan provisions for the Horotiu Industrial Park relating to aerials have not been included within the Proposed District Plan. No justification is provided within the section 32 analysis to justify the deletion of the provisions. Seek the inclusions of the operative provisions within the Proposed District Plan. Seeks specific provisions for lighting masts within the Horotiu Industrial Park to a height of 25m. It is consistent with the maximum permitted height for other buildings within this part of the Industrial Zone and is consistent with the resource consent held by the Ports of Auckland Ltd. It is necessary to ensure the safe and efficient operation of industrial activities.	Accept in part	7
578.19	Ports of Auckland Limited	Oppose	Add a new rule providing for subdivision within the Horotiu Industrial Park to be undertaken as a controlled activity under Rule 20.4.1 Subdivision - General. The new rule will read: C1 (a) Subdivision within the Horotiu Industrial Park is a controlled activity where it complies with all of the following conditions: (i) every allotment in the Horotiu Industrial Park area has a net site area of at least 500m <sup>2</sup> , excluding access allotments or utility allotments which shall have a minimum net site area of 100m <sup>2</sup> ; (ii) prior to any subdivision or development of the Stage 3A areas on earth bund is constructed generally in the location of the form and height shown on Figure 20.6(B); (iii) any subdivision of land adjoining Horotiu Road includes a minimum 5m wide landscaping strip adjoining Horotiu Road (excluding access) to be planted and maintained with indigenous species that will achieve a height of at least 5m within 5 years and sufficient density to visually screen the land from the Residential Zone; (iv) any subdivision of land adjoining the designated boundary of the Waikato Expressway includes landscape planting and maintenance of indigenous species that will achieve an average height of 3m within 5 years and of sufficient density to visually screen the industrial activity from the Expressway in combination with any existing or proposed landscaping within the Expressway designation. (b) Control is reserved over: (i) amenity values; (ii) construction and maintenance of bund area; (iii) planting and maintenance of bund area. OR Add a new section 20.6 within Chapter 20 Industrial Zone, specifically providing for the Horotiu Industrial Park (see Schedule 2 of the submission for specific provisions). AND Amend	Under the Operative District Plan, subdivision within the Horotiu Industrial Park can be undertaken as a controlled activity subject to standards. No justification has been provided within the section 32 analysis which supports the Proposed District Plan as to why a restricted discretionary activity status is necessary and why different subdivision standards are appropriate within the Horotiu Industrial Park.	Accept in part	7

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			the Proposed District Plan to make alternative or consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.			
FS1388.842	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose		At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept in part	7
578.20	Ports of Auckland Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 20.4.1 RD1 Subdivision - General, as follows: (a) In all other areas, subdivision must comply with all of the following conditions... OR Add a new section 20.6 within Chapter 20 Industrial Zone, specifically providing for the Horotiu Industrial Park (see Schedule 2 of the submission for specific provisions). AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make alternative or consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.	Under the Operative District Plan, subdivision within the Horotiu Industrial Park can be undertaken as a controlled activity subject to standards. No justification has been provided within the section 32 analysis which supports the Proposed District Plan as to why a restricted discretionary activity status is necessary and why different subdivision standards are appropriate within the Horotiu Industrial Park.	Accept in part	7
579.44	Simon Ash for Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited	Support	Amend the position of the Lakeside walkway to ensure it is located only within the Lakeside Development 2017 Limited property boundary, Te Kauwhata and west of the Significant Natural Area and Outstanding Natural Feature (see map included in submission). AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any amendments or consequential changes that are necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	Supports the identification of the walkway along the edge of the property adjoining Lake Waikare. The walkway has been well supported by a range of parties through the Plan Change 20 process. Seeks the realignment of the Lakeside walkway to ensure that the walkway is entirely located within the Lakeside Property boundary.	Accept	7
648.2	Chorus New Zealand Limited	Support	Retain Objective 3.1.1 - Biodiversity and ecosystems as notified.	Policy 6.1.10 in Infrastructure section directly addresses infrastructure in 'Identified Areas,' requiring a consideration of the values and attributes of these areas where new infrastructure or significant upgrades are required in these areas. Policy 6.1.10 will need to be read in conjunction with Natural Environment provisions where assessing proposals in these areas. Submitter considers Natural Environment provisions, as drafted, set out a workable framework for assessing telecommunications infrastructure in these areas, particularly where assessed in conjunction with Policy 6.1.10. Submitter wishes to preserve its standing on these provisions should changes be sought by other parties.	Accept in part	7
697.670	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 20.4.6 Subdivision - Significant Natural Areas.	This rule is not required in the Industrial Zone.	Reject	7
697.850	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Add a new permitted activity (P6) to Rule 23.1.1 Permitted Activities, as follows: Amendment or alteration to an existing retirement village Specific	A new rule is required to accommodate Tamahere Eventide.	Accept in part	7

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			activity conditions: (a) The site is already serviced with water, wastewater and stormwater infrastructure; (b) Total building coverage of the site or combination of sites does not exceed 65% including all impervious surfaces areas; and (c) Building height does not exceed 8m, except for 10m on 30% of the total site coverage.			
FS1004.15	Tamahere Eventide Home Trust - Tamahere Eventide Retirement Village	Support	Allow submission point 697.850.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support the addition of a site specific rule for Tamahere Eventide; and the permitted activity status for alterations to the existing retirement village.</li> <li>The adoption of a site specific rule for Tamahere Eventide and the permitted activity status is supported.</li> </ul>	Accept in part	7
FS1005.19	Tamahere Eventide Home Trust - Atawhai Assisi Retirement Village	Support	Allow submission point 697.850.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support the addition of a site specific rule for Tamahere Eventide; and the permitted activity status for alterations to the existing retirement village.</li> <li>The adoption of a site specific rule for Tamahere Eventide is supported.</li> </ul>	Accept in part	7
697.892	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.3.3 D1 (a) Buildings and structures in Landscape and Natural Character Areas, as follows: (a) Any building or structure that is located within any of the following landscape and natural character areas: (i) ...	The additional words in this rule provide clarity.	Reject	7
FS1387.724	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose		<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>	Accept	7
825.2	John Lawson	Oppose	Add rules to Chapter 16 Residential Zone to provide for protection of defined views from public places to the harbour, coast and natural backdrops and to include at least the following defined views: (a) from SH23 (north of Maungatawhiri Rd) to Kaitoke Creek (b) all existing views of the bar from Main Road, Bow St and Norrie Avenue (c) all existing views of Karioi from Raglan Central Business District (d) from Wainui Rd to the coast between the Bryant Reserve and the Bible Crusade Camp (e) from SH23 summit to Karioi (f) AroAro salt marsh from Wallis St. AND Amend the planning maps for any consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Rules in each zone are required to give effect to Policies 3.3.3 (a) and 4.5.14 (a) (iii). Views are a part of Raglan's character. Raglan Naturally makes various references to 'view'. The original submission notes these references in detail. RMA (Section 5) includes "well being" which was included in Raglan Naturally and this clearly includes protection of views. Raglan Naturally needs to be considered as a part of the district plan review. Other district plans protect views (Auckland and Hastings).	Reject	7
FS1258.53	Meridian Energy Limited	Oppose	Disallow	The submission point does not provide sufficient detail to determine the precise spatial extent of the view protection areas and does not define what 'protection' means in terms of rules and policy framework. It is not possible to determine what the potential effect would	Accept	7

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				be for structures, including infrastructure installations. In the absence of this detail, Meridian opposes the submission point.		
FS1329.17	Koning Family Trust and Martin Koning	Oppose	Oppose. Disallow the introduction of protected viewshafts.	The submission seeks to introduce rules that protect defined views. It is unclear in the submission what is to be protected and the extent of the viewshafts sought to be protected. The consequences of introducing protected views without specific landscape and visual assessment are unclear.	Accept	7
FS1387.1311	Mercury Limited NZ for Mercury D	Oppose		At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	7
825.5	John Lawson	Neutral/Amend	Add new rules for all zones as follows: Construction of a building or other structure and planting of trees and other vegetation is a permitted activity if: (a) it can be shown that it will not significantly block views of sea, river, bush or hills from neighbouring properties, or (b) neighbouring property owners confirm in writing that any loss of view does not concern them, or (c) it can be shown that the planted vegetation is of native plants and likely to contribute to reduction of river, or coastal erosion, or (d) it can be shown that the planting would improve views from public places. Any activity that does not comply with a condition for a permitted activity is a discretionary activity.	Sea and other views add monetary value to properties. Property rights of owners should take precedence over developers. Developers should be required to obtain written agreement from neighbours that the development does not concern them in terms of views lost, unless it is native planting to protect land from erosion, hides unsightly developments or will not significantly affect views. While no requirement under the RMA to protect views, no provisions against either. Feasible to protect views as shown by other district plans. Only 4.7.2 requires view sharing and this will not apply to most developments as they do not require consent.	Reject	7
FS1092.4	Garth & Sandra Ellmers	Oppose	This submission is totally impractical and unworkable as would result in all applications to erect a building, structure or plant a tree/s only being a permitted activity in all zones if neighbouring property owners confirm in writing that any loss of view does not concern them. The submission states that "property rights of owners should take precedence over developers". Property developers are also 'property owners' so should have the same rights as any other property owner. Where does this leave a developer or property owner that has paid huge money for a block of land because it has unrestricted views? If any neighbour did not want the neighbouring land built on or possibly have their own views restricted then they could permanently prevent blocks of land from ever being built on or developed. This would result in court action becoming a 'common' part of all potential land development and replacement of existing buildings on land. Almost any new home or	Any new rules for all zones which would result in the construction of a building or other structure and planting of trees being a permitted activity ONLY if: (a) it can be shown that it will not significantly block views of sea, river, bush or hills from neighbouring properties, or (b) neighbouring property owners confirm in writing that any loss of view does not concern them would be totally unworkable. There is no requirement under the RMA to protect views. Any such rule/s would result in substantial prevention and/or curtailment of new development and replacement of existing buildings.	Accept	7

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			structure being built could potentially block some view/s from neighbouring properties so this rule could never work.			
FS1325.8	Avondale Trust	Oppose	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed. Unworkable.	Adding a new rule to protect views at the discretion of neighbours would NEVER work. It would result in parties being tied up in court. Very impractical.	Accept	7
FS1142.15	Greig Metcalfe	Oppose	Development in the Raglan Town Centre should not be constrained by protection of view shafts. Existing bulk and location provisions ensure buildings have an appropriate scale.		Accept	7
FS1329.19	Koning Family Trust and Martin Koning	Oppose	Oppose. Disallow inclusion of rules as drafted that seek to protect views from planting and construction.	The proposed rules as drafted cannot be implemented as permitted activity standards as they are unclear and include a degree of subjectivity.	Accept	7
FS1387.1314	Mercury Limited NZ for Mercury D	Oppose		At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	7
830.9	Linda Silvester	Neutral/Amend	Add new provisions to Chapter 17 Business Zone to include energy efficiency policies and rules (see submission for wording)	The Proposed District Plan only makes passing reference to climate change and says nothing about coal, gas and oil's effect on global warming. It is disappointing that Stage 2 of the Proposed District Plan is to be published in 2019 and that it is not possible to consider it in context with this part of the Plan. Section 1.9.5 reflects the Resource Management Act requirements around climate change and renewable energy.	Reject	7
FS1276.223	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Society Inc.	Support	WED seeks that the whole of these submissions be allowed.	Reasons for WED's support are that climate change issues can't be separated from the rest of the plan. Section 5.2.9 of the RMA states "Development should be designed and located to avoid or mitigate the predicted effects of global climate change on natural hazards, especially increased flooding, erosion, fire, and storms. Where there is incomplete information, a precautionary approach should be taken." Section 5.3.8 of the RMA states "Scientific opinion differs about the possible impacts of global climate change, but majority opinion predicts that the effects could include a greater frequency and intensity of extreme weather events. Increased storms, floods and droughts may occur. The extent of these is uncertain and a precautionary approach is taken, because of the high potential for harm."	Reject	7

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1387.1343	Mercury Limited Mercury D NZ for	Oppose		At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	7
830.10	Linda Silvester	Neutral/Amend	Add new provisions to Chapter 18 Business Town Centre Zone to include energy efficiency policies and rules (see submission for wording)	The Proposed District Plan only makes passing reference to climate change and says nothing about coal, gas and oil's effect on global warming. It is disappointing that Stage 2 of the Proposed District Plan is to be published in 2019 and that it is not possible to consider it in context with this part of the Plan. Section 1.9.5 reflects the Resource Management Act requirements around climate change and renewable energy.	Reject	7
FS1276.175	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Support	WED seeks that the whole submission point be allowed.	Reasons for WED's support are that climate change issues can't be separated from the rest of the plan. Section 5.2.9 of the RMA states "Development should be designed and located to avoid or mitigate the predicted effects of global climate change on natural hazards, especially increased flooding, erosion, fire, and storms. Where there is incomplete information, a precautionary approach should be taken." Section 5.3.8 of the RMA states "Scientific opinion differs about the possible impacts of global impacts of global climate change, but majority opinion predicts that the effects could include a greater frequency and intensity of extreme weather events. Increased storms, floods and droughts may occur. The extent of these is uncertain and a precautionary approach is taken, because of the high potential for harm."	Reject	7
830.11	Linda Silvester	Neutral/Amend	Add new provisions to Chapter 19 Business Zone Tamahere to include energy efficiency policies and rules (see submission for wording)	The Proposed District Plan only makes passing reference to climate change and says nothing about coal, gas and oil's effect on global warming. It is disappointing that Stage 2 of the Proposed District Plan is to be published in 2019 and that it is not possible to consider it in context with this part of the Plan. Section 1.9.5 reflects the Resource Management Act requirements around climate change and renewable energy.	Reject	7
FS1276.176	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Support	WED seeks that the whole of the submission point be allowed.	Reasons for WED's support are that climate change issues can't be separated from the rest of the plan. Section 5.2.9 of the RMA states "Development should be designed and located to avoid or mitigate the predicted effects of global climate change on natural	Reject	7

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				hazards, especially increased flooding, erosion, fire, and storms. Where there is incomplete information, a precautionary approach should be taken." Section 5.3.8 of the RMA states "Scientific opinion differs about the possible impacts of global impacts of global climate change, but majority opinion predicts that the effects could include a greater frequency and intensity of extreme weather events. Increased storms, floods and droughts may occur. The extent of these is uncertain and a precautionary approach is taken, because of the high potential for harm."		
830.13	Linda Silvester	Neutral/Amend	Add new provisions to Chapter 21 Industrial Zone Heavy to include energy efficiency policies and rules (see submission for wording)	The Proposed District Plan only makes passing reference to climate change and says nothing about coal, gas and oil's effect on global warming. It is disappointing that Stage 2 of the Proposed District Plan is to be published in 2019 and that is not possible to consider it in context with this part of the Plan. Section 1.9.5 reflects the Resource Management Act requirements around climate change and renewable energy.		7
FS1276.178	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Support	WED seeks that the whole of the submission point be allowed.	Reasons for WED's support are that climate change issues can't be separated from the rest of the plan. Section 5.2.9 of the RMA states "Development should be designed and located to avoid or mitigate the predicted effects of global climate change on natural hazards, especially increased flooding, erosion, fire, and storms. Where there is incomplete information, a precautionary approach should be taken." Section 5.3.8 of the RMA states "Scientific opinion differs about the possible impacts of global impacts of global climate change, but majority opinion predicts that the effects could include a greater frequency and intensity of extreme weather events. Increased storms, floods and droughts may occur. The extent of these is uncertain and a precautionary approach is taken, because of the high potential for harm."		7
FS1387.1345	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose		At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		7
830.25	Linda Silvester	Neutral/Amend	Add new provisions to Chapter 26 Hampton Downs Motor Sport and Recreation Zone to include energy efficiency policies and rules (see submission for wording)	The Proposed District Plan only makes passing reference to climate change and says nothing about coal, gas and oil's effect on global warming. It is disappointing that Stage 2 of the Proposed District Plan	Reject	7

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				is to be published in 2019 and that is is not possible to consider it in context with this part of the Plan. Section 1.9.5 reflects the Resource Management Act requirements around climate change and renewable energy.		
<b>FS1276.185</b>	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Support	WED seeks that the whole of the submission point be allowed.	Reasons for WED's support are that climate change issues can't be separated from the rest of the plan. Section 5.2.9 of the RMA states "Development should be designed and located to avoid or mitigate the predicted effects of global climate change on natural hazards, especially increased flooding, erosion, fire, and storms. Where there is incomplete information, a precautionary approach should be taken." Section 5.3.8 of the RMA states "Scientific opinion differs about the possible impacts of global impacts of global climate change, but majority opinion predicts that the effects could include a greater frequency and intensity of extreme weather events. Increased storms, floods and droughts may occur. The extent of these is uncertain and a precautionary approach is taken, because of the high potential for harm."	Reject	7
831.25	Gabrielle Parson on behalf of Raglan Naturally	Oppose	Add provisions in Policy 8.1.3 Esplanade reserves and walkways and Rule 16.5.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities, to implement Waikato District Council's Walking, Cycling and Bridle Trails Strategy to create links within new developments as well as existing developments that currently have no safe alternative to car use, such as Greenslade Road.	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 recognizes 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	7
<b>FS1276.60</b>	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Support	WED seeks that the whole of the submission point be allowed.		Reject	7

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
831.37	Gabrielle Parson on behalf of Raglan Naturally	Support	Retain and strengthen Rule 23.4.5 Site boundaries - Significant Natural Areas, heritage items, archaeological sites, sites of significance to Maaori, to celebrate and protect archaeological sites.	To celebrate and protect archaeological sites, so as to enhance understanding of our history, improve the tourist experience and preserve our inheritance for future generations.	Accept in part	7
939.2	David Totman on behalf of Waipa District Council	Support	Retain the strategic directions and objectives as set out in Section 1.12- Strategic directions and objectives for the district.	Waipa Council is supportive of the Proposed Waikato District Plan's strategic directions and objectives as a Future Proof partner.	Accept in part	7
FS1273.2	Auckland Transport	Support	Support.	Auckland Transport supports the retention of strategic directions and objectives in the Proposed Plan (submission points 742.3, 939.2 and 749.92), and supports amendments that provide clarity to their purpose and function (submission point 742.3).	Accept in part	7
FS1387.1558	Mercury Limited NZ for Mercury D	Oppose		At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept in part	7
986.10	Pam Butler on behalf of KiwiRail Holdings Limited (KiwiRail)	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 3.5.4(a)(iv) Protecting the natural character of wetlands, and lakes and rivers and their margins as follows (or similar amendments to achieve the requested relief): (iv)requiring appropriate setbacks of new activities from wetlands, lakes and rivers. AND Any consequential amendments to link and/or accommodate the requested changes.	• This clause is unreasonably restrictive for linear land transport networks like KiwiRail. • KiwiRail supports Council in requiring activities to be setback from rivers, lakes and the coastal marine area, however this policy as worded gives no recognition to existing encroachments or where activities have a functional and operational need to be located in these areas. The rail network is not able to be easily relocated and frequently crosses watercourses	Reject	7
FS1340.198	TaTa Valley Limited	Support	Support.	The submitter supports submission point 986.10 as requiring a setback from activities that have already been established will result in their future development being inhibited. However, the submitter does support the need for new activities to comply with appropriate setbacks.	Reject	7
FS1345.139	Genesis Energy Limited	Support	Accept submission point.	For the reasons set out in the KiwiRail submission.	Reject	7
986.73	Pam Butler on behalf of KiwiRail Holdings Limited (KiwiRail)	Neutral/Amend	Add a new clause (b) to Policy 4.6.7 Management of adverse effects within industrial zones as follows (or similar amendments to achieve the requested relief): (a) Manage adverse effects including visual impact from buildings, parking, loading spaces and outdoor storage, lighting, noise, odour and traffic by managing the location of industrial uses, bulk and form of buildings, landscaping and screening at the interface with roads and	• 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	Reject	7

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			environmentally sensitive areas. (b) Manage Reverse sensitivity by providing sufficient setbacks buildings to provide for residents' safety and amenity AND Any consequential amendments to link and/or accommodate the requested changes.	where the proposed 5 metre Building setback - railway corridor rule cannot be met, or it is inappropriate to require compliance.		
<b>FS1193.35</b>	Van Den Brink Group	Oppose	The submission is disallowed.	Setbacks from the NIMT (greater than a normal yard control) imposes unnecessary development restrictions on the use of land.	Reject	7
986.128	Pam Butler on behalf of KiwiRail Holdings Limited (KiwiRail)	Neutral/Amend	Amend the second paragraph of the Introduction in Section E Designations as follows (or similar amendments to achieve the requested relief): The zone rules regulate activities that are not covered by the designation. Where designated land is un-zoned, activities not covered by the designation will be subject to the rules of the adjacent zone. If there are two different zones, the adjacent zone extends to the centre line of the designated land. AND Any consequential amendments to link and/or accommodate the requested changes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Although KiwiRail uses most of its landholdings for railway purposes, parts of KiwiRail's designated land are tenanted by third parties. The activities of KiwiRail's lessees, typically being unrelated to rail operations, are not authorised under KiwiRail's designations and so are subject to the relevant underlying zone provisions.</li> <li>Under the notified Plan, the activities of KiwiRail's tenants would be subject to provisions of the Rural Zone (as the rail corridor currently has this underlying zoning throughout the District), regardless of the activity or where it is located. The blanket approach of zoning the entire rail corridor "Rural" may lead to perverse outcomes for KiwiRail's tenants, who operate under the reasonable expectation that they will be able to carry out activities or development that are in accordance with the development pattern of the surrounding zone(s). KiwiRail's lessees should be subject to the same planning controls as the owners / occupiers of the surrounding land. To do otherwise would result in an inequitable situation where KiwiRail's tenants could be subject to stricter planning controls than their immediate neighbours, even though their activities are equally as appropriate in that location (or vice versa).</li> <li>KiwiRail submits that the most effective way to achieve the objectives and policies of the Plan, in particular Objective 6.1.1 and Policy 6.1.2, is to have the land subject to KiwiRail's designations un-zoned but include a rule in Section E providing that where activities are occurring on designated land that is un-zoned, the applicable zoning is determined by the adjacent zone. This will allow for the efficient and effective development, operation and maintenance of infrastructure while at the same time ensuring that KiwiRail's tenants enjoy the appropriate zoning for their activities.</li> </ul>	Accept in part	7
<b>FS1323.179</b>	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	That the changes sought are declined.	HNZPT is concerned at the unintended consequences that these amendments may have on historic heritage and would need to see the suite of associated changes and estimated effects to confirm their stance.	Accept in part	7
271.4	Dave and Fransiska Falconer	Neutral/Amend	Amend zoning of a small portion of the land at Solid Energy's Huntly East Mine from Rural Zone to Residential Zone.	This is in relation to 1.4.4 (Issues for Waikato District – The Urban Environment) and 1.5.2 (What does this mean for Waikato district strategic objectives and directions – Planning for urban growth and development) To help fund for the project proposed in previous submission points. The	Accept	7

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				rezoning of a small portion of the defunct mine to Residential Zoning would meet the Councils requirement to ensure the environment is maintained and enhanced from the derelict state it was left in to creating quality residential sites in a desirable area, which will fund further development of the mine into a sustainable environment.		
397.11	Horotiu Properties Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any consequential amendments necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.	Various, as outlined in the submission.	Reject	7
524.37	Anna Noakes	Neutral/Amend	Amend the rules relating to subdivision to give effect to policies 6.4.2-6.4.7 and ensure greenfield sites for urban growth are investigated through section 32 analysis to assess the ability to appropriately, effectively and efficiently service these areas in comparison to other areas.	No reasons provided.	Reject	7
FS1385.17	Mercury Energy Ltd	Oppose		At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure perspective. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	7
633.47	Van Den Brink Group	Support	Retain Policy 4.5.31 Reverse Sensitivity, insofar as it gives effect to the relief sought.	Supports the intention of the objective to protect amenity values, subject to the relief sought elsewhere in the submission. Policy 4.5.31 is a duplicate of Policy 4.5.33.	Accept in part	7
[FS1387.48]	Mercury Energy Ltd	Oppose		At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept in part	7
945.1	First Gas Limited	Neutral/Amend	Retain activity specific condition 14.3.1.3(3)(a) relating to Permitted Activities.	The submitter supports the inclusion of Activity P4 which provides for earthworks associated with infrastructure as a permitted activity, noting that the submitter has sought to amend the definition of	Accept in part	7

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				infrastructure to include above ground incidental equipment.		
804.1	PLB Construction □	Neutral/Amend	Amend the Proposed Waikato District Plan to recognise at the policy level that there is a need for more Industrial Zoned land to be provided within the Waikato District.	To adhere to proposed Policy 4.6.3 Maintain a sufficient supply of industrial land The Ohinewai area is underdeveloped and largely constrained under the current Country Living Zone provisions The economic potential for the Ohinewai area should be suitably realised in the Proposed District Plan.	Reject	7
FS1141.2	Shand Properties Limited	Support	Allow the part of the submission that seeks additional industrial land to be provided in the Waikato District, in particular for Huntly.	The submitter identifies there is a need for more industrial land in the Waikato District to adhere to Policy 4.6.3.	Reject	7
FS1145.6	Ohinewai Area Committee	Oppose	The Ohinewai Community fed back loud and clearly in the Blue Print meeting that they do not want industrial/heavy industrial zoning in Ohinewai. At the follow-up meeting to the Blue Print, it was clearly stated that the Blue Print response from the community has a precedence over the submissions made to the District Plan. We expect this to be supported by WDC as they stated. The reasons for this submission not to proceed, other than the community Blue Print feedback, are: Current Zoning: The Ohinewai Area is largely rural zoned, not Country Living Zoned. To change Ohinewai from Rural to Industrial/Heavy Industrial is a huge step and will be impactful to the people, the environs, the infrastructure and the way of life. Because Ohinewai is currently largely under-developed for anything other than Rural or Rural Country Living does not mean to say that it has to be developed as per this submission. There are other areas available which are currently already zoned Industrial and should be explored first. Huntly already has zoned land for Industrial South of Huntly which is not utilised at all. PLB Construction: The Company making this submission are currently sited in Huntly with access to both the future North and South on/off ramps and have 2 established sites there. The owners of the company do not live in Ohinewai and will not have any adverse effects on their lifestyle – they have no vested interest in Ohinewai at all. The company has tried repetitively to have this area re-zoned Industrial/heavy industrial and the community have repetitively said they don't want it. The company wishes to have a SHI facing business for advertising, with easy on/off ramp access which is beneficial only to the company and not to the community. The People of Ohinewai: The denizens of Ohinewai chose to live in this area due to its rural nature – to change it to Industrial is unfair on the occupants. They have expressed their response to proposed industrial zoning at the Blue Print meeting where Rural Country Living was identified as the preferred option – to keep Ohinewai in line with the lifestyle of places like Tamahere. Because Ohinewai is on the main trunk line and is seen to be desired location for industrial businesses, this is not the request of the people. The School: There is a school on the main road that PLB Construction wish to locate to – there is already an issue		Accept	7

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p>with trucks and traffic going too fast past this school – currently at a 70 k/zone and not been accepted by the Council to change this any lower. We have a fear for the school children, as previously identified to the council, that there may be an impact sooner or later. The increased traffic passed a rural school is not an ideal situation at all as the school uses the Ohinewai Road for their physical activities currently e.g. school runs, bike roads, etc. The Environment: The property submitted by PBL Construction to move to Industrial is a site that is below the existing water table from the Waikato River. To build this land up to an acceptable height will be a huge impact on the people living there. The concern is also for the impact on the environment – the water table is high along the properties between the Waikato River and the Highway – there is a very real concern about run-off and impact to the Waikato River as the water currently runs to the River, not away from it. Also, the soil on the Western side of the express way is dominated by thin topsoil over Taupo pumice. This is highly draining, and means stock is well suited for the soil type over winter, as minimal pugging occurs. What does occur, is a water table rise, and this can lead to ponding at specific locations. And like any activity in winter, with a high water table, stock need to be wisely managed. But their assumptions are incorrect about soil type. To bring the land high enough to be developed would have a huge impact onto the community of Ohinewai with the amount of basic land infrastructure work that would need to be done. As mentioned, industrial development west of SH1, is not desired due to risks associated with development of flood risk land. Aesthetics: The community has expressed at the Blue Print meeting that they do not want to have industrial in Ohinewai with the image in Ohinewai being Industrial buildings down the SH – the Rural or Rural Country Living has been identified repetitively by the people during the Blue Print meetings as the impression the community want to have. Industrial does not align with that statement as given by the Community. Therefore OAC does not support any of this submission and request that the land change request is turned down.</p>			
<b>FS1309.6</b>	Bryan Morris	Support	Support submission point 804.1.	To allow the part of the submission that seeks additional industrial land to be provided in the Waikato District, in particularly for Huntly. The submitter identifies there is a need for more industrial land in the Waikato District to adhere to Policy 4.6.3.	Reject	7
<b>FS1207.15</b>	Ohinewai Area Committee	Oppose	Seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed.	The Ohinewai Community fed back loud and clear in the Blue Print meeting that they do not want Industrial/Heavy Industrial zoning in Ohinewai. At the follow-up meeting to the Blue Print, it was clearly stated that the Blue Print response from the community has a precedence over the submissions made to the District Plan. We expect this to be supported by WDC as they stated. The reasons for this submission not to	Accept	7

Submission number	Submitter	Support/ oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>proceed, other than the community Blue Print feedback, are: Current Zoning: The Ohinewai Area is largely rural zoned, not Country Living zoned. To change Ohinewai from Rural to Industrial/Heavy Industrial is a huge step and will be impactful to the people, the environs, the infrastructure and the way of life. Because Ohinewai is currently largely under-developed for anything other than Rural or Rural Country Living does not means to say that it has to be developed as per this submission. There are other areas available which are currently already zoned Industrial and should be explored first. Huntly already has zoned land for Industrial South of Huntly which is not utilised at all. PLB Construction: The Company making this submission are currently sited in Huntly with access to both the future North and South on/off ramps and have 2 established sites there. The owners of the company do not live in Ohinewai and will not have any adverse effects on their lifestyle- they have no vested interest in Ohinewai at all. The company has tried repetitively said they don't want it. The company wishes to have a SH1 facing business for advertising, with easy on/off ramp access which is beneficial only to the company and not to the community. The People of Ohinewai: The denizens of Ohinewai chose to live in this area due to its rural nature- to change it to Industrial is unfair on the occupants. They have expressed their response to proposed Industrial zoning at the Blue Print meeting where Rural Country Living was identified as the preferred option- to keep Ohinewai in line with the lifestyle of places like Tamahere. Because Ohinewai is on the main trunk line and is seen to be desired location for Industrial businesses, this is not the request of the people. The School: There is a school on the main road that PLB Construction wish to locate to- there is already an issue with trucks and traffic going too fast past this school- currently at 70km zone and not been accepted by the Council to change this any lower. We have a fear for the school children, as previously identified to the council, that there may be an impact sooner or later. The increased traffic passed a rural school is not an ideal situation at all as the school uses the Ohinewai Road for their physical activities currently e.g. school runs, bike roads etc. The environment: The property submitted by PBL Construction to move to Industrial is a site that is below the existing water table from the Waikato River. To build this land up to an acceptable height will be a huge impact on the people living here. The concern is also for the impact on the environment- the water table is high along the properties between the Waikato River and the highway- there is a very real concern about run-off and the impact to the Waikato River as the water currently runs to the River, not away from it. Also, the soil on the Western side of the expressway is dominated by</p>		

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				thin topsoil over Taupo pumice. This is highly draining, and means stock is well suited for the soils type over winter, as minimal pugging occurs. What does occur, is a water table rise, and this can lead to ponding at specific locations. And like any activity in winter, with a high water table, stock need to be wisely managed. But their assumptions are incorrect about soil type. To bring the land high enough to be developed would have a huge impact onto the community at Ohinewai with the amount of basic land infrastructure work that would need to be done. As mentioned, industrial development west of SH1, is not desired due to risks associated with development of flood risk land. Aesthetics: The community has expressed at the Blue Print meeting that they do not want to have Industrial in Ohinewai with the image in Ohinewai being Industrial buildings down the SH- the Rural or Rural Country Living has been identified repetitively by the people during the Blue Print meetings as the impression the community want to have. Industrial does not align with that statement as given by the community. Therefore OAC does not support any of this submission and request that the land change request is turned down.		
412.1	David Saxton	Neutral/Amend	Require the Department of Corrections to maintain all mitigation plantings associated with Springhill Prison for as long as the prison exists. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to apply a "Significant Natural Area" map annotation to the native plantings at Springhill Prison.	The Department of Corrections was directed by the consenting authorities to mitigate the impact of the prison on the landscape by extensive planting that is maintained for as long as the prison exists.	Reject	7
FS1210.1	Ara Poutama Aotearoa (Department of Corrections)	Oppose	The Department seeks that the whole of submission 412.1 be disallowed.	The requirement to maintain and protect planting is already confirmed through the designation ("P1") conditions applicable to the Spring Hill Corrections Facility- including conditions 6.1 and 6.2. These conditions act in the same way as resource consent conditions and are thus able to be monitored and enforced by the Council where compliance is not achieved. Any additional level of protection is unnecessary.	Accept	7
697.347	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend the purpose and status of the objectives in Chapter 1 Introduction. AND Add a stand-alone chapter containing all of the strategic objectives.	The Introduction chapter is unclear in its purpose and is unclear in its legal effect. The Introduction chapter contains strategic objectives but it is not clear whether these are part of the Plan or have more of an advisory role and status. The Introduction contains strategic objectives but if they are to be Objectives, they would benefit from more visibility in the plan through creation of a new strategic objectives chapter.	Accept	7
FS1323.1	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	That a revised version of the chapter is circulated for submitter consideration and approval.	HNZPT understands the WaiDC/WRC interest to variously amend the Chapter to provide increased clarity regarding the content and status of Chapter 1, delete unnecessary text, and seeks separation of material into standalone chapters. However, HNZPT is unclear how this would impact and influence the remaining content of the WaiDC PDP, in particular the implications for the management of Historic Heritage	Reject	7

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1202.30	New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Support submission point 697.347.	The requested changes would make the plan simpler to use.	Accept	7
FS1291.15	Havelock Village Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	HVL supports amendments to improve the readability and clarity of the Plan. But the amendments sought by the submitter are unclear. The PWDP already contains objectives in each chapter so it appears inappropriate and unnecessary to introduce a separate chapter just for objectives.	Reject	7
FS1384.42	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury A	Oppose		At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	7
FS1308.109	The Surveying Company	Support		We support this submission and agree with the reasons for the decision sought.	Accept	7
FS1377.216	Havelock Village Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	HVL supports amendments to improve the readability and clarity of the Plan. But the amendments sought by the submitter are unclear. The PWDP already contains objectives in each chapter so it appears inappropriate and unnecessary to introduce a separate chapter just for objectives.	Reject	7
923.91	Waikato District Health Board	Neutral/Amend	Amend Chapter 1 to more clearly state the strategic objectives and policies in each policy chapter, and identify how they relate to each other and the issues.	Several chapters in the Plan include strategic objectives and policies, and the relationship between these and what might be termed non-strategic objectives and policies and resource management issues identified in Chapter 1 is not clear. Within Chapter 1 the relationship between the various strategic provisions within 1.4, 1.5 and 1.12 is unclear, in particular whether there is a hierarchy between these provisions.	Accept	7
FS1384.69	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury A	Oppose		• At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure perspective. • Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure	Reject	7

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
<b>FS1308.168</b>	The Surveying Company	Support		If the strategic objectives are objectives that form part of the planning cascade this needs to be clear. The purpose of these objectives needs to be identified as they may not be relevant to all planning applications. We support this submission and agree with the reasons for the decision sought.	Accept	7
<b>FS1377.293</b>	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support in part.	HVL supports amendments that will increase the functionality and clarity of Chapter 1 but opposes any substantial changes that are inconsistent with its primary submission.	Accept	7
345.7	Brent Trail	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.4.1.5 RD1(a) Rural Hamlet Subdivision, to replace the word "lot" with "record of title".	The interchangeability between "lot" and "record of title" is confusing and incorrect. A lot is a separately surveyed and marked piece of contiguous land, whereas a record of title may be comprised of one or more lots.	Accept	7
482.10	Hill Country Farmers Group	Neutral/Amend	Delete the limits on volume, area and cuts in Rule 22.2.3.4 PI Earthworks within Landscape and Natural Character Areas, for the purpose of maintaining existing farming infrastructure. AND Amend Rule 22.2.3.4 PI Earthworks within Landscape and Natural Character Areas to permit earthworks, for new infrastructure such as fencing, tracks and drains.	Regular and complete maintenance of tracks is essential to meet health and safety requirements.	Accept in part	7
662.49	Blue Wallace surveyors	Neutral/Amend	Amend structure plans to avoid placing roads that will span different boundaries.	No reasons provided.		7
286.34	Waikato Tainui	Neutral/Amend	Not Stated	Amend the Proposed District Plan to re-instate deferred zoning to a point in time when Waikato District Council have clarity around their wastewater infrastructure and are not reliant on outdated technology that is currently causing negative environmental outcomes.	Reject	7
<b>FS1035.40</b>	Pareoranga Te Kata	Support	Support	Support the submission in full.	Reject	7
<b>FS1176.45</b>	Watercare Services Ltd	Support	Support		Reject	7
<b>FS1261.36</b>	Annie Chen	Oppose	Oppose	Reject submission point and do not re-instate any form of deferred zoning that previously existed.	Accept	7
<b>FS1297.46</b>	CSL Trust & Top End Properties Limited	Oppose	Oppose	Reject submission points and do not re-instate any form of deferred zoning that previously existed.	Accept	7
493.17	Jackie Colliar	Neutral/Amend	Amend the Proposed District Plan to re instate deferred zoning to a point in time when Waikato District Council have clarity around their infrastructure and how the areas will be serviced.	The Proposed Waikato District Plan 'live zones' or assigns Residential Zoning to areas of land that were previously Rural Zoned/Future Urban/Deferred Zones. For most of this land there is uncertainty around infrastructure timing and funding and structure planning is yet to be undertaken. Given the wastewater issues that the Waikato District Council currently have and are facing in the future, it seems almost impossible that Waikato District Council infrastructure will be able to cope with the live zoning of the district. The submitter is concerned that live zoning will create an expectation, that the Waikato River will absorb greater volumes of wastewater and stormwater discharge, an expectation that is contrary to and does not give effect	Reject	7

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				to the Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River. The submitter strongly opposes this proposition and believe deferred zoning is required in most if not all locations that cannot be catered for through existing infrastructure.		
FSI035.70	Pareoranga Te Kata	Support	Agree and support the whole submission.	• Engage with Waikato Tainui and mana whenua to ensure that the Tainui Environmental Plan Tai Tunu, Tai Pari, Tai Ao and marae environmental plans have been included in the Waikato District Plan.	Reject	7
FSI176.95	Watercare Services Ltd	Support		Watercare supports this submission point and has submitted in opposition regarding the amount of live zoned land proposed in the PWDP.	Reject	7
FSI261.37	Annie Chen	Oppose	Reject submission point and do not reinstate any form of deferred zoning that previously existed.	It is likely that any new land identified for Residential zoning in the proposed plan can be serviced to the satisfaction of the Council and as such should be retained to accommodate the immense future growth of the Waikato District. No form of deferred zoning is present in the proposed District Plan.	Accept	7
FSI297.47	CSL Trust & Top End Properties Limited	Oppose	Reject submission points and do not re-instate any form of deferred zoning that previously existed.	It is likely that any new land identified for Residential zoning in the proposed plan can be serviced to the satisfaction of the Council and as such should be retained to accommodate the immense future growth of the Waikato District. No form of deferred zoning is present in the proposed District Plan.	Accept	7
FSI108.120	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)	Support		Amend to reinstate deferred zoning until a point in time that WDC have clarify regarding infrastructure and how areas will be serviced.	Reject	7
FSI139.108	Turangawaewae Trust Board	Support		Amend to reinstate deferred zoning until a point in time that WDC have clarified regarding infrastructure and how areas will be serviced.	Reject	7
<b>Mapping</b>						
81.137	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend maps to show identified Neighbourhood Centres within the planning maps and not only on master and structure plans.	The submitter seeks clarity that Neighbourhood Centres will be depicted on the Planning maps, and not only on master and structure plans. The submission also states that WRC supports Policy 4.5.7 in principal but subject to the relief sought.	Reject	8
FSI377.31	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	HVL seeks to include a new Neighbourhood Centre within the Havelock Village and so supports showing this on the planning maps.	Accept	8
280.3	Peter Nation for New Zealand National Fieldays Society Inc	Not Stated	Amend the Proposed District Plan to include a noise contour for Mystery Creek Events Centre to align with the noise contour in the Operative Waipa District Plan. AND Add the rules from the Waipa District Plan (see Appendix E attached to the submission).	Waipa District Council have a Mystery Creek Noise Contour. Noise contour stops at boundary between the Waipa and Waikato Districts. Noise contour does not stop in logical location. Refer to Appendix F for an example map of an appropriate noise contour. Consistency of approach with the Waipa District Plan.	Reject	8
FSI386.290	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose		At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk	Accept	8

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				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.		
410.1	Trevor Weaver	Oppose	Amend Planning Map 14.5 for Rangiriri so that it indicates the canal/drain running from Lake Kopuera to Rangiriri Stream and the weir located beside this lake.	Notified planning map 14.5 for Rangiriri does not show a canal/drain that runs from Lake Kopuera to the Rangiriri Stream or the weir located beside this lake.	Reject	8
410.4	Trevor Weaver	Neutral/Amend	Amend Planning Map 14.5 Rangiriri to correct the boundaries of the submitter's property at Te Onetea Road so the farm boundaries align with the main trunk railway line and Lake Kopuera and include the swamp/bush from the lake to the railway line.	The planning maps showing the location of the farm are wrong.	Reject	8
FS1272.2	KiwiRail Holdings Ltd	Oppose		Any changes that may affect the railway corridor need to be agreed between the submitter and KiwiRail.	Accept	8
510.4	Bob Carter	Neutral/Amend	Amend planning maps to provide clearer symbols; AND Amend planning maps to not have overlays on top of one another.	It is very hard to differentiate between overlays and items on the legend. It is very hard to differentiate between mapped items including on the online maps.	Accept	8
FS1388.529	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose		At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	8
524.33	Anna Noakes	Neutral/Amend	Amend the Proposed District Planning maps (inclusive of Legend) to provide explanation as to what is meant by Stage 1.	There is no explanation as to what is meant by Stage 1.	Reject	8
FS1388.632	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose		At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and	Accept	8

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
598.23	Withers Family Trust	Oppose	Amend the Proposed District Plan (including planning maps) to explain what is meant by Stage I.	There is no explanation that the notified planning maps (including the legend) relate to Stage I of the review process.	Reject	8
<b>FS1388.1019</b>	<i>Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E</i>	Oppose		At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	8
680.249	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Delete all notified overlays on the Proposed District Plan planning maps which are identified over private land. The relief sought specifically relates to the overlays listed on the Waikato Proposed Plan Legend as: Natural character Environmental Protection Area Significant Amenity Landscapes Significant Natural Area Outstanding Natural Landscapes Outstanding Natural Feature Walkway Cycleway Bridleway Maori Site of Significance Maori Area of Significance AND Any consequential changes needed to give effect to this relief.	This relief sought is required as a consequential amendment to address the serious concerns which have been raised throughout this submission. The process used to identify and map these overlays onto private land has not been sufficiently robust to have any confidence in the accuracy of the data which has been mapped. This is particularly important to get right given the degree of regulation proposed to be applied over these respective areas. Submitter supports the principle of a planning approach that seeks to identify areas of national importance and consider that a targeted planning response is more appropriate than general catch all rules. The submitter considers that this plan has been notified prematurely before essential quality control work has been undertaken. Further frustrations relate to the consultation process. It is the submitters understanding that many affected parties are either not aware nor understand the implications of these overlays being mapped onto their properties. The submitter considers that Council has not been particularly proactive during the consultation process and it can be argued that affected parties will be disheartened that the pre-notification consultation ended up being ineffective.	Reject	8
<b>FS1307.7</b>	New Zealand Walking Access Commission	Oppose	WAC is not supportive of this amendment proposed by decorated Farmers to remove overlays on private land, including the walkway/cycleway/bridleway overlay. Such overlays are important for provision of a range of public goods- including landscape scale connectivity for active transport, recreation, enjoyment and active stewardship of the environment.		Accept	8
<b>FS1051.16</b>	Colette Shona Hanrahan	Support	Seek that the whole of the submission be allowed.	As Federated Farmers NZ states, the process used to identify and map these overlays onto private land has not been sufficiently robust to have any confidence in	Reject	8

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				the accuracy of the data which has been mapped. It is particularly important to get it right, given the degree of regulation proposed to be applied over these respective areas. Further frustrations definitely relate to the consultation process. Council has definitely not been proactive during the consultation process.		
<b>FS1108.78</b>	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)	Oppose		Inappropriate addition.	Accept	8
<b>FS1139.69</b>	Turangawaewae Trust Board	Oppose		Inappropriate addition.	Accept	8
<b>FS1198.53</b>	Bathurst Resources Limited and BT Mining Limited	Support	The submission point be allowed in full.	For the reasons given in the original submission.	Reject	8
<b>FS1275.18</b>	Zeala Limited trading as Aztech Buildings	Support	Allow.	As per the submission, the identification and correct mapping of the areas identified in the overlays appears to have been 'rushed' with in some cases either the specific characteristics of the site incorrectly identified, and/or mapped incorrectly. The incorrect identification of sites may well trigger the need for consent when otherwise non would be required.	Reject	8
<b>FS1369.18</b>	Ngati Tamaoho Trust	Oppose		This submission has a number of unreasonable requests, namely the removal of SNAs and SALs. While it is accepted that some areas identified may not contain native vegetation and other criteria pertaining to the overlay, it would be considered a mistake to remove them for the Proposed District Plan, instead they should remain and be assessed on a case by case basis as required.	Accept	8
<b>FS1369.24</b>	Ngati Tamaoho Trust	Oppose	Oppose	This submission has a number of unreasonable requests, namely the removal of SNA and SAL (Significant Amenity Landscapes and Significant Natural Areas). While it is accepted that some areas identified may not contain native vegetation and other criteria pertaining to the overlay, it would be considered a mistake to remove them for the proposed District Plan, instead they should remain and be assessed on a case by case basis as required. The submitter made many recommendations to have the insertion of "except in the rural zone" inserted into the Plan. This is not supported, Rural land owners have a responsibility for neighbouring and downstream properties.	Accept	8
<b>FS1385.25</b>	Mercury Limited NZ for Mercury B	Oppose		At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure perspective. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy	Accept	8

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
<b>FS1323.148</b>	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	That the relief sought by the submitter is declined.	The removal of the overlays from the Planning maps will result in a lack of protection for cultural heritage therefore the WaiDC PDP will not give effect to s6 and s7 of the RMA.	Accept	8
<b>FS1340.113</b>	TaTa Valley Limited	Oppose	Oppose in part.	The submitter is supportive in principle of the use of overlays within a District Plan, however has concerns where mapping of overlays is inaccurate. All high value areas identified in the plan should accurately reflect the relevant values and meet the relevant criteria. Area that do not meet the relevant criteria should be excluded from the relevant overlay. The provisions relating to overlays also need to anticipate an appropriate level of development and acknowledge existing uses.	Accept	8
<b>FS1377.194</b>	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support in part.	All high value areas identified in the plan should accurately reflect the relevant values and meet the relevant criteria. Areas that do not meet the relevant criteria should be excluded from the relevant overlay. The provisions relating to overlays also need to anticipate an appropriate level of development and acknowledge existing uses.	Reject	8
695.3	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Add those sites to which Sections 1.7.2.1(a), 1.7.3.1 and 1.7.3.5 are relevant as a planning overlay on the Planning Maps.	This would assist applicants for when a resource consent application is required to supply a statement of relevance to this document where it may potentially affect the rohe. Not all sites listed in the Waikato River Catchment would be relevant, as some are many kilometres from the river or key tributaries.	Reject	8
<b>FS1323.149</b>	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Support	That the amendment is accepted subject to review for suitability by Mana Whenua.	HNZPT welcomes additions to the planning maps of additional sites subject to the review and agreement from Mana Whenua and relevant consultation.	Reject	8
695.55	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Add a list of all known sites where Hazardous Activities and Industries List activities are understood to have occurred on the Planning Maps.	Waipa District Council does this.	Reject	8
<b>FS1168.174</b>	Horticulture New Zealand	Oppose	Reject submission.	Identifying all known HAIL sites on the planning maps is not necessary.	Accept	8
695.111	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Oppose	Amend the planning maps to reduce the number of planning overlays that undertake similar functions and group them, particularly landscape, features and character overlays.	Simplicity is best.	Accept	8
<b>FS1223.206</b>	Mercury NZ Limited	Oppose	Mercury seeks that the submission point is disallowed.	Mercury has an interest in the submission points listed in paragraphs 11.1 and 11.2 above. Mercury supports the protection of outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes in the context of section 6(b) of the RMA, where there has been a robust expert assessment undertaken to describe the values	Reject	8

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				supporting an assessment of what is outstanding. The Waikato RPS Table 12.2 sets out factors that District Councils are to consider when undertaking such an assessment. Mercury considers that such a robust assessment has not been undertaken as part of the preparation of the PWDP.		
697.339	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend map legend on all maps to ensure layers are able to be interpreted easily.	Ensure the map legend is easily interpreted and clear for plan users so as to not generate confusion.	Accept	8
<b>FS1108.5</b>	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)	Support		Support accuracy and consistency of mapping.	Accept	8
<b>FS1139.5</b>	Turangawaewae Trust Board	Support		Support accuracy and consistency of mapping.	Accept	8
<b>FS1387.536</b>	Mercury Limited NZ for Mercury D	Oppose		At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	8
697.340	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend labels on planning maps to avoid repetition. For example on some maps, stream names are repeated several times.	Ensure the planning maps do not repeat labels where not necessary.	Accept	8
697.341	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Planning Maps to create additional spatial extents on planning maps to correspond to certain activities (i.e. landscape rules, specific noise areas etc).	Ensure rules that have specific purposes are spatially mapped making the areas easier to identify on the planning maps. This would enable Council to group certain activities together and have one spatial extent to be more specifically targeted. It will also enable better plan usability for the customer.	Accept	8
<b>FS1387.537</b>	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose		At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and	Reject	8

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
765.2	Tamahere Eventide Home Trust on behalf of Atawhai Assisi Retirement Village	Support	Retain the proposed overlays as notified identified in Planning Maps for Tamahere Eventide Retirement Village and the surrounding properties in the immediate area at 621 State Highway One (Lot 2 DPS 88165), 0 State Highway One (Lot 1 DPS 88165) and 597 State Highway One (Pt Lot 2 DPS 2182).	The submission identifies the following policy overlays/areas as applicable to Tamahere Eventide Site: - Significant Natural Area - Waikato River Catchment - Walkway Cycle way Bridleway - Airport Noise Subdivision Control Boundary, - Airport Obstacle Limitation Surface, - Airport Noise Outer Control Boundary, - Hamilton Basis Ecological Management. Land immediately west of Tamahere Eventide is a designated site (Waikato Expressway).	Accept	8
FS1385.48	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury B	Oppose		At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure perspective. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is 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
766.33	Nicky Hogarth for Holcim (New Zealand) Limited	Oppose	Delete the Aggregate Extraction Area Overlay once quarrying activities have ceased, including the site at 611 Ridge Road, Bombay. AND Any additional or consequential relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	The Overlay affects future subdivision/building platforms only within the vicinity of the overlay and is not associated with any more enabling provisions for extraction itself. Overlay applies to part Waikato Pit, which has currently ceased extraction. Submitter is in the process of winding down aggregate extraction on its landholdings and is moving towards rehabilitation, therefore it is requested that the Aggregate Extraction Area is 'lifted' or no longer applies once extraction activities cease to ensure future activities are not unnecessarily restricted by the overlay.	Reject	8
797.39	Fonterra Limited	Oppose	Amend the Planning maps to identify the extent of the Te Rapa Dairy Manufacturing Facility Noise Control Boundary (See submission for map). AND Any consequential amendments or further relief to give effect to the concerns raised in the submission.	The amendment will identify the extent of the Te Rapa Dairy Manufacturing Facility Noise Control Boundary.	Reject	8
FS1387.1277	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose		At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and	Accept	8

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				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.		
807.3	Pukekohe Motorcycle Club	Oppose	Add a Noise Control Boundary overlay to the land surrounding the track at 115 Geraghty Maber Road, Tuakau, with a distance of at least 500m and taking into account the noise generated from the track. Submitter seeks a similar approach to the Noise Control Boundary over the Waikato Gun Club at 556 Holland Road, Eureka, where a Noise Control Boundary was added to the Operative District Plan Maps. AND Any further or consequential relief to give effect to the relief sought in the submission.	This accords with Policy 5.3.15(a)(vi) of the Proposed Plan The current Proposed Plan does not promote sustainable management of resources, will not achieve the purpose of the RMA and are contrary to Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA; The current Proposed Plan will not enable the social and economic wellbeing of the community in the Waikato region The current Proposed Plan does not represent the most appropriate means of exercising the Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means.	Reject	8
FS1200.3	Gerardus Aarts & Yvonne Gemma Aarts	Support	Support in part.	The submitter seeks a 500m noise control boundary. No analysis is provided as to why this distance should be applied. It is our opinion that the noise control boundary should be determined through an acoustic assessment to assess the noise level contours. From this assessment, the noise control boundary could be added to the planning maps and acoustic insulation (or other measures identified by the acoustic specialist) required within the buffer through the planning rules. We agree in principal with addition of a noise control boundary as outlined by the submitter. The addition of a noise control boundary to the planning maps is a suitable method to minimise the potential for reverse sensitivity while maintaining residential zoning. The noise control boundary would be identifiable on the GIS maps and any LIM which would alert potential landowners to the location of the Motocross facility and any planning requirements avoiding the requirement. We would like a change to review the submitters acoustic assessment required to assess the noise level contours that should form the basis of any noise control boundary.	Reject	8
939.3	David Totman on behalf of Waipa District Council	Oppose	Amend the planning maps to show the matching noise contour around the Mystery Creek Event Centre that matches that of the Waipa District Plan (See map provided in the submission).	The Operative Waipa District Planning Maps have a noise contour around Mystery Creek Event Centre. This contour ends abruptly at the Waikato River and is not matched in the Proposed Waikato District Plan Maps on the north side of the Waikato River and adjacent to the Mystery Creek Event Centre.	Reject	8
FS1387.1559	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose		At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and	Accept	8

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				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.		
942.67	Angeline Greensill for Tainui o Tainui	Neutral/Amend	Amend the planning maps to indicate where access is available in the district and where it is not due to private property.	This information should be appended to the Proposed District Plan and made available at the information centres that service the communities. Tainui lands around Raglan and Karioi are accessed daily by an increasing number of locals. Tourists freedom camp and walk uninvited with their dogs through both Whaanga, and Te Kopua properties. Despite signage, this behaviour continues.	Reject	8
845.3	Grace M Wilcock	Not Stated	Amend to confirm that the Rosebanks/Windmill gullies are a joined corridor with no gap between 152 Rosebanks Drive and 117 Windmill Road, Hamilton.	The proposed new maps show the Rosebanks/Windmill gullies as a joined corridor with no gap. Require confirmation that this is correct.	Reject	8
<b>Definitions</b>						
578.49	Ports of Auckland Limited	Support	Retain the definition of "Hazardous substances" in Chapter 13 Definitions, as notified.	Support the definition as notified.	Accept	9
<b>FS1388.853</b>	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose		At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	9
738.8	Shand Properties Limited	Oppose	Amend definition of "contaminated land" in Chapter 13: Definitions to refer to standards and or mapped locations.	The "contaminated land" definition refers to the Resource Management Act definition. This does not include any objective standards but requires a judgement to be made on effects. Given that this definition determines which rules apply to subdivision it could create uncertainty and difficulties in implementation.	Reject	9
<b>FS1089.1</b>	Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Limited and Mobil Oil NZ Limited for 'Oil Companies'	Support	Submission point 738.8 is opposed.	The Oil Companies did not submit on the definition of 'contaminated land.' However, the Oil Companies lodged submissions in support of the Objective (10.2.1) and the Policy (10.2.2) for contaminated land (submission points 785.9 and 785.10). The Oil Companies seek the retention of the definition of 'contaminated land' in so far as the term has the same meaning as the in the RMA 1991. Therefore, the Oil Companies oppose the approach by the submitter to amend the definition of contaminated land to refer to standards or mapped locations and seek retention of the definition as proposed.	Reject	9

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1349.11	Allen Fabrics Ltd.	Support	Support submission point 738.8 as submitted.	The area is partially in use now as lifestyle residential. Direct access to the Huntly's commercial area without having to use the expressway will give the town a much needed boost.	Reject	9
FS1342.197	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow submission point 738.8 until Stage 2 has been completed.	FFNZ understands the intent of the submission however; we consider it important for the Stage 2 process to be completed first. This will ensure there an accepted and agreed planning response for these areas.	Accept	9
FS1387.830	Mercury Limited NZ for Mercury D	Oppose		At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	9
742.67	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Neutral/Amend	Amend Proposed District Plan to ensure all terms are defined as appropriate. AND Request any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the submission.	The Proposed District Plan uses a large number of terms which are not defined and are critical to the interpretation of plan provisions. For example 'rural activities', 'rural areas', 'urban areas'.	Accept in part	9
419.24	Jordyn Landers for Horticulture New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Amend the definition of 'Vegetation Clearance' in Chapter 13 Definitions, to exclude clearance related to a rapid biosecurity response. Specific amendments are outlined elsewhere in the submission. OR Add a new clause (viii) to Rule 22.2.8 PI Indigenous vegetation clearance outside a Significant Natural Area, as follows: (a) Indigenous vegetation clearance outside a Significant Natural Area identified on the planning maps or in Schedule 30.5 (Urban Allotment Significant Natural Areas) must be for the following purposes: ... (viii) removal of vegetation for pest management and biosecurity works. AND Any consequential or additional amendments as a result of changes sought in the submission.	The submitter has sought an amendment to the definition of "vegetation clearance" to exclude clearance related to a rapid biosecurity response. The submitter requests this additional clause (viii) if the requested amendment to this definition is rejected.	Accept in part	9
FS1171.19	Phoebe Watson for Barker & Associates on behalf of T&G Global	Support	Allow the submission.	This submission is supported. This submission seeks to enable vegetation removal within Significant Natural Areas for rapid biosecurity response which is supported given the significance of a biosecurity risk to rural production activities, including the production of food crops.	Accept in part	9
FS1342.112	Federated Farmers	Support	Allow submission point 419.24.	FFNZ support the submitter's relief in addition to its own relief sought for this rule for the same reasons as the FFNZ submission on this rule.	Accept in part	9
574.23	TaTa Valley Limited	Oppose	Add a definition to Chapter 13 Definitions for "Outdoor Recreation", as follows: Physical activity undertaken in	Definition will enable these types of activities to be identified and referred to within the Resort Zone.	Reject	9

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			outdoors or natural settings to connect to the outside environment and whose primary aim is the enjoyment of leisure. Activities include: Walking and cycling, bush walks, bird watching, mini golf, paintball, zip lining, golf driving range. AND Any consequential amendments and other relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.			
<b>FS1223.95</b>	Mercury NZ Limited	Support		At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure perspective. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is 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	9
<b>FS1301.65</b>	New Zealand Health Food Park Limited	Support	Support the submission in its entirety.	TaTa Valley Limited controls land in southern Pokeno at 242 Bluff Road, Pokeno. TaTa Valley's submission is to amend the plan to enable the development of its site into a major tourism destination, known as the "TaTa Valley Resort." Health Food Park supports the improved tourism offerings that this will provide for the area, This is turn brings more consumers to the area, showcase New Zealand's rural character and significantly enrich the region socially and economically.	Reject	9
<b>FS1303.65</b>	Charlie Harris	Support	I also support the original submission by Ta Ta Valley Limited in its entirety.	Ta Ta Valley Limited controls land in southern Pokeno at 242 Bluff Road, Pokeno. TaTa Valley's submission is to amend the plan to enable the development of its site into a major tourism destination, known as the "Ta Ta Valley Resort". I Support the improved tourism offerings that this will provide for the area, showcase New Zealand rural character and significantly enrich the region socially and economically.	Reject	9
<b>FS1306.20</b>	Hynds Foundation	Support	Support.	Hynds Foundation support the inclusion of definitions that relate to Outdoor Recreation and Recreation Facility, this could be further refined to include an Informal Recreation also as per the Auckland Unitary Plan definition.	Reject	9
697.372	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Add to Chapter 13: Definitions a new definition for "Caretaker accommodation" as follows: Caretaker accommodation Means within the Industrial or Industrial Zone Heavy, one residential unit per site for the purposes of providing on-site security and monitoring.	This activity is sought to be included in the industrial Zones, and as a consequential amendment a definition would be helpful to provide clarity as to what the activity is.	Reject	9
<b>FS1340.122</b>	TaTa Valley Limited	Support	Support in part.	The submitter supports in part submission 697.372 as a caretaker is often required for some activities. However, the submitter opposes the restriction of this only applying to the Industrial and the Industrial Zone	Reject	9

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				Heavy and is of the opinion that it should apply to all zones within the district.		
<b>FS1387.548</b>	Mercury Limited Mercury D NZ for	Oppose		At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	9
732.8	Lucy Smith for Terra Firma Resources Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend the definition of "Commercial activity (Te Kauwhata Lakeside Precinct)", by adding text as follows: Commercial activity (Te Kauwhata Lakeside Precinct and Residential Puketirini Area) Means a community activity that relates to the Te Kauwhata Lakeside Precinct Plan area or the Residential Puketirini Area and involves the use of land and buildings that provide for individual or community health, welfare, care, safety, recreation, cultural, ceremonial, spiritual, and art and cultural purposes. It includes any preschool or education facility, place of worship, community hall or centre or recreation facility.	The broader range of community activities permitted in the Puketirini Area is appropriate to provide flexibility as to what might establish there.	Reject	9
574.15	TaTa Valley Limited		Chapter 13 Definitions or "Special Event", as follows: A temporary event that exceeds the permitted noise standard of the Resort Zone. AND Any consequential amendments and other relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	The definition will enable these types of activities to be identified and referred to within the Resort Zone.	Reject	9
<b>FS1108.92</b>	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)		Oppose	Inappropriate amendment.	Accept	9
<b>FS1139.83</b>	Turangawaewae Trust Board		Oppose	Inappropriate amendment.	Accept	9
<b>FS1301.57</b>	New Zealand Health Food Park Limited		Support	TaTa Valley Limited controls land in southern Pokeno at 242 Bluff Road, Pokeno. TaTa Valley's submission is to amend the plan to enable the development of its site into a major tourism destination, known as the "TaTa Valley Resort." Health Food Park supports the improved tourism offerings that this will provide for the area, This is turn brings more consumers to the area, showcase New Zealand's rural character and significantly enrich the region socially and economically.	Reject	9
<b>FS1303.57</b>	Charlie Harris		Support	Ta Ta Valley Limited controls land in southern Pokeno at 242 Bluff Road, Pokeno. TaTa Valley's submission is to amend the plan to enable the development of its site	Reject	9

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				into a major tourism destination, known as the "Ta Ta Valley Resort". I Support the improved tourism offerings that this will provide for the area, showcase New Zealand rural character and significantly enrich the region socially and economically.		
574.25	TaTa Valley Limited		Chapter 13 Definitions, for "Entertainment Facility", as follows: A facility used for entertainment, including: cinema, showground, performance/cultural venue. AND Any consequential amendments and other relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	This definition will enable these facilities to be identified and referred to within the Resort Zone.	Reject	9
FS1301.67	New Zealand Health Food Park Limited	Support		TaTa Valley Limited controls land in southern Pokeno at 242 Bluff Road, Pokeno. TaTa Valley's submission is to amend the plan to enable the development of its site into a major tourism destination, known as the "TaTa Valley Resort." Health Food Park supports the improved tourism offerings that this will provide for the area, This is turn brings more consumers to the area, showcase New Zealand's rural character and significantly enrich the region socially and economically.	Reject	9
FS1303.67	Charlie Harris	Support		Ta Ta Valley Limited controls land in southern Pokeno at 242 Bluff Road, Pokeno. TaTa Valley's submission is to amend the plan to enable the development of its site into a major tourism destination, known as the "Ta Ta Valley Resort". I Support the improved tourism offerings that this will provide for the area, showcase New Zealand rural character and significantly enrich the region socially and economically.	Reject	9
FS1388.826	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose		At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	9
574.22	TaTa Valley Limited	Neutral/Amend	Add a definition to Chapter 13 Definitions, for "Workers Accommodation", as follows: Means a dwelling for people whose duties require them to live onsite. This definition includes seasonal workers. AND Any consequential amendments and other relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	The operation of the proposed Resort and other activities is likely to require some staff to live onsite and as such, a definition is required.	Reject	9
FS1108.95	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)	Oppose		Inappropriate amendment.	Accept	9

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1139.86	Turangawaewae Trust Board	Oppose		Inappropriate amendment.	Accept	9
FS1171.61	Phoebe Watson for Barker & Associates on behalf of T&G Global	Support	Allow the submission to extent consistent with this further submission.	This submission proposes a definition of workers accommodation. This submission is supported to the extent that such a definition would assist with the application of a rule providing for worker accommodation for those reasons provided for in the submission by T & G Global.	Reject	9
FS1301.64	New Zealand Health Food Park Limited	Support	Support the submission in its entirety.	TaTa Valley Limited controls land in southern Pokeno at 242 Bluff Road, Pokeno. TaTa Valley's submission is to amend the plan to enable the development of its site into a major tourism destination, known as the "TaTa Valley Resort." Health Food Park supports the improved tourism offerings that this will provide for the area, This is turn brings more consumers to the area, showcase New Zealand's rural character and significantly enrich the region socially and economically.	Reject	9
FS1303.64	Charlie Harris	Support	I also support the original submission by Ta Ta Valley Limited in its entirety.	Ta Ta Valley Limited controls land in southern Pokeno at 242 Bluff Road, Pokeno. TaTa Valley's submission is to amend the plan to enable the development of its site into a major tourism destination, known as the "Ta Ta Valley Resort". I Support the improved tourism offerings that this will provide for the area, showcase New Zealand rural character and significantly enrich the region socially and economically.	Reject	9
FS1348.16	Perry International Trading Group Limited	Support		PITGL supports the inclusion of a new definition for "Workers accommodation", however suggest an amendment as follows: 'Farm Workers accommodation' Accommodation for people whose duties require them to live on-site, and in the rural zones for people who work on the site or in the surrounding rural area. The proposed wording acknowledges that a broader range of activities in the Rural Zone can require accommodation or people whose duties require them to live on-site. PITGL also request that in addition to the amendments sought above, 'worker accommodation' should become a permitted activity in the Rural Zone, subject to the appropriate standards.	Reject	9
FS1388.825	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose		At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and	Accept	9

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
578.79	Ports of Auckland Limited		Add the definition of "Sensitive land use" as follows: Sensitive land use Means an education facility including a childcare facility, waananga and koohanga reo, a residential activity <u>excluding worker's accommodation</u> , ... AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make alternative or consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.	Exclude worker's accommodation from the definition of sensitive land uses. Without the amendment sought, workers accommodation within the Industrial Zone will require resource consent as sensitive land uses.	Reject	9
FS1269.51	Housing New Zealand Corporation		Oppose	Housing New Zealand opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission.	Accept	9
FS1171.116	Phoebe Watson for Barker & Associates on behalf of T&G Global		Allow the submission.	This submission seeks to specifically exclude workers accommodation from the definition of sensitive land use. This submission is supported in so far as it is consistent with T & G Global's submission. Workers accommodation is not sensitive to rural activities in the same way as other residential activities are because rural workers are aware of and familiar with the effects associated with rural production activities.	Reject	9
FS1388.867	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E		Oppose	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	9
578.43	Ports of Auckland Limited		Add clause (f) to the definition of "building", as follows: Building Has the meaning in the Building Act 2004, excluding: ... (g) a structure that is permeable and less than 4 metres in height to protect crops for agricultural use.; or; <u>(f) cargo and containers associated with industrial activities within the Horotiu Industrial Park.</u> AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make alternative or consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.	The stacking of cargo and containers is a permitted activity in the Industrial Zone and will be carried out daily in the inland freight hub. Cargo and containers should be excluded from the definition of 'building'.	Reject	9
FS1388.850	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E		Oppose	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework.	Accept	9

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				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.		
578.51	Ports of Auckland Limited		Amend the definition of 'Height' in Chapter 13 Definitions as follows: Height Means, in relation to a structure, the vertical .... No account shall also be taken of: lift wells; lift towers; elevator and stair bulkheads; roof water tanks; machinery rooms; plant, including cooling towers, air-conditioning units, including any access walkways and screening directly associated with the plant; cranes; derricks; reefer gantries; cargo stacking and lifting devices; conveyors; stacking of cargo; telecommunications equipment associated with industrial activities; lighting poles and associated equipment that are ancillary to industrial activities; and aerials that are ancillary to industrial activities. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make alternative or consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.	There are a range of ancillary structures that are necessary to ensure the efficient day-to-day operation of the industrial activities, including the inland freight hub, which may have the potential to infringe the maximum permitted height control. There are a number of structures that require exclusion, those of which are noted in the amendment sought. Should not be required to obtain resource consents for these critical ancillary structures imply because they may infringe the height control. It is not an effective and efficient use of the Industrial Zoned land.	Reject	9
FS1345.1	Genesis Energy Limited		Accept submission point.	For the reasons presented in the submission.	Reject	9
FS1333.22	Fonterra Limited		Allow the relief.	For the reasons stated in the submission.	Reject	9
578.80	Ports of Auckland Limited	Not Stated	Add a definition of "Worker's accommodation" in Chapter 13 Definitions, as follows: Worker's accommodation A dwelling for people whose duties require them to live on-site, and in the rural zones for people who work on the site or in the surrounding rural area. Includes: a) accommodation for rangers; b) artists in residence; c) farm managers and workers; and d) staff. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make alternative or consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.	Provision has been sought for worker's accommodation within the Industrial Zone. A corresponding definition is therefore proposed.	Reject	9
FS1269.52	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Oppose	Oppose in part.	Housing New Zealand opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission.	Accept	9
FS1168.133	Horticulture New Zealand	Support	Accept in part.	The submitter seeks to add a definition of workers accommodation. HortNZ seeks specific recognition of seasonal worker accommodation which is a particular type of worker accommodation.	Reject	9
FS1171.117	Phoebe Watson for Barker & Associates	Support	Allow the submission.	This submission proposes a definition for workers accommodation. This submission is supported. The proposed definition recognises that workers in rural	Reject	9

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
	on behalf of T&G Global			zones may or may not work on the same site as their accommodation.		
749.50	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Neutral/Amend	Amend the definition of "Height" in Chapter 13 Definitions to add exclusions. AND Amend the definition of "Height" in Chapter 13 Definitions to include specific methods of measurements such as rolling height and/or average ground level. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan as consequential or additional relief as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission as necessary.	That the draft National Planning Standards proposed a definition for 'Height' in relation to a district plan. Housing New Zealand has made a submission to the Ministry for the Environment on the draft National Planning Standards and in doing so expressed that the definition of 'Height' was overly simplistic and requires a method of measurement to be specified and explained (i.e. rolling height and/or average ground level) as well as contain a list of exclusions. The submitter supports the proposed definition, however notes there are only one or two exclusions listed and no reference to how height is measured on a hill/rolling contours.	Reject	9
749.51	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Oppose	Delete the definition of "Height control plane" in Chapter 13 Definitions; AND Add a definition of "Recession plane" to Chapter 13 Definitions as follows: Means the height of a building or structure relative to its distance from the boundary of the site. The allowable height increases as the distance from the boundary increases up to the maximum height allowed. The Recession Plane is measured by lines that proceed at a prescribed angle (e.g. 45 degrees) from the horizontal, measured from any point at a prescribed height (e.g. 2m) vertically above ground level along site boundaries. The angle of the recessions plan and the height of the starting point vary by Zone. This control does not apply to chimneys, finials, or other similar decorative features, flues and ventilation shafts, antennas, satellite dishes with a diameter not exceeding 0.6m, flagpoles or any other similar projections not exceeding 2 metres in height and 1 square metre in area. AND Consequential or further amendments required to give effect to the new term "recession plane" replacing "height control plane".	The submitter opposes the angle degrees reference in the definition and seeks it is amended to align with changes sought to the daylight admission rules.	Reject	9
81.155	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend the definitions of "Commercial activity" and "Commercial services" to better distinguish large format from small scale activities.	These rules allow for Commercial activity and Commercial services as permitted activities in both the Business and Business Town Centre zones. Allowing the same activities to occur in both zones creates unnecessary and inappropriate competition between the Town Centre and Business Zones, and does not promote a supportive, complimentary role for them. This is not consistent with the policy approach set out in Section 4.5, which seeks to encourage a wide range of commercial activities in both zones, the town centres focusing on retail, administration, commercial and civic centre activities, the Business Zone discouraging small scale retail and focusing on large format retail. The submitter seeks clarification about the rationale behind the rules, and is concerned that they do not give proper effect to the WRPS' Policy 6.16 or the policy framework for these zones contained in Section 4.5: of the Proposed Plan.	Reject	9

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
749.36	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Neutral/Amend	Amend the definition of "commercial services" in Chapter 13 Definitions as follows: Means a business providing personal, property, financial, household, private or business services to the general public. It includes but is not limited to: a) authorised betting shops; b) copy and quick print services; c) financial and banking facilities; d) postal services; e) counter insurance services; f) dry cleaning and laundrette services; g) electrical goods repair services; h) footwear and leather goods repair services; i) hairdressing, beauty salons and barbers; j) internet and computer services; k) key cutting services; l) real estate agents and valuers; m) travel agencies, airline and entertainment booking services; n) optometrists; o) movie and game hire; and p) animal welfare and/or grooming services.; and q) government and administration services. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan as consequential or additional relief as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission as necessary.	The submitter supports the proposed definition, however notes the term is missing government administration services from the list of inclusions. It is unclear to what inclusion listed in the proposed definition would tenancy offices classify under. "It includes but is not limited to" would encompass any other commercial services that are not primarily listed under the definition.	Reject	9
FS1387.1009	Mercury Limited NZ for Mercury D	Oppose		At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	9
<b>No Specific relief sought</b>						
198.6	Katherine Wilson for Property Council New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	No specific decision sought, but submission encourages a coordinated approach between councils across the Waikato region to comply with the upcoming Ministry for the Environment's (MfE) National Planning Standards as soon as the standards are operative.	This will be a strong signal that the Waikato is open for business and plan users will have comfort in the consistency between plans across the Waikato region. If all councils were aligned in the Waikato, this would allow ease of use for the submitter's members and would likely attract new development opportunities for the region.	Reject	10
FS1269.96	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Support	Support in part.	Housing New Zealand supports the proposed amendment, to the extent it is consistent with its primary submission.	Reject	10
198.13	Katherine Wilson for Property Council New Zealand	Support	No specific decision sought, but the submission supports the monitoring of growth against the anticipated growth settlement patterns and the targets identified in Future Proof strategy and the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity.	The submitters know that as Auckland house prices continue to increase, many among the younger generation are looking to invest in and move outside of the city. The Waikato region is the natural beneficiary of this movement and the region needs to be prepared.	Reject	10

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1269.100	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Support	Support in part.	Housing New Zealand supports the proposed amendment, to the extent it is consistent with its primary submission.	Reject	10
372.1	Steve van Kampen for Auckland Council	Neutral/Amend	No specific decision sought, but submission seeks clarification over the exclusion of Chapter 11 from the Proposed Waikato District Plan.	The submission queries the value and process for a 'stage 2' plan change and how/when it will be included into the plan. The submission questions what impact a stage 2 plan change will have on provisions included in the proposed plan, particularly those relating to the implications of climate change such as developable areas, floor levels and restrictions on coastal development.	Reject	10
FS1297.1	CSL Trust & Top End Properties Limited	Not Stated	No decision sought.	Whilst further details on the implications of stage 2 on stage 1 are sought, the process of having the plan change across two stages is already well underway and as such should continue as first planned.	Reject	10
FS1388.1	Mercury Limited NZ for Mercury E	Oppose		At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	10
FS1340.48	TaTa Valley Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	The submitter considers that delaying hearing submissions on the Proposed Plan is inefficient and will lead to poor economic, environmental and social outcomes for the District. There are pressing environmental issues that need to be managed. National Planning Standards can be incorporated as required via substantive hearings.	Reject	10
FS1377.72	Havelock Village Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	Delaying hearing submissions on the Proposed Plan is inefficient and will lead to poor economic, environmental and social outcomes for the District. There are pressing environmental issues that need to be managed	Reject	10
FS1276.219	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Society Inc.	Support	WED seeks that the whole of the submission points be allowed.	For the reasons given in the submission, they would make the plan accord better with the purpose of the RMA. Climate Change is inseparable from the reset of the plan.	Reject	10
414.7	Chris Rayner	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, but submitter questions why there are 6 new cul-de-sacs in the Greenslade Road infill development, which is contrary to Policy 4.7.3(a)(iv). The submission seeks a detailed design with public consultation for the development between State Highway 23 and Greenslade Road.	No reasons provided.	Reject	10

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
695.144	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, but submission recommends that council follow the design principles of Professor Newman et al and Engwicht, in subdivision design.	No reasons provided.	Reject	10
942.45	Angeline Greensill for Tainui o Tainui	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, but the submitter opposes the commodification of the coastal space. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to classify economic development of the coast as a discretionary activity and notified.	The submitter have a MACA claim over the Whaingaroa harbour and rohe moana out to 200km. The submitter intends to enjoy the coastal space as a recreational space for whanau and visitors. Economic development brings threats which need to be planned for and notified as discretionary activities.	Reject	10
802.15	Vera van der Voorden	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, but submission expresses concern at the dearth of rental accommodation and lack of affordable housing.	The growing dearth of rental accommodation and the affordable housing issue, especially in Raglan where our tourist town needs affordable housing for its lower income employees of is a concern. The issue of housing needs to be looked into at council level. To date, all focus in Raglan has been that small part called Raglan village and seaside areas at the cost of blinding us to the potential of its outlying areas.	Reject	10
860.16	Aggregate and Quarry Association (AQA) and Straterra	Not Stated	No specific decision requested, but submission considered planning rules need to allow for fluctuating demands and periods of quarry inactivity.	Quarries sometimes sit idle due to fluctuations in demand such as post disaster situations. Needed to create an enduring industry which can respond quickly and appropriately to changes in market conditions.	Reject	10
FS1292.8	McPherson Resources Limited	Support	Allow subject to amendments sought in Fulton Hogan's original submission.	McPherson generally agree with the submission point and in particular support the inclusion of provisions which give recognition to quarries and extractive industries.	Reject	10
FS1334.8	Fulton Hogan Limited	Support	Allow subject to amendments sought in Fulton Hogan's original submission.	Fulton Hogan generally agree with these submission points and in particular support the inclusion of provisions which give recognition to quarries and extractive industries.	Reject	10
FS1332.16	Winstone Aggregates	Support	Support.	The submission point reflects the matters that affect the aggregate industry as a whole.	Reject	10
198.18	Katherine Wilson for Property Council New Zealand	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, but submission wishes to see more progress on Future Proof.	Future Proof has the potential to drive regional collaboration by monitoring and identifying land supply needs along with an agreed sequence of development over the next 50 years.	Reject	10
535.93	Lance Vervoort for Hamilton City Council	Oppose	No specific decision sought, but the submission opposes the extent of new residential zoning from Country Living Zone on Map 26.1 Horotiu, pending the satisfactory resolution of infrastructure implications, and addressing how future industrial needs in the southern areas of Waikato District will be met.	The 'live' Residential zoning at Horotiu is of concern to the submitter. It is not clear how the new growth will be serviced, and we wish to understand more about the intentions here. The proposed zoning change is directly adjacent to the City boundary and we feel it is appropriate to understand now the area will be serviced with wastewater and water supply, and how stormwater will be managed. The quantum of people living in the town could significantly increase, and given the proximity to the City, could place pressures on the City's physical and social infrastructure. Horotiu is one of the Strategic Employment Nodes in the sub-region, yet there are no plans to include any industrial growth in this	Reject	10

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				location. The submitter acknowledges that the somewhat uncertain planning situation in the adjoining part of Hamilton, being Te Awa lakes, is probably contributing to some uncertainty for the future planning of Horotiu. While the City has signalled it supports a Special Housing Area at Te Awa Lakes, this has yet to be formally gazetted and a Plan Change process is currently on hold. It is not yet clear how these proposals will progress and over what timeframe.		
FS1277.69	Waikato Regional Council	Support	Clarification of the infrastructure implications, and the supply of adequate industrial land in the Waikato District, is required.	It is anticipated that the H2A project, including the Hamilton- Waikato Spatial Plan, the Huntly Spatial Plan, and the Pokeno Spatial Plan, will inform decisions about the location, timing and form of future development. Decisions on the rezoning of land within the H2A corridor should be deferred until the relevant component of the corridor plan is complete to avoid undermining this important strategic planning process.	Reject	10
FS1313.14	Perry Group Limited	Support	Seek that the submission be disallowed, and that the proposed zoning on map 26.1 proceed in accordance with the plan as notified, and incorporating those matters raised in Perry's original submission.	The land can be adequately serviced within the planning horizon of the proposed plan. The proposed zoning will give effect to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity and will provide living opportunities for residents, providing for the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the District. The proposed Special Housing Area at Te Awa Lakes is unrelated and is subject to a separate plan change process. Horotiu is developing as an important industrial node and supporting residential areas are essential to create a sustainable mixed-use community. Sufficient infrastructure can be provided to service the land. Sufficient industrial land to enable the Council to meet their requirements to meet their requirements under the NPS on Urban Development Capacity is either zoned or sought to be zoned through the Proposed District Plan process.	Reject	10
FS1388.720	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose		At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	10
798.2	Ngati Te Ata	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, but submission considers the Proposed District Plan does not adequately cover future environmental effects.	No reason provided.	Reject	10
FS1385.59	Mercury NZ Limited	Oppose		At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate	Accept	10

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure perspective. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
<b>Issues not managed by a district plan</b>						
30.3	Henk Ensing	Neutral/Amend	No specific decision sought, but the submitter requests assistance with fencing and plants.	No reasons provided.	Reject	//
55.6	Shelley Munro	Neutral/Amend	Amend the Proposed District Plan to introduce signage to unsealed 100km/limit roads (yellow signs like on windy roads).	Safer speeds on rural gravel roads. Safer for stock, farm workers, dust pollution, farm fence damage and drivers.	Reject	//
99.1	Peter Roberts	Oppose	No specific decision sought, but submission opposes the painting of yellow no passing lines on Kaiua Road.	Expresses concern about control to beauraucrats and cops, and that ratepayers are not trusted to use roads sensibly.	Reject	//
99.2	Peter Roberts	Oppose	No specific decision sought, but submission states that Council are wasting ratepayers' money.	Council does not respect ratepayers. Council appears to be stealing rural ratepayers funds to subsidise town infrastructure. Council hires contract ecologists.	Reject	//
99.3	Peter Roberts	Oppose	No specific decision sought, but submission expresses concerns regarding the quality of Council's roading infrastructure, in particular Ratoroa Road.	Ratoroa Road is not fit for purpose. If there were to be a fatality on Rataoa Road, residents will point at Council negligence. Council has taken contributions for subdivision on this road and returned nothing. Extremely poor value for money on rates. Maybe a rates boycott of road citizens is an option.	Reject	//
134.1	Barbara Baker	Oppose	Requests removal of the recently planted trees on the roadside of Te Kowhai Road, Hamilton.	These trees will cause a traffic hazard because they grow too big and their trimming or removal is a ratepayer expense. Keeping them trimmed relies on the health of the owner and continuous ownership of the property.	Reject	//
136.1	Evelyn Ward on behalf of Ward Ranch Ltd	Oppose	Remove the weir from the Whangamarino Wetland.	The weir has ruined any natural aspects of the Whangamarino Wetand, has resulted in no water flow through the Pungarehu or Morrins Creek area, which are flooded with stagnant water. It has caused drainage, pasture and fencing damage on the submitter's property.	Reject	//
149.1	Peter Thomson on behalf of Maramarua Golf Club	Not Stated	Maramarua Golf Club carpark be maintained by Council.	Prior to Super City formation, Franklin Council painted parking lines on carpark. This has not been kept up by Waikato in spite of request Golf Club is a community asset that is used much more than just golf.	Reject	//
156.1	David Rawiri	Neutral/Amend	Maintain access to the property at 123 Rawiri Road from Rawiri Road, despite future changes to roading configuration.	That access to the property at 123 Rawiri Road is maintained from Rawiri Road.	Reject	//

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
198.3	Katherine Wilson for Property Council New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Increase collaboration with other councils for the sharing of resources and infrastructure near or crossing boundary lines.	This is important because of the increased urban development in both the north and south. It is encouraging to see the Council working closely with Auckland Council to ensure that infrastructure accommodates urban growth south of Auckland. The sharing of infrastructure and services between the two districts is important. It aligns with the Waikato District Development Strategy 2015. The submitter supports the Councils' ongoing collaboration with other councils. This will ensure that key stakeholders are aware of the infrastructure needs facing the region along with proposed future projects.	Reject	//
FS1176.36	Watercare Services Ltd	Support		Whilst this is not strictly a matter controlled by a district plan, Watercare supports collaboration between Councils, infrastructure providers and key stakeholders.	Reject	//
198.11	Property Council New Zealand	Support	No specific decision sought, but submission strongly supports the need for alternative funding mechanisms for infrastructure with central and local government, and the Long Term Plan and District Plan proposals in this regard.	The submitters strongly support the need for alternative funding mechanisms particularly given the growth of Auckland and Hamilton cities, as they expand into the Waikato. The Waikato region has seen a significant period of underfunding infrastructure. The submitter is happy to advocate alternatives to central government. The submitter is currently working with their members to look at alternative funding mechanism options to present to the Productivity Commission in its inquiry into local government funding.	Reject	//
212.6	Ron Pollock on behalf of Community Living Trust	Not Stated	Prioritise the provision of reticulated Council operated water and wastewater to existing home owners and residents (particularly Whatawhata Village), and include planning these systems in Council's Long Term plan to encourage and support housing development in the Whatawhata Village Residential Area.	Given Council's desire and planning for more development intensification, the submitter believes this vital infrastructure should be a priority.	Reject	//
271.2	Dave and Fransiska Falconer	Neutral/Amend	Add a southbound on/exit ramp near Kimihia Road or McVie Road, Huntly, to divert as much traffic away as possible from Taupiri Mountain Cemetery.	The Maori King, in the late 1860's, wept when he was informed of the intended route of the main rail trunk line alongside state highway 1 effectively cutting the access to the sacred burial ground. Mount Taupiri is a sacred mountain and burial ground for Waikato Iwi and Kingitanga. Parking and access became difficult because the State Highway and railway lie largely on gentler sloping land at the foot of the slopes of Taupiri Mountain. Parking is required to be on the other side of the North Island transport system in a small and constrained area beside the Waikato River and Mangawara Stream. Many mourners attending Tangi often cause disruption to traffic, out of necessity. Mourners attending funerals have to manage 70kph traffic and then when the trains come it is formidable, as it is required to blow its horn amidst all the mourners and ceremony. Any reduction in traffic will be a much welcome outcome	Reject	//

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1202.29	New Zealand Transport Agency	Oppose	Oppose submission point 271.2.	This is not a planned change to the Waikato Expressway Network Plan and there has been no assessment as to the effects upon the transport infrastructure or wider system.	Reject	//
FS1386.274	Mercury Limited NZ for Mercury C	Oppose		At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	//
271.3	Dave and Fransiska Falconer	Neutral/Amend	Restore the town name of Huntly to its original name of Rahui Poekaka.	The Council need to be mindful of cultural value/impact assessments such as honoring urupa rather than factor the Huntly access to the Expressway. The Council should be acknowledging 2.12.1, the significant legal power of Tangata Whenua and areas of significance such as urupa. It is a matter of utmost urgency and an obligation under 2.12.1 (iii) The Council had dismissed the submitters previously "At this stage Council is not looking to rename Huntly".	Reject	//
FS1386.275	Mercury Limited NZ for Mercury C	Oppose		At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	//
286.16	Lorraine Dixon for Waikato-Tainui	Not Stated	Amend the property description and title number SA57C/456 relating to 333 Old Taupiri Road and 467 Hakarimata Road to correct an error where both are referenced under same property description and title number.	Seeks to clarify and remedy an administrative error.	Reject	//
FS1035.22	Pareoranga Te Kata	Support	Support the submission in full.	• Council needs to partner with Kaitiaki, mana whenua or review strategies with Waikato Tainui to ensure preservation and restoration of the Waikato River.	Reject	//
371.3	Kitty Burton	Not Stated	Request that Matangi reticulated infrastructure issues are resolved or investigated further by council.		Reject	//

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1305.4	Andrew Mowbray	Support	Seek that the whole submission be allowed.	It is very important for the future sensible growth of Matangi there is one community plan in place to cater for the development of the area and its surrounds.	Reject	//
FS1311.10	Ethan & Rachael Findlay	Support	Support submission point 371.3.	To amend the provisions accordingly. To support general intent of submission point.	Reject	//
377.2	Rangimonehu Kereopa for Pareaute Kereopa Whanau Trust	Support	No specific decision sought, but submission supports Whaingaroa Kite Whenua, Tihei Mauriora - a cultural theme park plan.	Aligns with the vision and aspirations of Tangata whenua and owners and beneficiaries of Te Kopua lands on Riria Kereopa Memorial Drive, Whaingaroa.	Reject	//
380.1	Norman Hill for Waahi Whaanui Trust	Not Stated	Amend the name Huntly to Raahui Pookeka in the Proposed District Plan.	Whanui aims to reclaim the name Raahui Pookeka and to establish principles of beauty based on Huntly's original name. The Waikato –Tainui leader, Te Putu, christened Raahui Pookeka, he embraced the need for sustainability of the scarce resources, fair and equitable distribution of eel stocks, practical leadership for Iwi, Hapu and Whanau backing and working together for their livelihoods. Raahui Pookeka, the original name for Huntly, is more appropriate recognising the environment, people and history of the area. The colonial name for Huntly stems from Scotland, the place of the first Postmaster who arrived in 1877 to make him feel "at home" while he lived in the community.	Reject	//
380.3	Norman Hill for Waahi Whaanui Trust	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, but submission seeks that the Waikato District Council immediately commit resources to a programme of restoration and reconstruction of Raahu Pookeka (Huntly).	This is to achieve the collective aspirations and expectations for Maori in Raahui Pookeka. Whanui is committed to uphold the cultural, environmental and historical integrity of our people by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Actively promoting our cultural, social, economic and educational development.</li> <li>ii. Sponsoring strategic partnership and alliances that contribute to the unity and diversity of our wider community.</li> <li>iii. Encouraging the health and well-being of all people.</li> </ul>	Reject	//
380.8	Norman Hill for Waahi Whaanui Trust	Neutral/Amend	No specific decision sought, but submission seeks that Waikato District Council resource and support Whaanui to develop and undertake initiatives, activities and projects that improve the education, employment opportunities, health and well-being of the people and community of Whaanui.	No reasons provided.	Reject	//
381.1	Rawiri Bidois	Neutral/Amend	Council shall provide rates relief for the loss of use to the private landowner where an identified Significant Natural Area is located on private land.	The submitter considers the idea of applying restrictions to the Significant Natural Areas for environmental and aesthetic purposes is meritorious to the council community and its ratepayers. However in doing so ignores two important points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Firstly, by council applying the Significant Natural Area identifier, the private landowner is being robbed of the freehold and unfettered use of that land for ever, and for no compensation. The submitter considers this amounts to the same as was done to Maori in the 1800's (Eg: Raupatu, Public Works takings of the Tokanui land block for the Waikeria Prison at one end and Hospital at the other etc etc), with the flick of the pen.</li> <li>- Additionally it is difficult to believe and trust the machinery of Local and Central government, that they</li> </ul>	Reject	//

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				won't change the rules in the future to accommodate new best practise thinking of the time, to the detriment of the current thinking. eg: Significant Natural Area today turned into a highway tomorrow, or tree planting for Carbon Credits the day after. - Secondly, the council will be socialising the gains to the community, at the expense of the private landowner.		
389.2	Jonathan Quigley for J and T Quigley Ltd		Retain the current extent of Countryside Living Zone and Residential Zone located to the west of the submitters' site on Tamahere Drive, Tamahere.		Reject	//
<b>FS1388.91</b>	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury	Oppose			Accept	//
410.3	Trevor Weaver	Oppose	Lower the weir height in winter to stop water overflowing the normal margins of Lake Kopuera and causing flooding on private land.	The flood-prone areas on the submitter's property are required to support the submitter's farming operation which includes the raising of drystock and dairy replacements (as well as for hay and cropping).	Reject	//
419.99	Jordyn Landers for Horticulture New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Consider rates relief for situations where high class soils are rezoned for residential use.	Growers are provided a perverse incentive to subdivide as they are rated for the potential use of the land, rather than the actual use of the land. This incentive is maximised when land is rezoned from rural to residential. HortNZ has had feedback that even though growers don't want to leave the land, the cost of rates inhibits the viability of the growing operation. With a diminished supply of high class soils and versatile land, combined with other regulatory constraints (such as Proposed Plan Change 1) and the general cost of land are significant constraints which impact the long-term survival of the horticulture industry. This in term has repercussions for domestic food supply as outlined above.	Reject	//
466.74	Brendan Balle for Balle Bros Group Limited	Neutral/Amend	Explore rates relief for the following situations: Where high class soils are rezoned for urban growth but remain in primary production use to assist in retaining economic viability. Large scale ecological enhancement areas retired from productive use.	No reasons provided.	Reject	//
479.1	Olivia Dean-Chambers	Oppose	Horses should have access to the beach down the walking track.	It is safer for horses and riders to access the beach by that track rather than walking along the busy roads.	Reject	//
<b>FS1276.258</b>	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Support	WED seeks that the whole of the submission point be allowed, subject to correcting the spelling of Ngarunui.	Bridle tracks are a District Plan issues as much as any other part of this Plan relating to roads or tracks. There are very few tracks suited to horse riding, though Council's Trails Strategy policy says "Council will encourage walking, cycling and horse riding by providing and promoting trails in the district."	Reject	//
480.2	Susan Carter	Oppose	No specific decisions sought, but submission expresses concern at the lack of iwi consultation for road works and traffic detours, particularly on Wainui Road and Gilmour Street, Raglan.	There are clear guidelines as to the consultation process in the District Plan. Sediment is running into the harbour area as a result of this work. It is disgraceful that Gilmour Street is part of the detour when Gilmour Street is not even a proper road.	Reject	//
487.1	Charlotte Simsar	Neutral/Amend	Allow free access for horse riding through the paddocks.	There are not many tracks to ride with horses around Raglan. This is access through paddocks, where cows graze. The submitter does not see how two or three horses walking through per day could	Reject	//

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				damage the soil. It currently leaves barely any other safe areas to ride, leaving only the road, making it unsafe and unpleasant.		
<b>FS1276.260</b>	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Support	WED seeks that the submission point be allowed, subject to correcting the spelling of Ngarunui.	Bridle tracks are a District Plan issue as much as any other part of this Plan relating to roads or tracks. There are very few tracks suited to horse riding, though Council's Trails Strategy policy 6.1.1 says, "Council will encourage walking, cycling and horse riding by providing and promoting trails in the district."	Reject	//
493.24	Jackie Colliar	Not Stated	Recognise tikanga and Maatauranga Maori in the Blueprint and structure plan processes.	The submitter is pleased that structure plans were referenced in various parts of the proposed district plan, however there appears to be an absence of structure plans when attempting to locate them in the plan. The submitter understands a 'Blueprinting' exercise is currently underway and will provide the basis for any future structure plans. Whilst submission supports this initiative, especially considering the growth challenges that the district faces in the north; the timing of this process is unfortunate and would have been more effective if the process had been undertaken pre the notification of the Proposed District Plan. The submitter is concerned that the Blueprinting exercise and potential structure plans will require plan change processes to implement as part of the district plan. Locations such as Huntly, Mercer and Pokeno are in need of high-level planning assessment and it is disappointing that resource and time be required to get these guiding plans part of the district plan. The submitter is also of the opinion that any structure plans or Blueprinting exercises should recognise Waikato-Tainui tikanga and Maatauranga Maaori, to reflect the districts rich Maaori heritage.	Reject	//
<b>FS1035.77</b>	Pareoranga Te Kata	Support	Agree and support the whole submission.	• Engage with Waikato Tainui and mana whenua to ensure that the Tainui Environmental Plan Tai Tunu, Tai Pari, Tai Ao and marae environmental plans have been included in the Waikato District Plan.	Reject	//
<b>FS1108.122</b>	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)	Support		Submitter understands need to recognise. take into account iwi mgmt. plans.	Reject	//
<b>FS1139.110</b>	Turangawaewae Trust Board	Support		Submitter understands the need to recognise...take into account iwi management plans.	Reject	//
525.4	Gillian Marie	Oppose	Cease using toxic sprays for weed control and stop the requirement to opt out of having their berm sprayed; and replace with a system where people to pay for this service and have to opt in.	Strongly object to the proposal that if you do not want your berm to be sprayed you must pay a fee to the council to go on the No Spray Register, ie you must pay for a non-service. The tradition of cutting grass along roadside dates back to when cars backfired which may cause fires, or people threw cigarettes out the car window. Cars no longer backfire and peoples behaviour regarding cigarettes has changed.	Reject	//
525.5	Gillian Marie	Not Stated	WDC to monitor water quality more closely and look at innovative ways of dealing with Whaingaroa sewage and waste water, preferably in a land based system.	WDC should be doing more to monitor and improve the quality of water entering waterways and harbour Piping water from the sewage pond into the	Reject	//

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				ocean is a highly irresponsible and toxic way of dealing with sewage water waste.		
546.7	Lynne Adrienne	Neutral/Amend	Add the requirement for Council to take into account advice received from the Raglan Community Board in any future growth and development decisions made by council and decision-making be devolved to the Community Board.	No reasons provided.	Reject	11
<b>FS1208.4</b>	<i>Rangitahi Limited</i>	Oppose	Seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed.	Although the Raglan Community board is an important local representative body, it would be inappropriate to include provisions in the Proposed District Plan which devolve decision making to the Community Board or which require that Council too must take into account advice from the Raglan Community Board on development and growth decisions.	Reject	11
568.2	JoonYoung Moon	Neutral/Amend	Submitter seeks that the council purchase the land contained within the Waikato River stop banks for parkland.	Purchasing the land could enable the future connection via walkway/cycleway to the park accessed from River Road. Purchasing this land would enable the future connection via walkway/cycleway of the River access to extend along to the River Road park. The Proposed District Plan allows for a unique opportunity to gain land for River access, leisure activities and possibly a park.	Reject	11
572.2	Litania Liava'a	Neutral/Amend	Submitter seeks that council purchase the land contained within the Waikato River stop banks for parkland.	Purchasing the land could enable the future connection via walkway/cycleway to the park accessed from River Road. Purchasing this land would enable the future connection via walkway/cycleway of the River access to extend along to the River Road park. The Proposed District Plan allows for a unique opportunity to gain land for River access, leisure activities and possibly a park.	Reject	11
603.2	Helen Clotworthy on behalf of Pokeno Community Committee	Support	No specific decision sought, but submission agrees with the work being done on the Economic Corridor.	The submitter is hoping for a positive outcome for Pokeno.	Reject	11
<b>FS1175.1</b>	Pokeno Community Committee	Support	Hamilton to Auckland Economic Corridor	The proposed District Plan may need to be updated to reflect the outcome of the work currently under way for the Hamilton - Auckland Corridor Plan	Reject	12
628.1	Maris O'Rourke	Oppose	No specific decision sought, but submission opposes the proposed developments in Raglan such as the condominiums proposed for Wainui Road and Stewart Street.	Concerned Raglan's special character is being eroded. True community and charming place of character. Wants to see Raglan's unique nature continue.	Reject	11
<b>FS1276.193</b>	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Support	WED seeks that the whole of the submission point be allowed.	The submission highlights the need for the new District Plan to avoid the planning failures, which approved apartments on the corner of Stuart Street and Wainui Road, Raglan. The failures include devolution of power by council, resulting in the lack of any political or public involvement in making the decision, lack of adequate treatment of storm water from a site immediately adjacent to the coastal management area and a shellfish bed, infringement of daylight protections, parking and	Reject	11

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				setback requirements, location of a road junction with poor sightlines and failure to protect views of a heritage building. It also highlights the need for the District Plan to consider the social and economic value of a development. This development for holiday apartments removes much needed permanent accommodation and will exacerbate seasonal parking, traffic and employment problems. Furthermore, WED supports the 'Raglan Naturally' ethos and notes that the Waikato Blueprint, adopted by council in June 2019, aims to "Provide a high-level 'spatial picture' of how the district could progress over the next 30 years, address the community's social, economic and environmental needs, and respond to its regional context. The Blueprint will provide the Waikato District Council with an effective and legible tool to move from vision to strategy, and from strategy to action by setting out specific, prioritised initiatives at the district and social level." And includes these statements: "WDC should work with the Community Board and Raglan Naturally and Tangata Whenua to define, strengthen and communicate Raglan's special identity." The top priority initiatives for Raglan include: -Building a strong identity for the town, -Supporting Raglan Naturally in their prioritised local initiatives such as local food production, energy self sufficiency, alternatives to weed spraying, GE free approaches and education regarding climate change, - Partnering with Raglan Naturally in respect to planning processes.		
634.1	Kathryn Gold	Not Stated	Rebuild the single lane bridge at Wainui Road, Raglan.	Has become an urgent project. Need to cater for all recreational and residential movement that use this bridge as access to homes, beaches and boat ramps. Leaving the bridge as is for another nine years is reckless. Congestion caused by the one lane bridge is a major disruption to residents and visitors. Emergency services are extremely disadvantaged. Safety issues for children crossing the bridge for school due to the constant stream of traffic. From early morning until late evening residents unable to get into town in the weekends with roads blocked with cars, waiting as far as 3km away.	Reject	//
<b>FS1276.73</b>	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Oppose	WED seeks that the whole of the submission be disallowed.	Other solutions to the traffic problems exist and should be investigated before going ahead with the very expensive (\$7m) single land bridge project.	Reject	//
652.2	Kenneth Whyte	Not Stated	Council to purchase the land contained within the Waikato River stopbanks near Buckland Road, Tuakau by Council for park land (see the maps attached to the submission for further detail).	Access to this land will be difficult if the land adjoining Buckland Road becomes residential. The current rural use is marginally sustainable crops or grazing. Presents an amazing opportunity for current residents, future residents and tourists.	Reject	//
663.2	Graham Halsey	Not Stated	Purchase the land contained within the Waikato River stopbanks near Buckland Road, Tuakau, by Council for park land (see the maps attached to the submission for further detail).	Access to this land will be difficult if the land adjoining Buckland Road becomes residential. The current rural use is marginally sustainable crops or	Reject	//

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				grazing. Presents an amazing opportunity for current residents, future residents and tourists.		
695.1	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Not Stated	Requests council to promote discussion with Kiwirail, the NZ Government, and the Regional Council and transport providers about future development of rail infrastructure and appropriately designated corridors in its region.	Rail compared to road is at a 23% time and distance disadvantage for the haulage of anything but low time important commodities. The disadvantage depletes the benefit of rail haulage. The outcome: greater longevity or roading assets and infrastructure, less rebuild costs and improved road safety and travel times, improved bulk freight transport efficiency/costs and export gains, as well as a more balanced level of transport provider investments.	Reject	//
695.4	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Add an online calculator for development contributions linked to the Planning Maps that provides a site-specific assessment.	These could be much more simplified and made easier to understand how much is applicable.	Reject	//
695.5	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Requests applied development plans for each village and town to set out how localities should be developed which sets out how localities should be developed with visual plans.	In major development, it is expected that applicants will develop master plans.	Reject	//
695.146	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Not Stated	Investigate incentives for road transport operators to form co-operatives using computerised freight sourcing and tracking systems, and for road truck operators to invest in rail rolling stock or leasing.	This would retain revenue within truck companies. This would mean that road freight operators would decide, rather than have imposed regulation to change. Provides flexibility of use.	Reject	//
695.149	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Not Stated	Not Stated	Ensure that Council website online links and pathways are easy to find and links are to the current plan/s and maps.	Reject	//
695.150	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Not Stated	Not Stated	Clarify the Section 88 and Schedule 4 application requirements to Council planners and provide this detail online to the public with examples.	Reject	//
695.6	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Not Stated	Council to consider the needs of all likely road users when re-sealing road surfaces.	There are several examples where no consideration was given to all likely road users such as cyclists. It actively discourages cycling on local roads and incentivises proneness to sprains and injury, as well as being less safe for grip in all weather conditions. This detracts from active exercise opportunities. This practice undermines health outcomes. It is up to 33% harder to ride for the same amount of energy as a relatively smooth surface. Car and vehicle efficiency is decreased up to 15% due to a greater power to weight ratio. Vehicles are able to maintain momentum thus the energy loss is not as profound. The avoidance of flushing can be achieved by using a considerably smoother sealing surface. Very rough chip surfaces hold more water, drain less well and are less safe to use as the amount of grip per area of tire is lessened, leading to aqua-planned at speeds of 90km/h or more. The surface is more prone to pot-holing due to irregular pressures placed by vehicles and typically does not act as long. The only purpose achieved by the current rough chip seal is to save sealing costs, but at the immediate expense of all else. A safe environment for all road users that is created through thoughtful design enhances the presence of all users - this assists to slow traffic and on local roads and results in safer outcomes.	Reject	//

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
724.12	Sue Robertson for Tamahere Community Committee	Neutral/Amend	Add provisions into the District Plan to address cost responsibilities when the harvesting of forests results in damage to the local roading network.	No reasons provided.	Reject	//
724.13	Sue Robertson for Tamahere Community Committee	Neutral/Amend	Amend the Proposed District Plan to enable targeted rates to be charged when benefits are only accrued to a specific area (user pays).	Where infrastructure costs are specific to a ward, that ward should pay if it is not something other wards will use.	Reject	//
739.1	Karen Smith	Not Stated	No specific decision sought.	The submitter objects to the disregard for the plans in place for Raglan and the granting of consents for apartments. The submitter is concerned that the current building council departments can be bought at a price and be dammed to the actual environment or current infrastructure that Raglan currently has. The extra run off that this development will bring will further impact the environment that Raglan is so invested in keeping healthy. That corner is busy at the best of times and it will be worse now with 11 more units and additional cars. Concerned about pressure on carparks. Prominent sites like this should be protected from development which is too high and too close to the road. Considers all Submissions which break District Plan rules should be publicly notified. Supports Raglan adapting and growing, but we need more houses for locals - not more Airbnb and holiday lets. Raglan needs to become a conservation area where changes can't be made which make the area less attractive.	Reject	//
FS1276.195	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Support	WED seeks that the whole of the submission point be allowed.	The submission highlights the need for the new District Plan to avoid the planning failures, which approved apartments on the corner of Stuart Street and Wainui Road, Raglan. The failures include devolution of power by council, resulting in the lack of any political or public involvement in making the decision, lack of adequate treatment of storm water from a site immediately adjacent to the coastal management area and a shellfish bed, infringement of daylight protections, parking and setback requirements, location of a road junction with poor sightlines and failure to protect views of a heritage building. It also highlights the need for the District Plan to consider the social and economic value of a development. This development for holiday apartments removes much needed permanent accommodation and will exacerbate seasonal parking, traffic and employment problems. Furthermore, WED supports the 'Raglan Naturally' ethos and notes that the Waikato Blueprint, adopted by council in June 2019, aims to "Provide a high-level 'spatial picture' of how the district could progress over the next 30 years, address the community's social, economic and environmental needs, and respond to its regional context. The Blueprint will provide the Waikato District Council with an effective and legible tool to move from vision	Reject	//

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				to strategy, and from strategy to action by setting out specific, prioritised initiatives at the district and social level." And includes these statements: "WDC should work with the Community Board and Raglan Naturally and Tangata Whenua to define, strengthen and communicate Raglan's special identity." The top priority initiatives for Raglan include: -Building a strong identity for the town, -Supporting Raglan Naturally in their prioritised local initiatives such as local food production, energy self sufficiency, alternatives to weed spraying, GE free approaches and education regarding climate change, - Partnering with Raglan Naturally in respect to planning processes.		
FS1276.236	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Support	WED seeks that the whole of the submission point be allowed.	Reasons for WED's support are that all new CBD buildings have been 2 storey, whereas most older buildings are single storey. If allowed to continue this will change Raglan's character.	Reject	//
FS1276.242	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Support	WED seeks that the whole of the submission be allowed.	Raglan has long been recognised by Council as being a 'jewel in the crown' and having a 'seaside village character.' Retention of that character is threatened by a uniformity of new developments, which are of an urban character. These submissions address that threat and should be incorporated in the District Plan, primarily by confirming Raglan Naturally's role, as set out in the Waikato Blueprint adopted by council in June 2019, which aims to "provide a high-level 'spatial picture' of how the district could progress over the next 30 years, address the community's social, economic and environmental needs, and respond to its regional context. The Blueprint will provide the Waikato District Council with an effective and legible tool to move from vision to strategy, and from strategy to action by setting out specific, prioritised initiatives at the district and local level." And which includes these statements- "WDC should work with the Community Board and Raglan Naturally and Tangata Whenua to define, strengthen and communicate Raglan's special identity. The top priority initiatives for Raglan include: Building a strong identity for the town. Supporting Raglan Naturally in their prioritised local initiatives such as local food production, energy self sufficiency, alternatives to weed spraying, GE free approaches and education regarding climate change. Partnering with Raglan Naturally in respect to planning processes."	Reject	//
748.1	Peter Reynolds for T A Reynolds Limited	Not Stated	Amend the amount of rates payable on the properties at 105 Bollard Road - Property number 302134, Whangarata Road - Property number 302125, 128 Bollard Road and 124 Bollard Road, Tuakau to be based on the current land use (cropping) and not the current zoning. The submission seeks some sort of rates relief.	These properties have been rezoned in the last few years with a steep hike in the rates payable. The landowners are receiving very little service on these properties because they are being farmed and none of the use is residential or industrial.	Reject	//
748.4	Peter Reynolds for T A Reynolds Limited	Neutral/Amend	Align rates payable on the land to the land use not the zone.	The rates on the farming land that is zoned Residential are too high.	Reject	//

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
750.1	Matthew Dean on behalf of Mangatawhiri River Catchment Care Group	Not Stated	Beautify the landscape around the bridge on Pioneer Road over the Mangatawhiri River after consultation with all interested parties; AND Erect an interpretation panel to tell the history of the Mangatawhiri area. AND Upgrade the section of the Te Araroa trail that passes through that area. AND Clean up the river in the longer term.	Site is a significant historic place. Site is registered with Heritage New Zealand. Site is an ugly eyesore and river banks overgrown with exotic willow and weed species. A catchment care group has been formed in the area to improve water quality.	Reject	//
<b>FS1035.91</b>	Pareoranga Te Kata	Support	Support history and significance and the whole submission be aligned and allowed.	Heritage item and map 7.8 walkway/cycle way/bridleway along the route of the Te Araroa walkway in Pioneer Road, Mercer Mangatawhiri River.	Reject	//
792.1	Lisa Kerrisk	Oppose	Provide for free access to ride horses down beach track.	Really dangerous to take horses along the road which is the only other option. Opposes the restriction on horses down the beach track.	Reject	//
<b>FS1276.265</b>	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Support	WED seeks that the whole of the submission point be allowed, subject to correcting the spelling of Ngarunui.	Bridle tracks are a District Plan issue as much as any other part of this Plan relating to roads or tracks. There are very few tracks suited to horse riding, though Council's Trails Strategy policy 6.1.1 says, "Council will encourage walking, cycling and horse riding by providing and promoting trails in the district."	Reject	//
802.3	Vera van der Voorden	Not Stated	Create a register of septic tanks to show proof of regular maintenance to avoid adverse impacts to waterways, and a control team to monitor. OR Develop a bylaw to manage septic tanks.	If it is possible to have a dog registration team employed at council, it must be possible to create a septic tank registration and control team. Wandering septic overflows are more dangerous to the environment than wandering dogs. There should be no direct discharge of wastewater into the Whaingaroa harbour.	Reject	//
819.3	Dominic O'Rourke	Oppose	Undertake selective community consultation for Raglan.	Raglan is special and now becoming a "place to be and visit".	Reject	//
821.15	The Poultry Industry Association of New Zealand; I Brinks NZ Chicken; The Egg Producers Federation of on behalf of	Not Stated	Include information regarding the proximity of intensive farming activities into LIM reports.	Include information on the location on LIM reports for neighbouring properties to ensure new owners can be aware of an intensive farming activity occurring nearby and impact that it may have when constructing a new sensitive activity.	Reject	//
826.2	Kym Holland on behalf of Friends of Kimihia Lake	Oppose	Avoid discharge of water from the proposed Huntly East Mines Development into Kimihia Lake.	Water discharge is too important to just copy what was done 40-50 years ago. Surely we have come further than just relying on repeating what was done in the past without proving any impact to the current Kimihia Lake. The group has worked very hard to maintain current lake levels. The casual attitude to discharging water into Kimihia Lake from Huntly East Mines development would destroy our lake and the years of hard work we have done so far.	Reject	//
<b>FS1047.50</b>	Murray and Jennifer Allen - Allen Fabrics Limited	Oppose	Disallow submission 826 in its entirety.	Oppose the submission seeking to amend the name 'Kimihia Lakes Recreation and Events Park'; and the comments regarding discharge from the Huntly East Mines Development into Kimihia Lake.	Reject	//

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
831.30	Gabrielle Parson on behalf of Raglan Naturally	Oppose	Add a chapter and maps showing provision for freedom camping and associated rules, including those for signage.	Other camping is regulated by the Proposed District Plan. The impact of freedom camping on the town and accommodation providers is a potential problem.	Reject	//
831.53	Gabrielle Parson on behalf of Raglan Naturally	Oppose	Consider the positive benefits and negative aspects of a Raglan bypass and do not develop by default.	Raglan Land Co. proposals for village clusters amount to a bypass and Rangitahi could be vulnerable to disruption if its access route from Raglan West were severed and that referred to in Policy 9.3.5.4 was not complete. In the past, such proposals have been rejected due to their impact on local shops. The submitter has noted that Industrial zoning of site-specific areas should be considered in conjunction with any proposed bypass development.	Reject	//
880.2	Dave Falconer	Neutral/Amend	Add a southbound on/exit ramp near Kimihia Road or McVie Road, Huntly, to divert as much traffic away as possible from Taupiri Mountain Cemetery, in relation to 2.12.1 (Tangata Whenua – Whakapapa (connection to nature) Policy – Whanaungatanga (relationship to nature)) and encourage Huntly's significant current growth.	<p>The Maori King, in the late 1860's, wept when he was informed of the intended route of the main rail trunk line alongside state highway 1 effectively cutting the access to the sacred burial ground. Mount Taupiri is a sacred mountain and burial ground for Waikato Iwi and Kingitanga. Taupiri Te Putu Pa has a long history dating back to the 1600s, where past Maori Kings and Queen are buried in the highest part of the Urupa, on the summit where Te Putu's pa stood. Parking and access became difficult because the State Highway and railway lie largely on gentler sloping land at the foot of the slopes of Taupiri Mountain. Parking is required to be on the other side of the North Island transport system in a small and constrained area beside the Waikato River and Mangawara Stream. Many mourners attending Tangi often cause disruption to traffic, out of necessity. Mourners attending funerals have to manage 70kph traffic and then when the trains come it is formidable, as it is required to blow its horn amidst all the mourners and ceremony. Any reduction in traffic will be a much welcome outcome Maori obliged early European travelers to cross to the other side of the Waikato River to avoid the sacred area of Taupiri Mountain. It would be a valuable and thoughtful addition to include Taupiri Mountain and its significance to the Maori people as part of the Mayors proposition to gain acceptance of the need for the southbound on/off ramp. Any traffic passage that can give relief to the sacred Taupiri Mountain Urupa (Cemetery) and mourners must be of national and governmental significance and is reflected in the WDP, Chapter 2, Tangata Whenua. This should be a major concern of Council and Government. In 1.4.1.3, Huntly is projected to remain static. However, several new residential housing developments have fully sold including the Allen Mara Subdivision lifestyle development. Huntly is experiencing significant growth, which we have seen having lived in the town for decades, and it is highly likely the Waikato Expressway on/off ramp to Huntly will gain governmental approval to go ahead. It is fatalistic of WDC to be 'planning' under 1.4.1.3 for the Expressway to bypass Huntly</p>	Reject	//

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>when the Mayor and many others have put in so much effort including by WDC for this to go ahead. The Sacred Taupiri Mountain burial grounds should ensure the provision off the on/off ramps to Huntly on its own grounds alone. If Council has given up on the Huntly (Rahui Pokeka) Expressway on/off ramps then it needs to let the community know so they can take up the cause. The Council responded to the submitters as follows: "The Council has also been discussing with The New Zealand Transport Agency, the need for south facing expressway ramps to be installed. Activities such as the Huntly East Mine rehabilitation proposal will strengthen the need for such access." This response is contrary to the Waikato District Plan comments. Urupa was recently discussed with the Mayor regarding the Sacred Burial Grounds of Taupiri Mountain and was considered a major factor in addressing the need for access from Huntly to the Expressway. The submitter has included part of their submission to the Long Term District Plan 2018 regarding this. Under 2.12.1, it states 'recognize the relationship of Tangata Whenua with areas of significance, including waahi tapu, urupa, maunga and other landforms...' Under the RMA the Treaty of Waitangi needs to be upheld in discussions regarding the urupa and the diversion of traffic away from the sacred burial site (Taupiri Mountain) via a Huntly/Rahui Pokeka off/on ramp</p>		
FS1202.108	New Zealand Transport Agency	Oppose	Oppose submission point 880.2.	This is not a planned change to the Waikato Expressway network plan and there has been no assessment as to the effects upon the transport infrastructure or wider system.	Reject	//
880.3	Dave Falconer	Neutral/Amend	Restore the town name of Huntly to its original name of Rahui Pokeka.	The Council need to be mindful of cultural value/impact assessments such as honoring urupa rather than factor the Huntly access to the Expressway. The Council should be acknowledging Section 2.12.1, the significant legal power of Tangata Whenua and areas of significance such as urupa. It is a matter of utmost urgency and an obligation under Section 2.12.1 (iii). The Council had dismissed the submitters previously "At the stage Council is not looking to rename Huntly".	Reject	//
924.42	Alice Barnett for Genesis Energy Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend the Section 32 Report for Infrastructure regarding the Huntly Power Station's transition to being completely gas fired as set out in the submission	The information about the Rankine Units is not correct.	Reject	//
942.2	Angeline Greensill for Tainui o Tainui	Not Stated	Provide resources, such as a planner or funds to employ one to complete an Iwi engagement plan as outlined in section 1.7.3.4 Iwi Management Plans.	The submitter intends to complete an Iwi environmental plan prior to publication of Stage 2 of the Proposed District Plan.	Reject	//
942.39	Angeline Greensill for Tainui o Tainui	Not Stated	Consider an alternative transport route in the event that State Highway 23 is inaccessible.	Dual routes should be considered in case accidents occur on State Highway 23.	Reject	//
942.41	Angeline Greensill for Tainui o Tainui	Not Stated	Provide Tangata whenua with resourcing to undertake surveys and ensure the survival rate of indigenous biodiversity improves on their lands.	Indigenous biodiversity is threatened by pest species both plants and animal which have been imported into the area and human activity. Submission questions	Reject	//

Submission number	Submitter	Support/oppose	Decisions requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				what assistance is available to hapu and iwi to deal with problems they did not create.		
942.84	Angeline Greensill for Tainui o Tainui	Neutral/Amend	No specific decision sought, but the submission expresses disappointment that the plan does not improve public transport between the west coast communities and Auckland, Hamilton and Kawhia.	Given the increased visitor population using Whaingaroa as a tourist destination, it is disappointing to see nothing in the Proposed District Plan.	Reject	//
942.86	Angeline Greensill for Tainui o Tainui	Neutral/Amend	No specific decision sought for section 1.5.7.5 The Coast, but submission opposes access over dunes to the beach by vehicles, including horse-drawn carriages.	Vehicle use over beaches can adversely affect recovering pipi and kutai beds as well as disturb recreational users.	Reject	//
518.1	Neville Ritchie for Queen's Redoubt Trust	Not Stated	Develop a consent plan for development/beautification of 'Te Aukati Mangatawhiri Wahi Tapu' (and immediate surrounds along the banks of the Mangatawhiri Stream) as a significant historic place. This includes land between State Highway 1 and Pioneer Road, Pokeno in the vicinity of the Pioneer bridge including Mangatawhiri Stream.	The Mangatawhiri Stream in the vicinity of the Pioneer Road Bridge is a significant historic place. This site needs a concept plan in consultation with all parties. The Mangatawhiri Stream is a significant historic place, particularly the section in the immediate vicinity of the Pioneer Road Bridge. On the 17 July 1863 General Cameron's forces crossed the Mangatawhiri Stream, initiating the military campaign against Waikato Tainui. This site was also the northern boundary of Waikato Tainui. The Queens Redoubt Trust is planning a display in its Visitors centre at the redoubt illustrating the significance of the Mangatawhiri Stream.	Reject	//
FS1323.180	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	That the site is reinstated into the heritage schedules.	HNZPT supports the recognition of this historic heritage site, which has been deleted from the Heritage Schedule. HNZPT would strongly prefer/support that the site was reinstated to the heritage schedules for additional protection of this important archaeological and historical site to protect its heritage values.	Reject	//
169.2	Tom Seddon on behalf of Jo, Peggi, Oki, Mila, Jade, Anita and other kids	Oppose	Oppose the prohibition of horse access to Ngarunui Beach via the north-end carpark track.	Safety is concern to the submitter. Since the closure of the "pines" beach access track due to the creation of the mountain bike trails, this is the only safe access to Ngaruanui beach for all the people with horses on Wainui Road. The only alternative access requires a very dangerous ride down the open highway with no foot path or cycle lane.	Reject	//
FS1276.256	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Support	WED seeks that the whole of the submission point be allowed, subject to correcting the spelling of Ngarunui.	Bridle tracks are a District Plan issues as much as any other part of this Plan relating to roads or tracks. There are very few tracks suited to horse riding, though Council's Trails Strategy policy says "Council will encourage walking, cycling and horse riding by providing and promoting trails in the district."	Reject	//
414.4	Chris Rayner	Neutral/Amend	The submitter seeks a number of roading changes in Raglan; including: - State Highway 23 to end just before Greenslade Road; - A proper turning bay for traffic turning into Greenslade Road with enough room for traffic going straight; - Reducing speed limits; - Standards of roading, drainage, lighting and footpaths; and - Roundabout between Hills Road and Lorezen Bay Road and State Highway 23. -Turning bays on State Highway 23 at Lorenzen Bay Road/Hills Road.	Roads can be extremely dangerous. Posted speeds are too high. Waikato District Council and Transit NZ need to work together.	Reject	//