

Appendix I: Table of submission points

Land use

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
378.70	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Add a new objective to Section 4.3 Village zoning, as follows: <u>To recognise and provide for non-residential activities that contribute to the health, safety and wellbeing of the community while managing their potential adverse effects to ensure that the activities complement the amenity values of the District's Village Zone areas.</u> AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make further or consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.	The provisions focus on the management of effects, rather than an outcome that provides clear direction in relation to the appropriateness of some non-residential activities in the Village Zone. Emergency services have a functional and operational need to be located in close proximity to the communities they serve. These amendments better achieve the purpose of the RMA by providing for the health and safety of people and communities.	Accept in part	4.1
FSI035.177	Pareoranga Te Kata	Support	<i>Obtain statement of performance expectation (SPE) to allow submission to be accepted.</i>	<i>Fire safety and fire prevention to undertake training activities for fire fighters within the region.</i>	Accept in part	4.1
697.545	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Add to Chapter 4.3 Village Zone Objectives and Policies to add two new policies numbered 4.3.16 and 4.3.17 as follows: <u>4.3.16 Policy – Outdoor living court – Retirement villages (a) Require outdoor living courts or communal outdoor living courts to be usable and accessible. 4.3.17 Policy – Retirement villages (a) Provide for the establishment of new retirement villages and care facilities that: (i) Offer a diverse range of housing types, including care facilities, for the particular needs and characteristics of older people; (ii) Promote visual integration with the street scene, neighbourhoods and adjoining sites; (iii) Are comprehensively designed and managed and offer a variety of accommodation and accessory services that meet the needs of residents, including those requiring care or assisted living; (iv) Housing and care facilities for older people can require higher densities; (v) Provide high quality on-site amenity; and (vi) Integrate with local services and facilities, including public transport. (b) Enable alterations and additions to existing retirement villages that: (i) Promote visual integration with the</u>	To provide consistency with Residential Zone for proposed retirement village provisions in the Village Zone, there is a need to include additional policies.	Reject	4.1.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			street scene, neighbourhoods and adjoining sites; (ii) Recognise that housing and care facilities for older people can require higher densities; (iii) Provide high quality on-site amenity; and (iv) Integrate with local services and facilities, including public transport and alternative transport modes.			
FS1004.6	Tamahere Eventide Home Trust- Tamahere Eventide Retirement Village (submitter 769)	Support	Allow submission point 697.545.	Support the inclusion of specific policies for retirement villages within the Village Zone provisions, to provide consistency with the Residential Zone retirement village provisions.	Reject	4.1.1
FS1005.10	Tamahere Eventide Home Trust- Atawhai Assessi Retirement Village (submitter 765)	Support	Allow submission point 697.545.	Support the inclusion of specific policies for retirement villages within the Village Zone provisions, to provide consistency with the Residential Zone retirement village provisions.	Reject	4.1.1
FS1387.600	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	3.1
749.4	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Support	Retain Objectives and Policies in Section 4.3 Village Zone as notified.	The submitter supports the objectives and policies of the Village Zone.	Accept in part	4.1.2
FS1387.991	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is 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	Reject	3.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>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>		
695.27	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 4.3.5(a) Building setbacks as follows: Maintain existing and promote new vistas and views between new buildings in the Village Zone when viewed from a road.	The word "new" needs to be placed elsewhere in the phrase as the vista would already be existing (it cannot be new) whether it be from a building, a road, or any other place - before or after the building is built.	Accept	4.1.3
986.72	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	Neutral/Amend	Add a new clause (b) to Policy 4.3.5 Building setbacks as follows (or similar amendments to achieve the requested relief): (a) Maintain existing and promote new vistas and views between buildings in the Village Zone when viewed from a road. (b) <u>Manage Reverse sensitivity by providing sufficient setbacks buildings to provide for residents' safety and amenity</u> AND Any consequential amendments to link and/or accommodate the requested changes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The policies applying to each zone requiring setbacks from the railway corridor should include reference to the purpose of the setback. Existing and sought changes to the Plans objectives lend sufficient support the need for setbacks for amenity and safety, and the efficient integration of development and infrastructure. Adding an additional item to these plan sections will also facilitate assessment of situations where the proposed 5 metre Building setback - railway corridor rule cannot be met, or it is inappropriate to require compliance. 	Reject	4.1.3
FS1193.34	Van De Brink Group	Oppose	<i>The submission is disallowed.</i>	<i>Setbacks from the NIMT (greater than a normal yard control) imposes unnecessary development restrictions on the use of land.</i>	Accept	4.1.3
697.543	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 4.3.6(a) Front setback character as follows: Maintain the existing open and unbuilt character of streets through the use of setbacks.	Provides additional clarification to the policy.	Accept	4.1.4
695.28	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 4.3.6(a) Front setback character to consider new/anticipated development.	Consider Pokeno Design Guide for the Pokeno Village. The statement is supported in principle.	Reject	4.1.4
695.29	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 4.3.7(a) Excessive building scale as follows: Enable development shall only to exceed height, bulk and form only where it is in keeping with and does not detract from the amenity values of the street <u>which are existing and (where a design guide is available) any development proposal balances the anticipated amenity values with those which are existing.</u>	The relief sought provides for appropriate step-change of development. Incorrect tense used. It encourages non-compliance.	Accept in part	4.1.5
378.71	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Retain Policy 4.3.8 Residential amenity and function, to the extent that the provision anticipates non-residential activities in the Village Zone AND Amend Policy 4.3.8(ii) - Residential amenity and function as follows: (ii) Provide for the health, <u>safety</u> and well-being of the community.	FENZ supports in part Policy 4.3.8 to the extent that these provisions anticipate non-residential activities in the Village Zone, but considers that the provisions focuses on the management of effects, rather than an outcome that provides clear direction in relation to the appropriateness of some non-residential activities in the Village	Accept	4.1.6

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make further or consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.	Zone. For instance providing for emergency services that have a functional and operational need to be located in close proximity to the communities they serve. Amendments sought will better achieve the purpose of the RMA by providing for the health and safety of people and communities.		
FS1035.178	Pareoranga Te Kata	Support	Obtain statement of performance expectation (SPE) to allow submission to be accepted.	Fire safety and fire prevention to undertake training activities for fire fighters within the region.	Accept	4.1
923.55	Waikato District Health Board	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 4.3.8 (a) (ii) - Residential Amenity and Function as follows: Provide for the health, <u>safety</u> and well-being of the community.	Submitter supports Policy 4.3.8 to the extent that recognition is given to the health and wellbeing of communities. However, recommends that the wording better reflects section 5 of the RMA which also refers to the safety of the community.	Accept	4.1.6
378.72	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Retain Policy 4.3.11 Maintain residential function, to the extent that these provisions anticipate non-residential activities in the Village Zone AND Amend Policy 4.3.11 Maintain residential function as follows: Restrict the establishment of <u>non-residential commercial or industrial</u> activities, unless the activity has a strategic or operational need to locate within the Village Zone, and the effects of such activities on the character and amenity are insignificant. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make further or consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.	Fire and Emergency New Zealand supports in part Policy 4.3.11 to the extent that these provisions anticipate non-residential activities in the Village Zone, but considers that the provisions focus on the management of effects, rather than an outcome that provides clear direction in relation to the appropriateness of some non-residential activities within the Village Zone. For instance providing for emergency services that have a functional and operational need to be located in close proximity to the communities they serve. The amendments sought will better achieve the purpose of the RMA by providing for the health and safety of people and communities.	Accept in part	4.1.7
FS1035.179	Pareoranga Te Kata	Support	Obtain statement of performance expectation (SPE) to allow submission to be accepted.	Fire safety and fire prevention to undertake training activities for fire fighters within the region.	Accept in part	4.1
FS1388.55	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to	Reject	3.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
697.544	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 4.3.11(a) Maintain residential function as follows: ... a strategic or operational need to locate within the Village Zone, and not compromise the effects of such activities on the character and amenity of the Village Zones are insignificant.	Re-wording provides additional clarification to the policy.	Accept in part	4.1.7
FS1387.599	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	3.1
81.132	Waikato Regional Council	Support	Retain Policy 4.3.11 Maintain residential function.	The submitter supports this Policy, as it will assist with giving effect to the WRPS' policy direction relating to the Future Proof settlement pattern. (Note: WRPS Policies 6.1, 6.14 and Section 6A).	Accept in part	4.1.7
FS1223.23	Mercury Energy Limited	Support	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	3.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1223.166	Mercury Energy Limited	Support	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	3.1
923.56	Waikato District Health Board	Support	Retain Policy 4.3.11 - Maintain Residential function as notified.	Submitter supports this policy as it will assist with giving effect to the Waikato Regional Policy Statement's policy direction relating to the Future Proof settlement pattern.	Accept in part	4.1.7
FS1387.1504	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	3.1
297.21	Counties Manukau Police	Neutral/Amend	Add to Policy 4.3.12(a) (iii) Non-residential activities a new line as follows: <u>Conforming to the national guidelines for CPTED.</u>	To ensure that there is an obligation to consider national guidelines for CPTED, reducing victimisation, making people safe and feel safe.	Accept in part	4.1.8
FS1386.313	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is	Reject	3.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				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.		
297.15	Counties Manukau Police	Neutral/Amend	Add to Policy 4.3.15 Earthworks a new line as follows: <u>Manage the earthworks site to ensure that resources at the site are safe and to minimise the risk of victimisation</u>	Development sites are crime attractors. Vehicles, tools and diesel have previously been targeted by criminals. The inclusion of this wording ensures that there is an obligation through council policy to consider safety at development sites. This should result in a reduction in victimisations, making people safe and feel safe.	Reject	4.1.9
466.37	Brendan Balle on behalf of Balles Bros Group Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 4.3.15 (c) Earthworks to include provision for ancillary rural earthworks associated with existing activities. AND Amend Policy 4.3.15 Earthworks to consider reverse sensitivity issues associated with ancillary rural earthworks associated with existing activities.	Where rezoning has included high-class soils that are currently used for commercial vegetable production, then earthworks provisions must also cater for ongoing earthworks activities associated with this land use and the policy should reflect this. Policy should also consider the reverse sensitivity issues likely to develop from residential development occurring around ongoing commercial vegetable production activities that are unable to relocate elsewhere.	Reject	4.1.9
559.46	Sherry Reynolds on behalf of Heritage New Zealand Lower Northern Office	Neutral/Amend	Add a new clause 'f' to Policy 4.3.15 Earthworks as follows: (a) ... (f) <u>Earthworks are designed and undertaken in a manner that they do not adversely affect historic heritage and cultural values.</u>	The submitter supports Policy 4.3.15 Earthworks in part as this policy does not reflect the need to provide for the protection of historic and cultural values at the time of earthworks. The policy needs to be amended to reflect the need to give effect to s6 of the RMA.	Reject	4.1.9
695.143	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Not stated	Delete Policy 4.3.15(d) Earthworks. OR Amend Policy 4.3.15(d) Earthworks to refer to minimising earthworks to maintain the fundamental shape, contour and landscape characteristics where otherwise possible.	It is ultra-vires. It lacks any comprehension of building and development requirements. Altering fundamental shape, contour and landscape cannot be avoided in some scenarios to achieve a suitable and safe building development outcome. If the intended outcome is to minimise earthworks then this is what the clause should state.	Reject	4.1.9
FS1323.34	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	That the amendments sought are declined.	HNZPT supports the original policy that seeks to minimise the potential effects of earthworks, limiting	Accept	4.1.9

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>the potential for adverse effects to cultural values.</i>		
695.30	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 4.3.15(d) Earthworks as follows: Subdivision and development occurs in a manner that maintains fundamental shape, contour and landscape characteristics <u>That earthworks shall be to the extent necessary to enable the development, and where practical shall try to maintain the shape, contour and landscape characteristic.</u>	The objective is unachievable, as earthworks will often change the fundamental shape, contour and landscape, especially if large scale. It is ultra-vires. It lacks any comprehension of building and development requirements. Altering fundamental shape, contour and landscape cannot be avoided in some scenarios to achieve a suitable and safe building development outcome. If the intended outcome is to minimise earthworks then this is what the clause should state.	Reject	4.1.9
695.31	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	No specific decision sought for Policy 4.3.15(e); however submission considers common clauses for all development should be under one section in the District Plan to avoid unnecessary repetition.	It is ultra-vires. It lacks any comprehension of building and development requirements. Altering fundamental shape, contour and landscape cannot be avoided in some scenarios to achieve a suitable and safe building development outcome. If the intended outcome is to minimise earthworks then this is what the clause should state.	Reject	4.1.9
697.458	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Add new provisions to Chapter 24 Village Zone allowing for new retirement villages to be established as a permitted activity; AND Add provisions for alterations and additions to existing retirement villages as a Permitted Activity; AND Add new policies similar to Policies 4.2.19 and 4.2.13 (Residential Zone) to Chapter 4 Urban Environment to support the proposed provisions.	Retirement Villages have been provided for in the Residential Zone only. Council are seeking to include Retirement Villages into the Village Zone. Retirement Villages provide a range of housing options for older persons. New policies are required to support these proposed provisions.	Reject	4.1
FS1335.12	Greig Metcalfe for CKL	Support	Null	<i>Village Zone is an appropriate location for retirement villages. In respect of b), there should be an option for retirement villages to provide their own regular transportation services (e.g. shuttle bus).</i>	Reject	4.1
FS1387.564	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is</i>	Reject	3.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>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>		
182.7	Kirriemuir Trustee Limited	Support	Retain the Objectives and Policies in Section 4.4 Residential and Village Zones - Noise, lighting, outdoor storage, signs and odour, as notified.	The provisions provide a suitable framework to facilitate a residential environment.	Accept in part	4.2
367.2	Mercer Residents and Ratepayers Committee	Support	Retain Section 4.4 Residential and Village Zones - Noise, lighting, outdoor storage, signs and odour.	No reasons	Accept in part	4.2
FS1386.545	Mercury NZ Limited	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Reject	3.1
749.5	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Support	Retain the Objectives and Policies in Section 4.4 Residential and Village Zones - Noise, lighting, outdoor storage, signs and odour, as notified.	The submitter supports the objectives and policies of 4.4 Residential and Village Zones – Noise, lighting, outdoor storage, signs and odour.	Accept in part	4.2
299.3	2SEN Limited and Tuakau Estates Limited	Support	Retain Section 4.4 Noise, lighting, outdoor storage, signs and odour as notified except where specific modification is sought elsewhere in the submission.	The provisions provide a suitable framework to facilitate a residential environment.	Accept in part	4.2
297.22	Counties Manukau Police	Support – with addition	Amend Objective 4.4.1(a) Adverse effects of land use and development as follows: The health, <u>safety</u> and well-being of people, communities and the environment are protected from the adverse effects of land use and development.	To ensure that there is an obligation to consider safety, reducing victimisation, making people safe and making people feel safe.	Accept	4.2.1
FS1114.3	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support		<i>FENZ supports the amendment of Objective 4.4.1 as it recognises the importance of protecting the health, safety and wellbeing of communities from the</i>	Accept	4.2.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>adverse effects of land use and development and better reflects section 5 of the RMA, which also refers to the safety of the community. This submission supports the intention sought in FENZ's submission point number 378.73 noting the slightly different wording change sought as follows: 4.4.1(a) The health, <u>safety</u> and well-being of people, communities and the environment are protected from the adverse effects of land use and development.</i>		
FS1269.17	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Oppose in part		Opposes to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission	Reject	4.2.1
923.57	Waikato District Health Board	Support in part	Amend Objective 4.4.1(a) Adverse effects of land use and development as follows: The health, safety and well-being of people, communities and the environment are protected from the adverse effects of land use and development.	The submitter supports Objective 4.4.1- Adverse effects of land use and development to the extent that recognition is given to the health and wellbeing of communities and communities are protected from the adverse effects of land use and development, however recommends that the wording better reflects section 5 of the RMA which also refers to the safety of the community.	Accept	4.2.1
FS1114.33	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support		FENZ supports the amendment of Objective 4.4.1 as it recognises the importance of protecting the health, safety and wellbeing of communities from the adverse effects of land use and development and better reflects section 5 of the RMA, which also refers to the safety of the community. This submission supports the intention sought in FENZ's submission point number 378.73.	Accept	4.2.1
FS1387.1590	Mercury Energy Limited	Oppose		At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and	Reject	3.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
378.73	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support in part	Retain Objective 4.4.1 Adverse effects of land use and development, to the extent that recognition is given to the health and well-being of communities and are protected from the adverse effects of land use and development AND Amend Objective 4.4.1 (a) Adverse effects of land use and development as follows: 4.4.1 (a) The health, <u>safety</u> and well-being of people, communities and the environment are protected from the adverse effects of land use and development. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make further or consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.	Fire and Emergency New Zealand supports Objective 4.4.1 to the extent that recognition is given to the health and wellbeing of communities and are protected from the adverse effects of land use and development. However, Fire and Emergency New Zealand recommends the wording better reflect section 5 of the RMA, which also refers to the safety of the community.	Accept	4.2.1
<i>FS1035.180</i>	<i>Pareoranga Te Kata</i>	<i>Support</i>		<i>Fire safety and fire prevention to undertake training activities for fire fighters within the region. Obtain statement of performance expectation (SPE) to allow submission to be accepted.</i>	Accept	4.1
986.22	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	Neutral/Amend	Retain Policy 4.4.2 Noise, particularly clauses (iii)-(v) as amended below AND Amend Policy 4.4.2(a) Noise as follows (or similar amendments to achieve the requested relief): (iii)Maintaining appropriate setback distances between high noise environments and sensitive land uses <u>noise-sensitive activities</u> ; (iv)Managing the location of sensitive land uses <u>and noise-sensitive activities</u> , particularly in relation to lawfully-established high noise generating activities; and (v)Requiring acoustic insulation where <u>noise-sensitive</u> activities are located within high noise environments. AND Any consequential amendments to link and/or accommodate the requested changes.	KiwiRail supports the policy, particularly clauses (iii)-(v). These clauses support noise sensitive activities managing reverse sensitivity effects on the railway corridor including through both setbacks and acoustic design. • The terminology used in the policy is 'sensitive land uses'. The policy should be expanded to include 'noise' sensitive activities (as this is also defined in the Plan). A separate KiwiRail submission seeks that the definitions of 'noise sensitive' and 'sensitive' land uses be clarified or combined.	Accept in part	4.2.2
<i>FS1345.141</i>	<i>Genesis Energy Limited</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Accept submission point.</i>	<i>For the reasons set out in the KiwiRail submission.</i>	Accept in part	4.2.2
182.10	Kirriemuir Trustee Limited	Support	Retain Policy 4.4.2 Noise, as notified.	The policy seeks to ensure lawfully established activities are protected and that setbacks are provided. This is agreed and will need to be supported with robust planning (for lawful establishment) and technical (acoustic) reporting where any setback is proposed.	Accept in part	4.2.2
299.6	2SEN Limited and Tuakau	Support	Retain Policy 4.4.2 Noise as notified.	The policy seeks to ensure lawfully established	Accept in part	4.2.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
	Estates Limited			activities are protected and that setbacks are provided. This is agreed and will need to be supported with robust planning (for lawful establishment) and technical (acoustic) reporting where any setback is proposed.		
742.23	New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Retain Policy 4.4.2 Noise as notified.	The submitter supports the intent of this policy, in particular clauses (iii)-(v). These clauses are consistent with the Transport Agency's approach to managing the reverse sensitivity effects from activities sensitive to noise on the state highway network.	Accept in part	4.2.2
297.23	Counties Manukau Police	Support – with addition	Retain Policy 4.4.3 Artificial outdoor lighting, except for the amendments sought below. AND Add to Policy 4.4.3 Artificial outdoor lighting a new line as follows: (d) <u>Conform to the national guidelines for CPTED.</u>	To ensure that there is an obligation to consider safety, reducing victimisation, making people safe and making people feel safe.	Accept in part	4.2.4
<i>FS1269.18</i>	<i>Housing New Zealand Corporation</i>	<i>Oppose (in part)</i>		<i>Opposes to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission</i>	Reject	4.2.4
742.24	New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Retain Policy 4.4.3 Artificial outdoor lighting as notified.	Supports Policy 4.4.3 (c)	Accept in part	4.2.4
182.11	Kirriemuir Trustee Limited	Support	Retain Policy 4.4.5 Objectionable odour, as notified.	The policy seeks to ensure lawfully established activities are protected and that setbacks are provided. This is agreed and will need to be supported with robust planning (for lawful establishment) and technical (acoustic) reporting where any setback is proposed.	Accept	4.2.6
299.7	2SEN Limited and Tuakau Estates Limited	Support	Retain Policy 4.4.5 Objectionable odour as notified.	The policy seeks to ensure lawfully established activities are protected and that setbacks are provided. This is agreed and will need to be supported with robust planning (for lawful establishment) and technical (acoustic) reporting where any setback is proposed.	Accept	4.2.6
695.32	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Not specified	Amend Policy 4.4.6 Signage to include restrictions on the number of signs on a premises.	Council could also consider placing restrictions on the number of signs on a premises, and also itself in terms of road signs many of which are superfluous to advise traffic of safety, speed or directions. This avoids 'signage clutter'.	Reject	4.2.8
986.23	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	Neutral/Amend	Retain Policy 4.4.7 Managing the adverse effects of signs except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Policy 4.4.7(a) Managing the adverse effects of signs as follows (or similar amendments to achieve the requested relief): (a) The location, colour, content, and appearance of signs directed at traffic is controlled to	KiwiRail supports the policy as it provides for the assessment of the effects of signs on land transport safety. This is reflected in the minor amendment sought.	Reject	4.2.9

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			ensure signs do not distract, confuse or obstruct motorists, pedestrians and other road <u>land transport</u> users; AND Any consequential amendments to link and/or accommodate the requested changes.			
695.33	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Not specified	Amend Policy 4.4.7 Managing the adverse effects of signs to include restrictions on the number of signs on a premises.	Many signs are superfluous to advise traffic of safety, speed or directions. This avoids signage clutter.	Reject	4.2.9
742.25	New Zealand Transport Agency	Support with amendments	Retain Policy 4.4.7 Managing the adverse effects of signs, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Policy 4.4.7 Managing the adverse effects of signs as follows: (a) The location, colour, content, and appearance of signs directed at or visible to road users traffic is controlled to ensure signs <u>they</u> do not distract, confuse or obstruct motorist, pedestrians and other road users <u>adversely affect safety of road users</u> ... (b) Discourage Signs that generate adverse effects from illumination, light spill, flashing, <u>moving</u> , or reflection <u>are avoided</u> . AND Request any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the submission.	The submitter supports the recognition in Policy 4.5.37 of the potential adverse effects of signs on people using the land transport system but seeks minor amendments.	Accept in part	4.2.9
297.26	Counties Manukau Police	Support	Retain Policy 4.4.7 Managing the adverse effects of signs as notified.	The intention of this policy is in line with the Police Prevention First Model (taking every opportunity to prevent harm) and the Safer Journeys Strategy (reducing and preventing road related trauma) and the target to reduce road deaths every year by 5 percent.	Accept in part	4.2.9
FS1134.20	Counties Power Limited	Oppose		<i>The application of CPTED to infrastructure would not have any meaningful outcome as infrastructure sites e.g. substations are secured from the general public for safety reasons. In areas where CPTED is usually adopted all infrastructure tends to be underground.</i>	Reject	4.2.9
697.935	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Chapter 24 Village Zone heading, as follows: Chapter 24: Village Zone – Rules.	This is to assist in clarifying that all of the provisions within the chapter are rules.	Accept	4.3
FS1387.738	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure.</i>	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
697.936	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 24(2) Village Zone, as follows: The rules that apply to subdivision in the Village Zone are contained in Rule 24.4 and the relevant rules in 14 Infrastructure and Energy; and 15 Natural Hazards and Climate Change (Placeholder).	This is to clarify that the rules in Chapter 14: Infrastructure and Energy and Chapter 15: Natural Hazards and Climate Change apply to subdivision as well as to land use activities.	Accept	4.3
<i>FS1387.739</i>	<i>Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	<i>Reject</i>	<i>3.1</i>
81.74	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Chapter 24: Village Zone to manage buildings, structures and subdivision within landscape and natural character overlay areas, which may be through activity status, rules and assessment criteria.	Apart from Rule 16.2.4.4/24.2.4.4 which relates to earthworks in landscape and natural character areas, it appears that no other provisions apply to buildings, structures and subdivision that fall within an overlay area. This does not give effect to WRPS Policy 12.1, 12.2 and associated Implementation Methods.	Accept in part	4.3
<i>FS1223.10</i>	<i>Mercury Energy Limited</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the</i>	<i>Reject</i>	<i>3.1</i>

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				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.		
746.123	The Surveying Company	Support	Retain Chapter 24: Village Zone as notified, except for the amendments sought below.	Village Zone provisions provide for the efficient use of the urban land resources. Village Zone provisions enable the subdivision of land to provide for the growth of the district.	Accept in part	4.3
FSI127.12	Vineyard Road Properties Limited	Support	Null	A Village is appropriate.	Accept in part	4.3
FSI387.977	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	3.1
689.16	Greig Developments No 2 Limited	Support	Retain Chapter 24 Village Zone, except for those addressed in the submission points.	It provides for the efficient use of the land resources Enables the subdivision of land to provide for the growth of the district.	Accept in part	4.3
FSI387.288	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate	Reject	3.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>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>		
697.937	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 24.1.1 Permitted Activities, as follows: (1) The following activities are permitted activities if they meet all the following: (a)Activity-specific conditions; (a) (b)Land Use – Effects rules in Rule 24.2 (unless the activity rule and/or activity-specific conditions identify a condition(s) that does not apply); (b) (c)Land Use – Building rules in Rule 24.3 (unless the activity rule and/or activity-specific conditions identify a condition(s) that does not apply); (c) Activity-specific conditions.	The list of rules (a) – (c) should follow the order that they appear.	Accept in part	4.3.1
FS1387.740	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Reject	3.1
697.940	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Activity Rule 24.1.1 P3 (d) and (e) Permitted Activities (Home occupation), as follows: (d) Unloading and loading of vehicles and/or the receiving of customers or deliveries only occur after 7:30am and before 7:00pm on any day; (e) Machinery may can only be operated after 7:30am and up to 97pm on any day.	To align the hours for the activity with the noise rule (24.2.1) for this zone.	Accept	4.3.1
697.941	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 24.1.1 P7 (b) Homestay.	Condition (b) is unnecessary for a home occupation activity.	Accept	4.3.1
FS1387.743	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the</i>	Reject	3.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
697.943	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 24.1.2 D1 Discretionary Activities as follows: Any permitted activity that does not comply with <u>one or more of the an 'Activity-Specific Conditions'</u> in Rule 24.1.1.	Consistency with other chapters and additional clarity of the rule.	Accept	4.3.1
FS1387.745	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	3.1
697.944	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 24.1.2 D2 Discretionary Activities.	This rule is not needed as it refers to Land Use Effects and Land Use Building rules which are in subsequent parts of the chapter.	Accept	4.3.1
FS1387.746	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is	Reject	3.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				appropriate.		
697.945	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Add new heading for Rule 24.2 noise rules, as follows: <u>24.2.1 Noise</u> AND Make consequential changes to numbering.	New heading required for noise rules to be consistent with other zone chapters.	Accept	4.3.1
FS1387.747	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	3.1
697.946	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 24.2(1) Land Use -Effects.	Reduces duplication – this noise rule is adequately covered by points (2) and (3).	Accept	4.3.1
FS1387.748	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	3.1
697.942	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Add a new activity to Rule 24.1.1 after P8 for retirement villages, as follows: <u>A new retirement village or alterations to an existing retirement village:</u> Activity Specific Conditions: <u>(a) The site or combination of sites where the retirement village is proposed to be</u>	Retirement villages in the Village Zone should be provided for on the boundaries of towns and villages provided they can be serviced by infrastructure. Retirement villages provide opportunities for residential development (aged	Reject	4.1.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			located has a minimum net site area of 3ha; (b) The site is either serviced by or within 400m walking distance of public transport; (c) The site is connected to public water and wastewater infrastructure; (d) Minimum living court or balcony area and dimensions: (i) Apartment – 10m ² area with minimum dimension horizontal and vertical of 2.5m; (ii) Studio unit or 1 bedroom unit – 12.5m ² area with minimum dimension horizontal and vertical of 2.5m; or (iii) 2 or more bedroomed unit – 15m ² area with minimum dimension horizontal and vertical of 2.5m; (e) Minimum service court is either: (i) Apartment – Communal outdoor space (ie no individual service courts required) of at least 5m ² with a minimum dimension of 1.5 metres for each apartment; or (ii) All other units – 10m ² with a minimum dimension of 1.5 metres for each unit; (f) Building height does not exceed 8m, except for 15% of the total building coverage, where buildings may be up to 10m high; (g) The following Land Use – Effects rule in Rule 24.2 does not apply: (i) Rule 24.2.7 (Signs); (h) The following Land Use – Building rules in Rule 24.3 do not apply: (i) Rule 24.3.1 (Dwelling); (ii) Rule 24.3.3 (Building Height); (j) The following Infrastructure and Energy rule in Chapter 14 does not apply: (i) Rule 14.12.1 P4(1)(a) (Traffic generation).	care) that is not only confined to the residential zone.		
FS1187.111	Greig Developments No 2 Limited	Support	Support submission point 697.942.	Retirement villages are appropriate land use in the Village Zone. Retirement villages do not feature as a land use activity in the Village zone. Given the demand for such facilities, provision should be made for retirement villages in all urban areas, including the Village zone.	Reject	4.1.1
FS1308.114	Leigh Shaw on behalf of The Surveying Company	Support	Null	Retirement villages are in appropriate land use in the Village Zone. Retirement villages do not feature as a land use activity in the village zone. Given the demand for such facilities, provision should be made for retirement villages in all urban areas, including the village zone.	Reject	4.1.1
FS1387.744	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to	Reject	3.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>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>		
602.46	Greig Metcalfe	Oppose	Add a new rule to Rule 24.1.1 Permitted Activities for "A new retirement village or alterations to an existing retirement village" and appropriate activity-specific conditions. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	Retirement villages are an appropriate land use in the Village Zone.	Reject	4.1.1
<i>FS1187.9</i>	<i>Greig Developments No 2 Limited</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support submission point 602.46.</i>	<i>Retirement villages are appropriate land use in the Village Zone. Retirement villages do not feature as a land use activity in the village zone. Given the demand for such facilities, provision should be made for retirement villages in all urban areas, including the village zone.</i>	<i>Reject</i>	<i>4.1.1</i>
<i>FS1308.84</i>	<i>Leigh Shaw on behalf of The Surveying Company</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>Retirement villages are appropriate land use in the Village Zone. Retirement villages do not feature as a land use activity in the village zone. Given the demand for such facilities, provision should be made for retirement villages in all urban areas, including the village zone.</i>	<i>Reject</i>	<i>4.1.1</i>
<i>FS1388.1045</i>	<i>Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	<i>Reject</i>	<i>3.1</i>
689.17	Greig Developments No 2 Limited	Neutral/Amend	Add a new permitted activity to Rule 24.1.1 Permitted Activities as follows: <u>A new retirement village or alterations to an existing retirement village.</u>	Retirement villages do not feature as a land use activity in the Village Zone. Given the demand for such facilities, provision should be made for	Reject	4.1.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				retirement villages in all urban areas, including the Village Zone.		
FS1387.289	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	3.1
746.124	The Surveying Company	Neutral/Amend	Add a new permitted activity to Rule 24.1.1-Permitted activities as follows: <u>A new retirement village or alterations to an existing retirement village.</u>	Given the demand for such facilities, provision should be made for retirement villages in all urban areas, including the village zone.	Reject	4.1.1
FS1387.978	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	3.1
781.16	Ministry of Education	Oppose	Add a new restricted activity rule to Rule 24.1 Land Use - Activities as follows: <u>24.1.2 Restricted Discretionary Activities</u> <u>(1) The activities listed below are restricted discretionary activities</u> <u>(2) Discretion to grant or decline consent and impose conditions</u>	Education facilities are not listed in the Village Zone. Opposes the non-complying activity status. Education facilities such as schools, community education, tertiary education institutions, work skills training centres, outdoor education centres and sports training establishments within village areas are essential social infrastructure.	Accept in part	4.3.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p><i>is restricted to the matters of discretion set out in the following table:</i></p> <p><i>Activity</i></p> <p><i>RD 1 Education facilities</i></p> <p><i>Council's discretion shall be restricted to the following matters:</i></p> <p><i>a. The extent to which it is necessary to locate the activity in the Village Zone.</i></p> <p><i>b. Reverse sensitivity effects of adjacent activities.</i></p> <p><i>c. The extent to which the activity may adversely impact on the transport network.</i></p> <p><i>d. The extent to which the activity may adversely impact on the streetscape.</i></p> <p><i>e. The extent to which the activity may adversely impact on the noise environment.</i></p>	The submitter requests consistency with their requested definition of 'Education facilities'.		
FS1387.1220	Mercury Energy Limited	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>	Reject	3.1
FS1202.92	New Zealand Transport Agency	Support		The Transport Agency supports the inclusion of c, the extent to which the activity may adversely impact on the transport network	Accept in part	4.3.3
378.45	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Oppose	<p>Add a new activity to Rule 24.1.1 Permitted Activities, as follows: (x) <u>Emergency services training and management activities.</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend the Proposed District Plan to make further or consequential amendments as necessary to address the</p>	Fire and Emergency New Zealand opposes range of activities listed in Rule 24.1.1 as permitted activities to the extent no provision is made for emergency services training and management activities. The rules should be expanded to provide for emergency services training and	Accept in part	4.3.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			matters raised in the submission.	management in order to better achieve the sustainable management purpose of the Act and better enable Fire and Emergency New Zealand to achieve its statutory function by facilitating firefighting and emergency response.		
FS1035.151	Pareoranga Te Kata	Support	Obtain statement of performance expectation (SPE) to allow submission to be accepted.	Fire safety and fire prevention to undertake training activities for fire fighters within the region.	Accept in part	4.1
FS1388.42	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate	Reject	3.1
378.46	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Oppose	Add a new activity to Rule 24.1.2 Discretionary Activities, to include the following as a Discretionary activity: <u>(x)</u> Emergency service facilities. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make further or consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.	Fire and Emergency New Zealand opposes Rule 24.1.2 as no provision is made for emergency service facilities. As provision is not made under the rule, emergency service facilities would instead default to a non-complying activity under Rule 24.1.3. The non-complying activity status is restrictive and inappropriate. Fire and Emergency New Zealand seek the inclusion of emergency service facilities as a discretionary activity in the Village Zone for the following reasons: Fire stations must be strategically located within and throughout communities to maximise their coverage and response times so that they can efficiently and effectively provide for the health and safety of people and communities by being able respond to emergency call outs in a timely way, thus avoiding or mitigating the potential for adverse effects associated with fire hazard and other emergencies; The actual or potential effects of fire stations are minor and can be	Accept	4.3.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				adequately predicted and subsequently managed by conditions of consent and subsequent matters for control; Restricted Discretionary activity status better implement the Objectives and Policies of the Proposed District Plan. Restricted Discretionary activity status better achieves the purpose of the RMA and better enables Fire and Emergency New Zealand to meet its statutory obligations.		
FS1035.152	Pareoranga Te Kata	Support	Obtain statement of performance expectation (SPE) to allow submission to be accepted.	Fire safety and fire prevention to undertake training activities for fire fighters within the region.	Accept	4.1
FS1388.43	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	3.1
496.9	Andrea Millar for The Department of Corrections	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 24.1.1 P5 Permitted Activities, to provide an exclusion for community corrections activity as follows: P5 Community activity - Activity specific conditions <u>Excluding a community correction activity</u> Nil AND Any other consequential amendments required to give effect to this relief.	This would result in community correction activities being permitted in the Village Zone. The submitter considers it appropriate that this activity in the Village Zone should be subject to a resource consent application process to allow the Council to assess the effects on the environment.	Accept in [496.2] is accepted OR Reject if [496.2] is rejected	4.3.5
FS1388.496	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy	Reject	3.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
742.145	NZTA	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 24.1.1 P3 Home occupation, except for the amendments sought below AND Add a new condition to Rule 24.1.1 P3 Permitted activity - Home occupation as follows: <u>(f) There are no heavy vehicle movements associated with the activity.</u> AND Add a new Restricted Discretionary Activity rule for home occupations not complying with 24.1.1 P3 (f), with discretion restricted to the effects of heavy vehicle traffic on the safety and efficiency of the transport network. AND Request any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the submission.	Within the Village Zone, home occupations should not involve heavy vehicles without assessment of effects.	Reject	4.3.6
FS1387.888	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Reject	3.1
742.146	NZTA	Support	Retain Rule 24.1.1 P4 Permitted Activities - Temporary event as notified.	The submitter supports no direct access from a national route or regional arterial road. Temporary events are subject to Rule 14.12.1.4 which would ensure that for events exceeding a certain size, any effects on the transport network could be addressed.	Accept	4.3.7
FS1387.889	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear</i>	Reject	3.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>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>		
697.947	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	<p>Delete Rule 24.2.1 P3 and P4 Noise - General; AND</p> <p>Amend Rule 24.2.1 P2 Noise-General, as follows: (a) Noise measured within any other site in the Village Zone must not exceed: (i) 50dB (LAeq), 7am to 7pm every day; (ii) 45dB (LAeq), 7pm to 10pm every day; and (iii) 40dB (LAeq) and 65dB (LAmax), 10pm to 7am the following day. (b) <u>Noise levels must be measured in accordance with the requirements of New Zealand Standard NZS 6801:2008 "Acoustics - Measurement of Environmental Sound"; and (c) Noise levels must be assessed in accordance with the requirements of New Zealand Standard NZS 6802:2008 "Acoustic-Environmental noise.</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Make consequential amendments to Rule 24.2.1 D1 as follows: Noise that does not comply with Rule 24.2.1 P1, P2 or P3.</p>	P3 need to be conditions of P2 as they are the standards which need to be met.	Accept in part	4.3.8
923.161	Waikato District Health Board	Neutral/Amend	<p>Amend Rule 24.2.1 P2, P3 and D1 Noise - General, as follows: P2 <u>Sound measured in accordance with NZS 6801:2008 and assessed in accordance with NZS 6802:2008 must not exceed: (a)Noise measured The following noise limits at any point within any other site in the Village Zone must not exceed: (i) 50dB LAeq(15min), dB (LAeq), 7am to 7pm, every day; ii) 45dB LAeq(15min), dB (LAeq), 7pm to 10pm, every day; and (iii)40dB LAeq(15min), dB (LAeq) and 65Db (LAmax), 10pm to 7am the following day; (iv)65dB LAFmax, 10pm to 7am the following day; (b)The permitted activity noise limits for the zone of any other site where sound is received. P3 (a)Noise levels shall be measured in accordance with the requirements of NZS 6801:2008</u></p>	The proposed noise limits are generally in accordance with guideline values and use current measurement and assessment standards, acoustical metrics, numerical values, time-frames and assessment location. However, the following issues have been identified: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Incorrect terminology has been used in conflict with the standards specified, - No provision has been made for sound sources outside the scope of NZS 6802, - The measurement and assessment standards are an integral part of the noise limits and cannot be a separate permitted activity standard, - No noise limits are specified for sound received in adjoining zones. 	Reject	4.3.8

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			“Acoustics Measurement of Environmental Sound”; and (b) Noise levels shall be assessed in accordance with the requirements of NZS 6802:2008 “Acoustic Environmental Noise.” D1 (a) Sound that is outside the scope of NZS 6802:2008 or a permitted activity standard; and (b) Sound Noise that does not comply with Rule 24.2.1 P1 or P2 or P3.			
697.948	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 24.2.2 P1 (a) Noise - construction, as follows: (a) Construction noise must <u>not exceed</u> meet the limits in NZS 6803:1999 (Acoustics – Construction Noise); and	Amend the rule for additional clarity.	Accept	4.3.8
378.47	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Retain Rule 24.2.1 Noise - General.	Fire and Emergency New Zealand supports Rule 24.2.1 as it permits noise generated by emergency sirens. This exemption appropriately provides for the operational requirements of Fire and Emergency New Zealand and enables them to meet its statutory obligations in a manner that provides for on-going health and safety of people and communities.	Accept in part	4.3.8
FS1035.153	Pareoranga Te Kata	Support	Obtain statement of performance expectation (SPE) to allow submission to be accepted.	Fire safety and fire prevention to undertake training activities for fire fighters within the region.	Accept in part	4.1
742.147	NZTA	Support	Retain Rule 24.2.3 P1 Glare and artificial light spill, as notified. AND Retain Rule 24.2.3 RDI Glare and artificial light spill, as notified.	The submitter supports all rules in this section.	Accept	4.3.10
697.949	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 24.2.3 P1 (b) Glare and artificial light spill.	This rule is not required as the matters are not typical of the Village Zone. Consistency with the Residential Zone.	Reject	4.3.10
697.950	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 24.2.4(1) Earthworks, as follows: (1) Rule 24.2.4.1 – Earthworks General, provides the permitted rules for earthworks activities for the Rural Zone. <u>This rule does not apply in those areas specified in rules 24.2.4.1A, 24.2.4.2, 24.2.4.3 and 24.2.4.4.</u>	The wording of the rule does not make it clear that the rules specified in 24.2.4(2) apply instead of the general earthworks rule.	Accept in part	4.3.11
FS1350.101	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Oppose	Disallow in terms of sought relocation of National Grid provisions. Notwithstanding the location of the provisions, Transpower seeks that all amendments sought in its original submission be included.	Related to the original submission by Waikato District Council seeking relocation/replicating of the National Grid earthworks provisions (submission point 697.6), Transpower’s further submission point in response to Submission point 697.6 apply to the earthwork provisions listed. Transpower supports and prefers a standalone set of provisions (for the reason it avoids duplication and provides a coherent set of rules which submitters can refer to, noting that the planning maps clearly identify land that is subject to the National Grid	Reject in part	4.3.11

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>provisions). A stand-alone set of provisions as provided in the notified plan is also consistent with the National Planning Standards. Irrespective that the proposed plan has not been drafted to align with the National Planning Standards, it would be counterproductive to amend the layout contrary to the intent of the Standards. Standard 7. District wide Matters Standard provides, as a mandatory direction, that 'provisions relating to energy, infrastructure and transport that are not specific to the Special purpose zones chapter or sections must be located in one or more chapters under the Energy, Infrastructure and Transport heading'. Clause 5.(c) makes specific reference to reverse sensitivity effects between infrastructure and other activities. It is not clear from the submission points as to the relationship between chapters 14, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24 and 25 and the National Grid provisions within 14.1.1 provides the zone provisions do not apply to infrastructure and energy activities. As such, any other network utility activities would appear to be subject to the National Grid provisions and this requires further clarification. If council wishes to pursue splitting the National Grid provisions into the respective chapters, supply of a revised full set of provisions would be beneficial to enable Transpower to fully assess the implications and workability of the requested changes. Notwithstanding the location of National Grid provisions relating to earthworks within the proposed plan, Transpower seeks the specific changes to earthwork provisions as sought in its original submission point 576.55. Note: It is not evident from the summary if there is a submission point applicable for Chapter 17. If so, this further submission covers that point.</p>		
397.7	Horotiu Properties Limited	Oppose	Delete Rule 24.2.4.1 P1 (a)(i) Earthworks - General. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any consequential amendments necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.	Earthworks within 1.5m of a boundary are inevitable and even the most minor activities such as digging a posthole would trigger a requirement for resource consent.	Reject	4.3.11
397.8	Horotiu Properties Limited	Oppose	Delete Rule 24.2.4.1 P3 (a)(iv) Earthworks - General. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any	Earthworks within 1.5m of a boundary are inevitable and even the most minor activities	Reject	4.3.11

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			consequential amendments necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.	such as digging a posthole would trigger a requirement for resource consent.		
466.50	Brendan Balle on behalf of Balles Bros Group Limited	Oppose	Delete the requirement for 1.5m setback from the boundary where effects are mitigated from Rule 24.2.4.1 PI Earthworks.	The submitter questions the requirement for a 1.5m setback from all boundaries where appropriate erosion and sediment controls are in place and effects are mitigated. This is unworkable.	Reject	4.3.11
602.47	Greig Metcalfe	Oppose	Delete Rule 24.2.4.1 PI (a) (i) Earthworks - General. AND Delete Rule 24.2.1 P3 (a) (iv) Earthworks - General. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	Earthworks within 1.5m of a boundary are inevitable and even the most minor activity, such as digging a posthole, would trigger the requirement for resource consent.	Reject	4.3.11
<i>FS1187.10</i>	<i>Greig Developments No 2 Limited</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support submission point 602.47.</i>	<i>Earthworks within 1.5m of a boundary are inevitable and even the most minor activity, such as digging a posthole, would trigger the requirement for resource consent.</i>	<i>Reject</i>	<i>4.3.11</i>
<i>FS1308.85</i>	<i>Leigh Shaw on behalf of The Surveying Company</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>Earthworks within 1.5m of a boundary are inevitable and even the most minor activity, such as digging a posthole, would trigger the requirement for resource consent.</i>	<i>Reject</i>	<i>4.3.11</i>
602.48	Greig Metcalfe	Oppose	Delete Rule 24.2.4.1 NCI Earthworks - General. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	The importation of cleanfill is provided for as a permitted activity by other rules (P2 and P3).	Reject	4.3.11
<i>FS1187.12</i>	<i>Greig Developments No 2 Limited</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support submission point 602.48.</i>	<i>The importation of clean fill is provided for as a permitted activity by other rules (P2 and P3).</i>	<i>Reject</i>	<i>4.3.11</i>
<i>FS1308.86</i>	<i>Leigh Shaw on behalf of The Surveying Company</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>The importation of clean fill is provided for as a permitted activity by other rules (P2 and P3).</i>	<i>Reject</i>	<i>4.3.11</i>
689.18	Greig Developments No 2 Limited	Neutral/Amend	No specific decision sought, but submission recognises the importation of fill to enable residential development is appropriate in Rule 24.2.4.1 Earthworks - General and questions whether this should be a permitted activity (P2) or a non-complying activity (NC1).	These provisions seem workable but the submitter is interested in the thoughts of other submitters Clean-fill may be required in residential zones to enable green-field land to be developed for residential purposes. It is unclear to the submitter whether it is a P2 permitted activity or a NCI non-complying activity. NCI would be too restrictive and needs to be more lenient to enable green-field development within residential zones.	Reject	4.3.11
695.125	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 24.2.4.1 PI Earthworks – General, so that earthworks limits be applied as a ratio of the site area i.e. 1:1 so a 450m2 site would provide 450m3 of earthworks.	The Proposed District Plan penalises bigger sites for no apparent outcome, especially when a bigger site is likely to be better able to absorb and diffuse effects. Earthworks totals should	Reject	4.3.11

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				not cancel each other out, i.e. cut and fill add together.		
695.126	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 24.2.4.1 P3 (a) (i) Earthworks – General, to increase the infill volume from 20m3 to 50m3.	The infill volume is too low and should be realistic for works outside of a building platform.	Reject	4.3.11
695.127	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 24.2.4.1 P3 (a) (ii) Earthworks – General, to increase the depth from 1m to 1.5m.	The relief sought is realistic.	Accept	4.3.11
697.952	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 24.2.4.1 P1(a) Earthworks - General, as follows: (a) Earthworks (excluding the importation of fill material) within a site must meet all of the following conditions: (i) Be located more than 1.5 m horizontally from any waterway, open drain or overland flow path; (ii) Not exceed a volume of more than 250m3 and an area of more than 1,000m2 over any single consecutive 12 month period; (iii) Not exceed an area of more than 1,000m2 over any single consecutive 12 month period; (iv) The total depth of any excavation or filling does not exceed 1.5m above or below ground level; (v) The slope of the resulting cut, filled areas or fill batter face in stable ground, does not exceed a maximum of 1:2 (1 vertical to 2 horizontal); (vi) Earthworks are set back <u>at least</u> 1.5m from all boundaries; (vii) Areas exposed by earthworks are re-vegetated to achieve 80% ground cover within 6 months of the commencement of the earthworks; (viii) Sediment resulting from the earthworks is retained on the site through implementation and maintenance of erosion and sediment controls; (ix) Do not divert or change the nature of natural water flows, water bodies or established drainage paths.	The rule needs to apply over a single consecutive 12 month period for both volume and area thresholds. This is also consistent with other zone chapters.	Accept in part	4.3.11
697.953	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 24.2.4.1 P3(a)(iv) Earthworks - General, as follows: (iv) Fill material is setback <u>at least</u> 1.5m from all boundaries;	The words “at least” provide clarity to this rule.	Accept (if error correction is within scope) OR Reject if error correction is out of scope	4.3.11
746.125	The Surveying Company	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 24.2.4.1 P1 (a)(ii)-Earthworks - General to increase the earthworks volume to 500m³.	Where subdivision has been approved by Council there should be no requirements for land owners to apply for additional consents for earthworks to undertake permitted activities on the land. The earthworks thresholds need to be lenient enough to ensure the land can be developed without additional consents. Permitted land use standards should be able to control the adverse effects of any earthworks.	Accept in part	4.3.11
746.126	The Surveying Company	Neutral/Amend	No specific decision is sought, but the submission recognises that the importation of fill to enable residential development is appropriate in Rule 24.2.4.1 Earthworks	These provisions seem to be workable but we are interested in the thoughts of other submitters. Cleanfill may be required in	Reject	4.3.11

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			General and questions whether this would be a permitted activity (P2) or a non-complying activity (NC1).	residential zoned sites to enable greenfield land to be developed for residential purposes. It is unclear whether cleanfill is a permitted activity (P2) or a non-complying activity (NC1). Non complying would be too restrictive and needs to be more lenient to enable greenfield development within residential zones.		
746.146	The Surveying Company	Not stated	No specific decision sought, but submission supports with amendments Rule 24.2.4.1 P2 Earthworks - General and considers that where subdivision has been approved, there should be no requirements for land owners to apply for additional resource consents for earthworks to undertake permitted activities on the land.	The earthworks thresholds need to be lenient enough to ensure the land can be developed without additional consents. Permitted land use standards should be able to control the adverse effects of any works.	Reject	4.3.11
746.147	The Surveying Company	Not stated	No specific decision sought, but submission supports with amendments Rule 24.2.4.1 P3 Earthworks - General and considers that where subdivision has been approved, there should be no requirements for land owners to apply for additional resource consents for earthworks to undertake permitted activities on the land.	The earthworks thresholds need to be lenient enough to ensure the land can be developed without additional consents. Permitted land use standards should be able to control the adverse effects of any works.	Reject	4.3.11
945.26	First Gas Limited	Neutral/Amend	Add a new condition to Rule 24.2.4.1.P1 (a) Earthworks - General as follows: <u>(x) Earthworks to a depth of greater than 200mm are to be located a minimum of 12m from the centre line of a gas pipeline.</u> AND Any consequential amendments and other relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	To address reverse sensitivity effects, the submitter seeks the inclusion of a new earthworks rule requiring a 12m setback from gas transmission pipelines where earthworks are proposed to a depth of greater than 200mm.	Reject	4.3.11
FS1289.4	Mowbray Group	Oppose	I seek that the sections referenced be maintained at 6 metres.	In my original submission (#404) I proposed to use the narrow ribbon of land owned by Mowbray Group for siting historic NZ cottages. As per the attached drawing. This is supported by the Matangi Community Council and has been widely notified in the community with no dissenting voices this proposal by First Gas completely destroys Mowbray Groups proposal in submission #404 for these cottages. Mowbray Group agrees with the present 6 metre setback and would like a mixed use zone for this strip of land similar to the mixed use zone they have for on the other 3 titles on the opposite side of the railway line. This mixed use zone will allow the site to transition from Industrial to retail, commercial, residential, and tourism activities in line with the aspirations of the local community. In this mixed use zone Mowbray Group would like a 5 metre set back from the boundaries.	Accept	4.3.11

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1305.24	Andrew Mowbray	Oppose	Seek that the whole of the submission point be rejected.	We understand the First Gas proposal however this would greatly restrict any work on the Mowbray Group property at 464 Tauwhare Road. The gas pipeline is 1m on the other side of the boundary fence and is a narrow piece of land, restricting any earthworks on 1 m of this strip would significantly reduce the value of the land and future potential development of the land.	Accept	4.3.11
945.27	First Gas Limited	Neutral/Amend	Add a new matter of discretion to Rule 24.2.4.1 RD1 (b) Earthworks - General RD1 as follows: <u>(xii) Effects on the safe, effective and efficient operation, maintenance and upgrade of infrastructure, including access.</u> AND Any consequential amendments and other relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	The submitter seeks to include an additional matter over which Council's discretion shall be limited under RD1 (b) to address potential effects of earthworks on gas transmission lines.	Reject	4.3.11
FS1134.92	Bridget Murdoch on behalf of Counties Power	Support	Seek that the submission point be allowed.	Discretion should be limited to address potential reverse sensitivity effects on existing infrastructure.	Reject	4.3.11
986.114	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 24.2.4.1 PI (a)(vii) Earthworks general as follows (or similar amendments to achieve the requested relief): (iv) Areas exposed by the earthworks are <u>stabilized to avoid runoff within 1 month of the cessation re-vegetated to achieve 80% ground cover 6 months of the commencement of the earthworks</u> AND Any consequential amendments to link and/or accommodate the requested changes.	KiwiRail also seeks that the rule relating to revegetation in certain zones be amended to include other available methods to stabilise the ground to prevent runoff, including building or hard cover development. As notified, these rules are ambiguous.	Reject	4.3.11
986.99	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 24.2.4.1 PI (a) Earthworks-General as follows (or similar amendments to achieve the requested relief): (i) Be located more than 1.5 m horizontally from any <u>infrastructure, including a waterway, open drain or overland flow path;</u> AND Any consequential amendments to link and/or accommodate the requested changes.	KiwiRail supports that earthworks are required to be setback from services and network systems. The rail track itself is most susceptible from adverse effects if adjacent earthworks are not adequately set back. KiwiRail seeks that rule relating to setbacks in certain zones should be amended to reflect that there should be an earthworks setback of 1.5m from infrastructure, to ensure that the efficient and effective operation of the existing network is maintained.	Reject	4.3.11
FS1176.312	Watercare	Support	Null	Watercare supports the approach in principle, however is seeking additional changes to protect existing infrastructure.	Reject	4.3.11
695.124	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Support	Retain a maximum area of earthworks in Rule 24.2.4.1 PI Earthworks – General.	No reasons provided.	Reject	4.3.11
559.87	Sherry Reynolds on behalf of Heritage New Zealand Lower Northern Office	Oppose	Amend Rule 24.2.7.1 P2 Signs - general to exclude any type of signage on Heritage Items and Maori Sites of Significance. AND	The submitter cannot support the P2 Signs General where the zone rules that relate to signage, including on heritage items or Maori sites of significance are permitted activities with	Reject	4.3.13

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			Amend Rule 23.2.7.1 RDI Signs - general to include signage on Heritage items and Maaori Sites of Significance. AND Add an advice note under this new rule to advise of the other heritage building related rules within the Chapter. AND Provide for any consequential amendments as required.	variations between the zones as to the permitted size and height of signage. While signs generally are not permitted in heritage buildings or Maaori sites of significance, a sign of 3m2 on a heritage building could be permitted in some zones if the sign was for identification or interpretation purposes. The generic, zoned based approach does not reflect the need to assess the suitability of a signage proposal against the specific heritage values of the individual building or site. The generic approach has the potential to cause adverse effects of historic heritage and Maaori sites of significance. To avoid adverse effects to heritage items and Maaori sites of significance it would be more appropriate for any signage on heritage items and Maaori sites of Significance to be elevated to a restricted discretionary activity level of assessment and subject to the matters of discretion already included (i.e. (vi) and (vii)).		
697.968	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 24.2.7.1 P2(a)(xi) Signs - general, as follows: (xi) The sign is for the purpose of identification and interpretation not attached to of a Maaori site of significance listed in Schedule 30.3 (Maaori Sites of Significance) except for the purpose of identification and interpretation;	Re-wording this rule provides clarity.	Accept	4.3.13
FS1323.91	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	That the amendments sought are declined.	The permitted activity signs rules are applicable to heritage items and Maaori Sites and Areas of significance. The additions proposed have the potential to cause adverse effects to these items.	Reject	4.3.13
697.969	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 24.2.7.1 P3 Signs - general, as follows: (b) A real estate 'for sale' or 'for rent' sign relating to the site on which it is located must comply with all of the following conditions: (i) There is no more than 3 signs per site agency; (ii) The sign is not illuminated; (iii) The sign does not contain any moving parts, fluorescent, flashing or revolving lights or reflective materials; (iv) Project into or over road reserve.	This rule excluded signs for rental properties and requires additional words to ensure consistency with rule 24.2.7.1. Additionally, P3 (a) (i) is not required as the village zone provisions do not apply within the road reserve.	Accept in part	4.3.13
602.54	Greig Metcalfe	Oppose	Amend Rule 24.2.7.1. P3 (a) Signs - general, as follows: (a) Any real estate 'for sale' sign relating to the site on which it is located must comply with all of the following conditions: (i) There is no more than 1 sign per agency measuring 600mm x 900mm per road frontage of the site to which the sign relates; (ii) There is no more than 1 sign measuring 1800mm x 1200mm per site to which the sign	The notified rules for real estate signs are too restrictive. Corner sites should be able to have additional sign opportunities without adversely affecting residential character and amenity. Allowance should be made for feature signs which are commonly used for properties going to auction or tender.	Accept in part	4.3.13

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			relates: (iii) There is no more than 1 real estate header sign measuring 1800mm x 1200mm on one other site; (ii) (iv) The sign is not illuminated; (ii) (v) The sign does not contain any moving parts, fluorescent, flashing or revolving lights or reflective materials; (iv) (vi) The sign does not project into or over road reserve. (vii) Any real estate sign shall be removed from display within 60 days of sale/lease or upon settlement, whichever is the earliest. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	Header signs should be able to be established on another sign (often on a high volume road) to direct purchasers to the site which is for sale (often on a low volume road).		
FS1323.89	Mercury NZ Limited	Support	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	3.1
695.131	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 24.2.7.1 P2 (a) (iii) Signs – General, to enlarge the maximum area of a sign from 0.25m2 to 1m2 (total per site).	The sign size is too small as Village Zone lots tend to be fairly large. It will keep with the balance of rural and residential qualities. It is more appropriate.	Reject	4.3.13
FS1323.90	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	That the amendments sought are declined.	The permitted activity signs rules are applicable to heritage items and Maori Sites and Areas of significance. The additions proposed have the potential to cause adverse effects to these items.	Accept	4.3.13
697.967	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 24.2.7.1 P2 (a) (viii) Signs - general.	24.2.7.1 P2 (a) (viii) is not required as the village zone provisions do not apply within the road reserve.	Accept	4.3.13
697.970	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 24.2.7.2 P1(a) Signs - effects on traffic, as follows: (a) Any sign directed at road users <u>must meet</u> the following conditions: (i) Not imitate the content, colour or appearance of any traffic control sign; (ii) Be located at least 60m from controlled intersections, pedestrian crossings and any other sign; (iii) Not obstruct sight lines of drivers turning into or out of a site	The amended wording provides clarity for the rule and consistency with other rules.	Accept in part	4.3.13

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			entrance and intersections; (iv) Be able to be viewed by drivers for at least 130m; (v) Contain a no more than 40 characters and no more than 6 symbols; (vi) Have lettering that is at least 150mm high; (vii) Be located at least 130m from a site entrance, where the sign directs traffic to the entrance.			
FS1264.27	Bootleg Brewery	Oppose	Seek that either the submission point is disallowed OR The Matangi site is excluded/exempt from these rules, on the basis effects from the operation of the site on local community are addressed through a bespoke precinct zone, commercial agreement, or effects are negligible and there is no need to apply a restriction.	Bootleg supports a framework which provides for the permissive operation of a brewery with on and off premise, as well as promotes economic growth and regeneration of the site to realise its full potential. The rules unnecessarily restrict or result in additional cost to operators, which there is no significant adverse effect to be managed. The anticipated effects are either negligible or can be managed through commercial outcomes. On this basis, the proposed rules will have a negative effect on economic growth and regeneration of the site, which will benefit the local community.	Reject in part	4.3.13
695.132	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 24.2.7.2 PI (a)(ii) Signs - Effects on Traffic, to delete the words "and any other sign"; OR Amend Rule 24.2.7.2 PI (a)(ii) Signs – Effects on Traffic, as follows: To be located at least 60m from controlled intersections, pedestrian crossings and any other sign <u>on the same site</u> OR Amend Rule 24.2.7.2 PI (a)(ii) Signs – Effects on Traffic, as follows: To be located at least 60m from controlled intersections, pedestrian crossings and any other sign <u>railway crossings (or roads under Council jurisdiction)</u>	This is unrealistic. The cost of the consent would usually be more than the cost of the sign.	Reject	4.3.13
742.149	NZTA	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 24.2.7.2 Signs- Effects on Traffic, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Rule 24.2.7.2 PI (v) Signs - Effects on Traffic as follows: Contain no more than 40 characters and no more than 6 <u>words, symbols or graphics.</u> AND Request any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the submission.	The submitter supports the intent of Rule 24.2.7.2 PI but seeks amendment to provide clarification on the maximum amount of words permitted. This will ensure that signage erected does not cause unnecessary visual clutter or affect the efficient, safe and effective functioning of the transport network.	Reject	4.3.13
986.121	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 24.2.7.2 PI Signs – Effects on traffic as follows (or similar amendments to achieve the requested relief): (a) Any sign directed at road land transport users must: ... (iii)Not obstruct sight lines of drivers turning into or out of a site entrance and intersections <u>or at a level crossing</u> ; AND	• Signs erected in the City should not have an adverse effect on the safe and efficient functioning of the land transport network, including railways, and the health and safety of road users. Traffic on the railway network will grow, and with more trains the issue of	Accept in part	4.3.13

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			Any consequential amendments to link and/or accommodate the requested changes.	minimising driver distraction is important to ensure the efficient running of the land transport network. • Further, signs should be restricted where they breach the level crossing sightline areas developed from the NZTA Traffic Control Devices Manual 2008, Part 9 Level Crossings as sought in KiwiRail submission 67. • It is appropriate to restrict and prevent the placement of signs within required sight lines for vehicles access and intersections, and within the sight lines required for rail crossings.		
742.148	NZTA	Support	Retain Rule 24.2.7.1 PI Signs - General as notified. AND Retain Rule 24.2.7.1 P2 Signs - General as notified. AND Retain Rule 24.2.7.1 RD1 Signs - General as notified.	The submitter supports Rules 24.2.7.1 PI and P2 and the matters of discretion under RD1, particularly (b) (iii), (b) (iv) and (b) (v).	Accept in part	4.3.13
742.150	NZTA	Support	Retain Rule 24.2.7.2 DI Signs - Effects on Traffic as notified.	The submitter supports Council having full discretion over signs that do not comply with permitted activity standards.	Accept	4.3.13
405.79	Counties Power Limited	Neutral/Amend	Add a clause to Rule 24.3.1 PI Dwelling so that where there are existing overhead lines, the location of the dwelling must comply with requirements of NZECP34:2001.	Works must comply with NZECP34:2001.	Reject	4.3.14
697.976	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 24.3.1 PI to read as follows: One dwelling within a <u>site record</u> of title.	The definition "record of title" has been included for correction.	Reject	4.3.14
FS1387.753	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Reject	3.1
405.80	Counties Power Limited	Neutral/Amend	Add a clause to Rule 24.3.2 PI Minor dwelling by adding another clause so that where there are existing overhead lines, the location of the dwelling must comply with the requirements of NZECP34:2001.	Works to comply with NZECP34:2001.	Reject	4.3.15

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
697.977	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 24.3.2 PI Minor dwelling, to read as follows: (a) One minor dwelling up to 70m ² gross floor area contained within the site a record of title must comply with all of the following conditions; (i) The net site area is 1000m ² or more; (ii) The gross floor area shall not exceed 70m ² .	Rewording of this rule required to align with the residential zone rule to make the 70m ² requirement a condition of the rule.	Accept in part	4.3.15
FS1387.754	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	3.1
689.19	Greig Developments No 2 Limited	Support	Retain Rule 24.3.2 PI Minor dwelling as proposed in terms of a maximum gross floor area of 70m ² and requiring a net site area of 1000m ² or more.	No reasons provided.	Reject	4.3.15
FS1387.290	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	3.1
746.127	The Surveying Company	Support	Retain Rule 24.3.2 PI Minor dwelling as notified.	No reasons provided.	Reject	4.3.15
FS1387.979	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood	Reject	3.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>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>		
697.978	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 24.3.3 (2) Height, as follows: (2) Rule 24.3.3.1 Height – Building general provides permitted height limits across the entire Village Zone. <u>This rule does not apply in those areas specified in Rule 24.3.3(3).</u>	The wording of the rule does not make it clear that rule 24.3.3(2) does not apply in those areas specified in rule 24.3.3(3).	Reject	4.3.17
378.49	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 24.3.3.1 Height - Building general, to include the following: <u>This Standard does not apply to hose drying towers up to 15m associated with emergency service facilities.</u> AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make further or consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.	The inclusion of a specific exemption for emergency service facilities and hose drying towers in order to appropriately provide for the operational requirements of Fire and Emergency New Zealand. Fire stations are single storied buildings of approximately 8-9m in height and are typically able to achieve the height standards in a District Plan. Some fire stations also include a hose drying tower of between 12-15m in height. Fire and Emergency New Zealand considers that the inclusion of an exemption for associated structures better provides for the health and safety of the community by enabling the efficient functioning of Fire and Emergency New Zealand.	Reject	4.3.17
FS1035.155	Pareoranga Te Kata	Support	Obtain statement of performance expectation (SPE) to allow submission to be accepted.	Fire safety and fire prevention to undertake training activities for fire fighters within the region.	Reject	4.1
499.14	Adrian Morton	Oppose	Amend Rule 24.3.3.1 Height - Building general to encourage the use of variable building heights, stepped facades to maintain the built character of Raglan for example: A maximum height of a building must not exceed 7.5m, and where continuous roof lines occur (more than one unit) then variable roof lines should be implemented to maintain the character and amenity of Raglan	The provision for a 'maximum height' makes it more of a target and does not allow/encourage variable roof heights that would be better at complementing the built character of Raglan. Housing in and around Raglan typically have variable heights and forms that contribute to the character of the area, which needs to be reflected in the policy.	Reject	4.3.17
FS1276.55	John Lawson on behalf of Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Support	WED seeks that the whole of the submission point be allowed.	Variable roof lines would help maintain the character of Raglan.	Reject	4.3.17

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
757.15	Karen White	Oppose	Amend Rule 24.3.3.1 Height - Building general to encourage the use of variable building heights, stepped facades to maintain the built character of Raglan. Submission provides the following example: <u>A maximum height of a building must not exceed 7.5m, and where continuous roof lines occur (more than one unit) then variable roof lines should be implemented to maintain the character of Raglan.</u>	Provision for a maximum height makes that height more of a target. Does not allow and encourage variable roof heights that would complement the built character of Raglan. Housing in and around Raglan have variable heights and forms that contribute to character of the area, which needs to be considered.	Reject	4.3.17
FS1276.56	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Support		Variable roof lines would help maintain the character of Raglan.	Reject	4.3.17
695.133	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 24.3.3.1 PI Height – Building general, so the rule only applies to that part of the building structure opposite the immediate ground level; AND Amend Rule 24.3.4 PI Daylight admission as a consequential amendment.	This would avoid giving neighbours perverse objection rights. Height in relation to boundary would need to account for the same. Subdivision design would need to ensure larger lots on steeper sites than the minimums to avoid solar access issues when development occurs.	Reject	4.3.17
689.20	Greig Developments No 2 Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 24.3.4 Daylight admission as follows: A building must not protrude through a height control plane rising at an angle of 45 degrees commencing at an elevation of 2.5m above ground level at every point of the site boundary”.	Inconsistency with previous Planning documents which are less restrictive Too restrictive for urban areas Adequate amenity and daylight for adjoining sites can be achieved with a less restrictive control plane The 37-degree angle is difficult to calculate	Accept	4.3.17
695.134	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 24.3.4 PI Daylight admission, as follows: A building must not protrude through a height control plane rising at an angle of 37 45 degrees commencing at an elevation of 2.5 3m above ground level at every point of the site boundary.	There is no logical planning reason for this differentiation. All daylight control planed should be consistent with each other and that are used by adjoining Councils.	Accept in part	4.3.17
746.128	The Surveying Company	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 24.3.4 PI-Daylight Admission as follows: A building must not protrude through a height control plane rising at an angle of 45 37-degrees commencing at an elevation of 2.5m above ground level at every point of the site boundary.	An angle of 37 degrees to be harder to follow than the general standard of 45 degrees that is presented across many other Plans in New Zealand. 45 degrees is clear cut and easy to measure.	Accept	4.3.17
697.982	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 24.3.4 RD1 (b) Daylight admission, as follows: (b) Council’s discretion is restricted to the following matters: (i) Height of the building; (ii) Design and location of the building; (iii) Extent of shading on adjacent sites; Level of shading on any other sites; (iv) Privacy on other sites; and (v) Effects on a Amenity values and residential character of the locality.	Additional wording provides clarity to the rule in respect to shading and other sites. Also provides consistency with other zone chapter.	Accept in part	4.3.17
697.455	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 24.3.3.2 Buildings, structures and vegetation within an airport obstacle limitation surface, to include a calculation to determine the permitted height with the airport obstacle limitation surface.	This rule needs to be able to be clearly interpreted by customers in relation to the Waikato Regional Airport.	Reject	4.3.18

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1253.34	Waikato Regional Airport	Oppose	Seek that the whole part of this submission be disallowed.	The clarification/calculation sought is provided for already in Appendix N of the Proposed District Plan. Using the defined coordinates and elevations from this Appendix architects, draft person etc. can work out whether the development is within or outside of the OLS.	Accept	4.3.18
FS1339.98	NZTE Operations	Support	NZTE seeks that this submission be allowed.	NZTE supports the clarification of the OLS Height rules in the PWDP and supports the inclusion of a calculation to determine a permitted height in the OLS. NZTE also seeks that Rules 24.3.3.2 P1 and 24.3.3.2 D1 be amended in accordance with point 823.12 in NZTE's submission on the PWDP for the OLS rule to include a tree or other vegetation.	Reject	4.3.18
333.1	Russell Grey	Oppose	Amend Rule 24.3.5 P2 Building Coverage, reducing the provision from 20% to 15%.	On a 5000m ² 20% site coverage allows 600m ² of building ground floor area which is excessive. Most new dwellings are 250m ² -350m ² in size with a shed of 100m ² totaling 450m ² /15% which is ample for small sites. More building area will lead to greater pressure on storm water runoff and local waterways, and ultimately the Waipa River.		
FS1308.18	The Surveying Company	Oppose	Null	20% allows greater flexibility in housing choice and built form. Buildings are anticipated for this zone and do not need to be further restricted by reducing the building coverage. 20% building coverage will achieve adequate low density housing opportunities while continuing to provide a sense of open space between properties.		
FS1386.463	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	3.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1091.6	GD Jones	Oppose	The amendments would be unduly restrictive and the reasoning incorrectly assumes that all unserviced sites (including existing sites) would be at least 3,000 m ² in area	The submission is disallowed		
FS1187.13	Greig Developments No 2 Limited	Oppose	Oppose submission point 333.1.	20% allows greater flexibility in housing choice and built form. Buildings are anticipated for this zoned and do not need to be further restricted by reducing the building coverage. 20% building coverage will achieve adequate low-density housing opportunities while continuing to provide a sense of open space between properties.		
FS1286.13	Horotiu Properties Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 24.3.5 P2 Building Coverage, reducing the provision from 20% to 15%. The submitter believes that on a 5000m ² 20% site coverage allows 600m ² of building ground floor area which is excessive. Most new dwellings are 250m ² -350m ² in size with a shed of 100m ² totaling 450m ² /15% which is ample for small sites. More building area will lead to greater pressure on storm water runoff and local waterways, and ultimately the Waipa River.	Rule 24.3.5 allows for 20% of the net site area to be covered, leaving sufficient area for wastewater disposal where the lot is not connected to public reticulation. The minimum net site area in the Village Zone is 3000m ² . That gives potential for 600m ² building coverage. Policy 4.3.2 says that buildings and activities in the Village Zone should maintain the semi-rural character. That contemplates that there could be semi-rural activities occurring that might require larger than 100m ² shed.		
695.135	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 24.3.5 P1 and P2 to retain the operative district plan building coverage of 10% or 300m ² , whichever is the larger.	Whether or not a site is reticulated or does not has not bearing on building coverage. It is the area and ground conditions (for non-reticulated sites) of the lot that prescribes suitability. It does not achieve any outcome under the Act that cannot be achieved via other regulations already in place.		
FS1091.34	GD Jones	Oppose	The submission is disallowed and submissions 397.9 and 602.49 are allowed.	While it is agreed that building coverage should be unaffected by whether reticulated services are provided, the proposed coverages are in most cases more permissive.		
FS1187.14	Greig Developments No 2 Limited	Oppose	Oppose submission point 695.135.	20% allows greater flexibility in housing choice and built form. Buildings are anticipated for this zone and do not need to be further restricted by reducing the building coverage. 20% building coverage will achieve adequate low-density housing opportunities while continuing to provide a sense of open space between properties.		
FS1308.104	Leigh Shaw on behalf of The Surveying Company	Oppose	Null	20% allows greater flexibility in housing choice and built form. Buildings are anticipated for this zone and do not need to be further restricted by reducing the building coverage. 20% building coverage will achieve adequate low density housing opportunities while continuing to provide a sense of open space between properties.		

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1387.339	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	3.1
397.9	Horotiu Properties Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 24.3.5 Building coverage, as follows: P1 On a lot connected to public reticulated waste water and a water supply, the total building coverage must not exceed 40%. P2 On a lot connected to public reticulated waste water and a water supply, the total building coverage must not exceed 20%. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any consequential amendments necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.	It is feasible that the development in the Village Zone could be serviced by reticulated services that are privately owned, and shouldn't be limited to only publicly owned infrastructure networks. The Village Zone anticipates lots at 3,000m2 which can be self-sufficient or 1,000m2 if urban infrastructure is provided.		
FS1091.11	GD Jones	Support	The amendments provide for suitable flexibility for development should extensions to public reticulated networks not be feasible	The submission is allowed		
FS1388.134	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	3.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
602.49	Greig Metcalfe	Oppose	Amend Rule 24.3.5 P1 and P2 Building coverage, as follows: P1 On a lot connected to public reticulated wastewater and a water supply, the total building coverage must not exceed 40%. P2 On a lot not connected to public reticulated wastewater and a water supply, the total building coverage must not exceed 20%. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	It is feasible for development in the Village Zone to be serviced by reticulated services that are privately owned (i.e. community scale) and therefore this provision should not be limited to publicly owned infrastructure networks.		
FS1091.24	GD Jones	Support	The submission is allowed.	The amendments provide for suitable flexibility for development should extensions to public reticulated networks not be feasible.		
FS1388.1049	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	3.1
697.981	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Add the following rule after Rule 24.3.5 Building coverage: Rule 24.3.5A Impervious surfaces P1 The impervious surface of a site must not exceed 70%. RD1 (a) Impervious surfaces that does not comply with Rule 24.3.5A P1 (b) Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters: (i) Site design, layout and amenity; (ii) The risk of flooding, nuisance or damage to the site or other buildings and sites.	Include the impervious surfaces rule from Rule 14.11.1 P2 and 14.11.2 (RD2) to make it easier to find.	Reject	4.3.19
697.983	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 24.3.5 P1 Building coverage, as follows: On a lot connected to public wastewater and a water supply, the total building coverage must not exceed 40%.	Word "total" is not required. Consistency across zone chapters.	Accept	4.3.19
FS1387.755	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be	Reject	3.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure.</p> <p>Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</p>		
697.984	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 24.3.5 P2 Building coverage, as follows: On a lot not connected to public wastewater and a water supply, the total building coverage must not exceed 20%.	Word "total" is not required. Consistency across zone chapters.	Accept	4.3.19
FS1387.756	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<p>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure.</p> <p>Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</p>	Reject	3.1
697.985	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 24.3.5 DI Building coverage, as follows: –A Bbuilding coverage that does not comply with Rules 24.3.5 P1 or P2.	Consistency across zone chapters.	Accept	4.3.19
FS1387.757	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<p>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure.</p> <p>Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate</p>	Reject	3.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				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.		
689.21	Greig Developments No 2 Limited	Support	Retain Rule 24.3.5 Building coverage.	These building coverages recognise the different attribute of lot connected to public wastewater. It corresponds with rule 24.4.2 Subdivision - Te Kowhai and Tuakau.		
FS1091.33	GD Jones	Oppose	The submission is disallowed and submissions 397.9 and 602.49 are allowed.	Building coverage should be unaffected by whether reticulated services are provided, especially based on whether those reticulated services are public or private.		
FS1387.291	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	3.1
746.129	The Surveying Company	Support	Retain Rule 24.3.5 Building Coverage as notified.	These building coverages recognise the different attribute of lot connected to public wastewater and correspond with rule 24.4.2 Subdivision - Te Kowhai and Tuakau.		
FS1091.41	GD Jones	Oppose	The submission is disallowed and submissions 397.9 and 602.49 are allowed.	Building coverage should be unaffected by whether reticulated services are provided, especially based on whether those reticulated services are public or private.		
FS1387.980	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to	Reject	3.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>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>		
333.2	Russell Grey	Not Stated	Amend Rule 24.3.6.1 PI (i) Building setbacks- All boundaries so that a setback from a road at 3m is the same as a setback from an indicative road of 13m.	Appears to be an anomaly around the setbacks. A large Te Kowhai property is to be rezoned 'Village,' allowing building setbacks to be 3m from a local rural road (Woolrich Road) with a 5.5m width, impacting on its rural nature, whilst any setback from indicative roads within the proposed development would be 13m.	Reject	4.3.21
333.3	Russell Grey	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 24.3.6.1 PI (iii) and (iv)-Building setbacks- All boundaries to be a minimum of 3m.	Appears to be an anomaly around the setbacks.	Reject	4.3.21
695.136	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 24.3.6.1 PI (a) (ii) Building setbacks – All boundaries, to include phrasing that if an indicative road is constructed and is open to the public the classification is redundant.	Previous application of rules when the indicative road has not been removed from the Planning Maps but the maps has been constructed.	Accept	4.3.21
943.55	McCracken Surveys Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 24.3.6.1 PI (a) (ii) Building setbacks - All boundaries, to have the setback from the centre line of the indicative road.	No reason provided.	Accept	4.3.21
397.12	Horotiu Properties Limited	Oppose	Delete Rule 24.3.6.1 P3 Building Setbacks - All boundaries. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any consequential amendments necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.	There are instances when it is appropriate to locate the garage forward of the front façade of the dwelling.	Reject	4.3.21
602.1	Greig Metcalfe	Oppose	Delete Rule 24.3.6.1 P3 Building setbacks. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	There are instances when it is appropriate to locate the garage in front of the façade of the dwelling.	Reject	4.3.21
742.151	NZTA	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 24.3.6.1 Building setbacks- All boundaries, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Rules 24.3.6.1 PI and P2 Building setbacks - All boundaries to require 15m setbacks from all state highways. AND Request any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the submission.	Rules 24.3.6.,1 P1 and P2 do not differentiate between different road types as described in the road hierarchy.	Reject	4.3.21
FS1221.7	Cindy and Tony Young	Oppose	Null	15m setback from all state highways for all buildings	Accept	4.3.21

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>(including those that are not inhabitable) does not constitute an efficient use of the land resource. There are no resource management reasons (particularly acoustic reasons) why an uninhabitable, or building that is otherwise not used for sensitive activities should be subject to an increased setback from a state highway in comparison to a district road.</i>		
FS1283.7	Gavin And Brenda Butcher on behalf of Parkmere Farms	Oppose	Oppose	1.5m setback from all state highways for all buildings (including those that are not habitable) does not constitute an efficient use of the land resource. There are no resource management reasons (particularly acoustic reasons) why an uninhabited building, or building that is otherwise not used for sensitive activities should be subject to an increased setback from a state highway in comparison to a district road.	Accept	4.3.21
742.152	NZTA	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 24.3.6.1 RD1 Building setbacks- All boundaries, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend matter of discretion (b)(i) in Rule 24.3.6.1 RD1 Building setbacks - All boundaries as follows: Road transport network safety and efficiency; AND Request any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the submission.	The submitter supports the matters of discretion under Rule 24.3.6.1 RD1, particularly (b)(i) and (b) (ii) with minor amendment, although no reasons have been provided.	Reject	4.3.21
742.153	NZTA	Support	Retain Rule 24.3.6.2 PI Building setbacks - All boundaries as notified (subject to relief sought in other submissions on acoustic treatment).	The submitter notes the proposed setbacks will not be sufficient to avoid adverse effects on occupiers on their own and buildings will also require acoustic treatment. Relief sought in this respect assumes submission points regarding acoustic treatment are accepted.	Reject in part	4.3.21
419.52	Jordyn Landers for Horticulture New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Add a new clause (vi) to Rule 24.3.6.2PI Building setback - Sensitive land use, as follows: (a) Any new building or alteration to an existing building for a sensitive land use must be set back a minimum of: ... (vi) <u>100m from any boundary adjoining a Rural Zone where the sensitive activity is not a residential activity.</u> AND Any consequential or additional amendments as a result of changes sought in the submission.	Additional standards are sought to ensure adequate management of the rural-urban interface and to avoid and mitigate the potential for reverse sensitivity effects between habitable residential buildings and legitimate farming activities. There are many sensitive land uses that are incompatible with horticulture and greater setbacks should be provided to avoid or mitigate reverse sensitivity effects.	Reject	4.3.21
FS1330.33	Middlemiss Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	Reject submission.	Unreasonable constraint on use of land as above.	Accept	4.3.21
FS1388.200	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood	Reject	3.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>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>		
419.50	Jordyn Landers for Horticulture New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	<p>Add a new clause (v) to Rule 24.3.6.1 PI (a) Building setbacks - All boundaries, as follows: (a) Any building must be setback a minimum of: ... (v) <u>8m from any boundary adjoining a Rural Zone</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential or additional amendments as a result of changes sought in the submission.</p>	<p>A 1.5m setback from all boundaries as proposed is not sufficient to avoid or mitigate potential reverse sensitivity effects that arise between residential activities and rural activities. There are pockets of land that have been rezoned from Rural to Village around the Tuakau area and the potential for reverse sensitivity from a new rural-urban boundary should be avoided.</p>	Reject	4.3.21
FS1171.34	T&G Global	Support	Allow the submission.	<p>This submission proposes a new clause to Rule 24.3.6.1 Building setbacks - All boundaries. This submission is supported. Building set backs on the boundary of a rural zone can address issues of reverse sensitivity.</p>	Reject	4.3.21
419.51	Jordyn Landers for Horticulture New Zealand	Support	Retain Rule 24.3.6.1 RDI Building setbacks - All boundaries, as notified.	The submitter supports the inclusion of reverse sensitivity effects as a matter to which discretion is restricted for buildings that do not meet the permitted boundary setbacks.	Accept	4.3.21
466.51	Brendan Balle on behalf of Balles Bros Group Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 24.3.6.2 PI Building setbacks – sensitive land use to ensure adequate setbacks are maintained for sensitive land uses.	The submitter seeks measures to adequately avoid and mitigate the potential for reverse sensitivity effects between sensitive land uses and farming activities.	Reject	4.3.21
FS1388.425	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	<p>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure.</p> <p>Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is</p>	Reject	3.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
697.987	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Add to Rule 24.3.6.2 P1 Building setbacks - sensitive land new clause (vi), as follows: <u>(vi) 300m from the boundary of another site containing an intensive farming activity.</u>	Include new condition to protect against reverse sensitivity in this zone.	Accept	4.3.21
FS1350.120	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Oppose	Disallow in terms of sought relocation of National Grid provisions. Notwithstanding the location of the provisions, Transpower seeks that all amendments sought in its original submission be included.	<p>Related to the original submission by Waikato District Council seeking relocation/replicating of the National Grid provisions into the respective chapters, Transpower supports and prefers a standalone set of provisions (for the reason it avoids duplication and provides a coherent set of rules which submitters can refer to, noting that the planning maps clearly identify land that is subject to the National Grid provisions).</p> <p>A stand-alone set of provisions as provided in the notified plan is also consistent with the National Planning Standards. Irrespective that the proposed plan has not been drafted to align with the National Planning Standards, it would be counterproductive to amend the layout contrary to the intent of the Standards. Standard 7. District wide Matters Standard provides, as a mandatory direction, that 'provisions relating to energy, infrastructure and transport that are not specific to the Special purpose zones chapter or sections must be located in one or more chapters under the Energy, Infrastructure and Transport heading'. Clause 5.(c) makes specific reference to reverse sensitivity effects between infrastructure and other activities.</p> <p>It is not clear from the submission points as to the relationship between chapters 14, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24 and 25 and the National Grid provisions within 14.1.1 provides the zone provisions do not apply to infrastructure and energy activities. As such, any other network utility activities would appear to be subject to the National Grid provisions and this requires further clarification.</p> <p>If council wishes to pursue splitting the National Grid provisions into the respective chapters, a revised full set of provisions would be beneficial to enable Transpower to fully assess the implications and</p>	Reject	4.3.21

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				workability of the requested changes. Notwithstanding the location of National Grid provisions within the proposed plan, Transpower seeks the specific changes to provisions as sought in its original submission.		
FS1387.758	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	3.1
697.986	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	<p>Add new clause (5) into Rule 24.3.6 Building setbacks, as follows: <u>(5) Rule 24.3.6.4 Buildings and structures within the National Grid Yard</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Add the following rule into Chapter 24, after Rule 24.3.6.4: <u>24.3.6.4 Buildings and structures within the National Grid Yard P1 (a) Within the National Grid yard, building alterations and additions to an existing building or structure must comply with the following conditions: (i) Not involve an increase in the building height or footprint; and (ii) Comply with the New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safe Distances 34:2001 ISSN 0114-0663 under all National Grid transmission line operating conditions. P2 (a) Within the National Grid yard, the maximum height of fences are 2.5m within 5m from the nearest National Grid Pole or 6m from the nearest National Grid tower. P3 Within the National Grid yard, new buildings and structures that are not for a sensitive land use must comply with the following conditions: (i) Comply with the New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safe Distances 34:2001 ISSN 0114-0663 under all National Grid transmission line operating conditions; and (ii) Locate a minimum 12m from the outer visible foundation of any National Grid tower and locate a</u></p>	Replicate the rule regarding buildings and structure within the National Grid from Chapter 14 into Chapter 24 (as relevant to the Village Zone) for increased clarity and usability of the Plan.	Reject	4.3.21

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p>minimum 12m from any pole and associated stay wire, unless it is: A. A building or structure where Transpower has given written approval in accordance with clause 2.4.1 of the New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safe Distances 34:2001 ISSN 0114-0663. NC1 Any building alterations or additions within the National Grid Yard that does not comply with Rule 24.3.6.4 P1, P2 or P3.</p>			
FS1350.119	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Oppose	<p>Disallow in terms of sought relocation of National Grid provisions. Notwithstanding the location of the provisions, Transpower seeks that all amendments sought in its original submission be included.</p>	<p>Related to the original submission by Waikato District Council seeking relocation/replicating of the National Grid provisions into the respective chapters, Transpower supports and prefers a standalone set of provisions (for the reason it avoids duplication and provides a coherent set of rules which submitters can refer to, noting that the planning maps clearly identify land that is subject to the National Grid provisions).</p> <p>A stand-alone set of provisions as provided in the notified plan is also consistent with the National Planning Standards. Irrespective that the proposed plan has not been drafted to align with the National Planning Standards, it would be counterproductive to amend the layout contrary to the intent of the Standards. Standard 7. District wide Matters Standard provides, as a mandatory direction, that 'provisions relating to energy, infrastructure and transport that are not specific to the Special purpose zones chapter or sections must be located in one or more chapters under the Energy, Infrastructure and Transport heading'. Clause 5.(c) makes specific reference to reverse sensitivity effects between infrastructure and other activities.</p> <p>It is not clear from the submission points as to the relationship between chapters 14, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24 and 25 and the National Grid provisions within 14.1.1 provides the zone provisions do not apply to infrastructure and energy activities. As such, any other network utility activities would appear to be subject to the National Grid provisions and this requires further clarification.</p> <p>If council wishes to pursue splitting the National Grid provisions into the respective chapters, a revised full set of provisions would be beneficial to enable Transpower to fully assess the implications and workability of the requested changes.</p>	Accept	4.3.21

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>Notwithstanding the location of National Grid provisions within the proposed plan, Transpower seeks the specific changes to provisions as sought in its original submission.</i>		
697.988	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Add to Rule 24.3.6.2 Building setbacks - sensitive land use, as follows: <u>P2 (a) Any building for a sensitive land use must be set back a minimum of: (i) 10m from the centre line of any electrical distribution or transmission lines, not associated with the National Grid, that operate at a voltage of up to 110kV; (ii) 12m from the centre of line of any electrical distribution or transmission lines, not associated with the National Grid, that operate at a voltage of 110kV or more. P3 (a) Within the National Grid yard, alterations or additions to a building used for an existing sensitive land use must comply with all the following conditions: (i) Not increase the building height or footprint; and (ii) Comply with the New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safe Distances 34:2001 ISSN 0114-0663 under all National Grid transmission line operating conditions; and (iii) Locate a minimum 12m from the outer visible foundation of any National Grid tower and locate a minimum 12m from any pole and associated stay wire, unless Transpower has given written approval in accordance with clause 2.4.1 of the New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safe Distances 34:2001 ISSN 0114-0663 D1 Any building for a sensitive land use that does not comply with in Rule conditions in Rule 24.3.6.2 P1 or P2. NC1 Any activity within the National Grid Yard that does not comply with Rule 24.3.6.2 P3. NC2 Any new building for a sensitive land use within the National Grid Yard NC3 Any change of use of an existing building to a sensitive land use within the National Grid Yard NC4 The establishment of any new sensitive land use within the National Grid Yard</u>	Replicate the rule regarding sensitive land uses from Chapter 14 into Chapter 24 (as relevant to the Village Zone) for increased clarity and usability of the Plan.	Reject	4.3.21
FS1387.759	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include</i>	Reject	3.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
697.989	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 24.3.6.2 Building setbacks-sensitive land use to add "I" to DI; AND Amend Rule DI to read as follows: Any building for a sensitive land use that does not comply with in-Rule conditions in Rule 24.3.6.2 P1.	Additional words in this rule provide clarity.	Accept in part	4.3.2I
FS1387.760	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Reject	3.1
986.56	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 24.3.6.2 Building setback - sensitive land use as follows (or similar amendments to achieve the requested relief): Building setback – Sensitive land use P1 <u>Sensitive land use</u> (a)Any new building or alteration to an existing building for a sensitive land use must be set back a minimum of: (i)5m from the designated boundary of the railway corridor ... P2 Railway corridor any new buildings or alterations to an existing building must be setback 5 metres from any designated railway corridor boundary OR Retain Rule 24.3.6.2 P1 (a) (i) Building setback -sensitive land use if the primary relief above is not accepted AND Any consequential amendments to link and/or accommodate the requested changes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KiwiRail seeks that a 5metre setback apply to all new building development adjacent to operational railway corridor boundaries (i.e. not just sensitive land uses). Ensuring all new structures in all zones are set back from the rail corridor allows access and maintenance to occur without the landowner or occupier needing to gain access to the rail corridor- potentially compromising their own safety. • Setting back buildings from the rail corridor boundary is a means of ensuring people's health and wellbeing through good design. • Construction of buildings in close proximity to the rail corridor has significant safety risk if it is not managed appropriately in accordance with relevant standards. • A 5m setback is not an acoustic setback. It allows for vehicular access to the backs of buildings (e.g. a cherry picker) and 	Accept in part	4.3.2I

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				would also allow scaffolding to be erected safely. This in turn fosters visual amenity as lineside properties can then be regularly maintained. • A setback is the most efficient method of ensuring intensification does not result in additional safety issues for activities adjacent to the rail corridor, whilst not restricting the ongoing operation and growth of activity within the rail corridor. • The proposed provisions would require any development within the setback to obtain consent with matters of discretion relating to: (i)location, design and use of the proposed building or structure as it relates to the rail network (ii)impacts on the safe operation, maintenance and development of the rail network (iii)construction and maintenance management. • The relief provides for the rejection of the primary relief. This setback applies only to sensitive land use buildings which does not achieve the safety and amenity.		
FS1031.9	Chorus NZ Limited	Oppose	Oppose in part.	These further submissions provide standing for us to work with Kiwi Rail to reach and agreed position regarding appropriate exclusions for telecommunications equipment.	Reject	4.3.21
FS1032.9	Vodafone NZ Limited	Oppose	Oppose in part.	These further submissions provide standing for us to work with Kiwi Rail to reach and agreed position regarding appropriate exclusions for telecommunications equipment.	Reject	4.3.21
FS1033.9	Spark NZ Limited	Oppose	Oppose in part.	These further submissions provide standing for us to work with Kiwi Rail to reach and agreed position regarding appropriate exclusions for telecommunications equipment. These further submissions provide standing for us to work with Kiwi Rail to reach and agreed position regarding appropriate exclusions for telecommunications equipment.	Reject	4.3.21
986.69	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	Neutral/Amend	Add new matters of discretion relating to non-compliance with the 5m Building setback - railway corridor (sought elsewhere in other submission points) in Rule 24.1 Land Use Activities as follows (or similar amendments to achieve the requested relief): <u>1. The size, nature and location of the buildings on the site. 2. The extent to which the safety and efficiency of rail and road operations will be adversely affected. 3. The outcome of any consultation with KiwiRail. 4. Any characteristics of the proposed use that will make</u>	• KiwiRail accepts that there will be at times situations where the proposed 5 metre Building setback - railway corridor rule cannot be met, or it is inappropriate to require compliance. • It is noted that some zones have restricted discretionary activity categories and some don't. It's been KiwiRail's policy to seek restricted discretionary activity status for non-compliance with its noise and vibration performance	Accept in part	4.3.21

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			compliance unnecessary. AND Any consequential amendments to link and/or accommodate the requested changes.	standards. The criteria allow for a bespoke consideration of site specific effects. • Application for resource consent under this rule can be decided without public notification. KiwiRail are likely to be the only affected person determined in accordance with section 95B of the Resource Management Act 1991.		
419.53	Jordyn Landers for Horticulture New Zealand	Support	Retain Rule 24.3.6.2 D Building setback - Sensitive land use, as notified.	The discretionary activity status is supported.	Accept in part	4.3.2I
FS1388.201	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	3.1
742.154	NZTA	Support	Retain Rule 24.3.6.2 DI Building setbacks - Sensitive land use as notified.	The submitter supports Council having full discretion over sensitive land use activities that do not comply with permitted activity standards.	Accept in part	4.3.2I
FS1387.890	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	3.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
433.24	Auckland Waikato Fish and Game Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 24.3.6.3 Building setback - Water bodies, as follows: P1 (a) A building <u>that is not a maimai</u> must be set back a minimum of 30m from: ... P2 A building <u>that is not a maimai</u> must be setback at least 50m from a bank of the Waikato River and Waipa River. ... P3 A building <u>that is not a maimai</u> must be set back a minimum of 10m from the bank of a perennial or intermittent stream. AND/OR Any alternative relief to address the issues and concerns raised in the submission.	Maimai should be exempt from this rule because they are already controlled by the Building Act 2004 and need to be an adequate size to maintain safe shooting zones and not compromise hunter safety. There should be the same or similar provisions as the Waikato Regional Plan which permits maimai subject to a maximum area of 10m ² and height of 2.5m measured from floor level.	Accept in part	4.3.23
FS1223.80	Mercury NZ Limited	Support	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	3.1
397.13	Horotiu Properties Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 24.3.6.3 P1 (a) Building setback - Waterbodies, as follows: P1 (a) A building must be setback a minimum of 30m: (i) From the margin of any: A. Lake with a bed area of 8ha or more B. Wetland with an area greater than 1ha; and C. River bank other than the Waikato River and Waipa River <u>whose bed has an average width 3m or more.</u> AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any consequential amendments necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.	Building setbacks from lakes should be to protect buildings from flood risk (covered by other rules) or alternatively large lakes which could potentially one day require space for esplanade purposes. Current wording places unjust setback requirement from private, onsite and often artificial ponds/Waterbodies.	Reject	4.3.23
FS1388.135	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the	Reject	3.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				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.		
602.3	Greig Metcalfe	Oppose	Amend Rule 24.3.6.3 PI Building setback - water bodies as follows: (a) A building must be setback a minimum of 30m (i) from the margin of any: A. Lake with a bed area of 8ha or more; B. Wetland with an area greater than 1ha; and C. River bank, other than the Waikato River and Waipa River whose bed has an average width 3m or more. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	There needs to be parameters as to when this rule applies. The parameters from the Operative Waikato District Plan are sought.	Reject	4.3.23
FS1388.1027	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	3.1
662.31	Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 24.3.6.3 PI Building setback - Waterbodies as follows: (a) A building must be set back a minimum of 30 from: (i) the margin of any: A. Lake over 4ha; B. Wetland; and C. River bank, other than the Waikato River and Waipa River. D. 10m from a managed wetland	Opposes the use of the generic term "wetland" as this all-encompassing terminology is inappropriate for use within the Proposed District Plan as it will have a significant impact on land development in Country Living Zone that may not carry any reasonable environmental benefit. The setbacks for man-made stormwater infrastructure and/or modified waterbodies be identified under all applicable waterbody setback rules is 10m. As a 'lake' can constitute a large array of waterbodies, the submitter contends that a starting point of 4ha	Reject	4.3.23

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				be used in the Proposed District Plan before the setback applies.		
FS1387.112	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<p>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure.</p> <p>Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</p>	Reject	3.1
689.22	Greig Developments No 2 Limited	Neutral/Amend	<p>Retain Rule 24.3.6.3 Building setback - Waterbodies, except for the amendments sought below</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend Rule 24.3.6.3 P1 (a)(i)C Building set back - Waterbodies as follows: <u>Named</u> River bank, other than the Waikato River and Waipa River.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend Rule 24.3.6.3 P3 Building setback - Waterbodies as follows: A building must be setback a minimum of 10m from the bank of a perennial or intermittent <u>named or unnamed</u> stream.</p>	<p>It is important to define a stream to avoid confusion with the definition of a river. The RMA defines river as “a continually or intermittently flowing body of freshwater; and includes a stream and modified watercourse” if a watercourse is named “Stream” then it should be subject to the appropriate setback by the Plan.</p>	Reject	4.3.23
FS1387.292	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<p>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure.</p> <p>Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</p>	Reject	3.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
746.130	The Surveying Company	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 24.3.6.3 P3 Building setback- Waterbodies except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Rule 24.3.6.3-Building setback - Waterbodies as follows: P1 (a) (i) C. <u>Named</u> River bank, ... P3. A building must be set back a minimum of 10m from the bank of a perennial or intermittent <u>named or unnamed</u> stream.	It is important to define a stream to avoid confusion with the definition of a river. The RMA defines a river as "a continually or intermittently flowing body of fresh water; and includes a stream and modified watercourse." If a watercourse is named "Stream" then it should be subject to the appropriate setback by the Plan.	Reject	4.3.23
FS1387.981	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	3.1
695.137	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 24.3.6.3 Building setbacks – Waterbodies and Rule 22.3.7.5 Building setbacks – Waterbodies, to be the same.	There does not appear to be a regulatory or logical reason for a difference with the Rural Zone.	Reject	4.3.23
FS1387.340	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	3.1
697.469	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 24.3.6.3 Building setback - Waterbodies, to be consistent in terms of the terminology of structures across	Consistency with the equivalent rule in other chapters.	Reject	4.3.23

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			all zone chapters.			
FS1108.18	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated WITHDRAWN	Oppose	Null	Unclear as to what is sought by the submission.	N/A - Withdrawn	
FS1139.17	Turangawaewae Trust Board	Oppose	Null	Unclear as to what is sought by the submission.	Accept	4.3.23
FS1387.453	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	3.1
697.990	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend 24.3.6.3 P4 Building setbacks-waterbodies, as follows: A public amenity of up to 25m ² , or a pump shed (public or private) within any building setback identified in Rule 24.3.6.3 P1, P2 or P3.	Insert the words “public or private” to clarify that the pump shed is both private and public.	Accept	4.3.23
697.991	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 24.3.6.3 P3 Building setbacks - waterbodies; AND Consequential amendment to Rule 24.3.6.3 D1 as follows; A building that does not comply with Rules 24.3.6.3 P1, P2, P3 or P4.	There is no need for this rule as it is adequately covered by the other setback requirements from water bodies.	Accept in part	4.3.23
FS1286.14	Horotiu Properties Limited	Support	Rule 24.3.6.3 - Building setbacks - waterbodies, amend as follows: P1 (a) A building must be set back a minimum of 23m from: (i) the margin of any: A. Lake; B. Wetland; and C. River bank, other than the Waikato River and Waipa River.	This submission is supported to the extent HPL seeks other amendments to this rule as set out in its original submission. Building setbacks from lakes should be to protect building from flood risk. The current wording places unjust setback requirements from private, onsite and often artificial ponds/water bodies.	Accept in part	4.3.23
FS1387.761	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure.	Reject	3.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
697.992	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 24.3.6.3 Building setbacks - waterbodies, as follows: P1 (a) A building must be set back a minimum of 30 <u>23m</u> from: (i) the margin of any: A. Lake; B. Wetland; and C. River bank, other than the Waikato River and Waipa River. P2 A building must be set back at least 50 <u>28m</u> from a bank of the Waikato River and Waipa River.	Amend the rule so that the setback represents 25m esplanade reserve plus the yard setback for the Waikato and Waipa Rivers, and 20m esplanade plus the yard setback for all other waterbodies.	Accept	4.3.23
FS1387.762	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure.</i> <i>Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Reject	3.1
378.50	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Retain Rule 24.3.6.3 Building setback - Waterbodies.	The Rule will safeguard the wellbeing of communities in accordance with the purpose of the RMA and the purpose of Fire and Emergency New Zealand in the effective protection of lives, property and the surrounding environment.	Accept in part	4.3.23
FS1035.156	Pareoranga Te Kata	Support	Obtain statement of performance expectation (SPE) to allow submission to be accepted.	Fire safety and fire prevention to undertake training activities for fire fighters within the region.	Accept in part	4.1
249.2	Anton Marais	Neutral/Amend	Amend the title for the "Village Zone", to use a more descriptive term such as "Rural Residential", "Residential Low Density", "Residential Large Lot" or similar.	The "Village Zone" is not used elsewhere in New Zealand (to submitter's knowledge). "Village Zone" is not suggested in the draft National Planning Standards, and unlikely to be included. The zone name does not describe the intended land use nor the intended form or feel of the	Accept	4.3.25

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>zone. The naming of the zone should describe the activities, land uses, and intended street-scape one would expect, and the name does not describe these areas, the connotation is very unlike what the actual zone is like. It is difficult for people to describe their property when it is being sold if a buyer is not familiar with the location and the house for sale is in a "Village Zone". It is not an accurate description of the neighboring property nor the density and lot sizes a person would expect when they hear the term "Village Zone". The description of the property will match buyer/seller expectation of the zone description. Zoning has a big impact on property valuations and when the name is not consistent with other zone names and types the valuation is not as easily standardized. Aligning the name to something more commonly used will help people understand what the zone means. Names such as Rural Residential, Large Lot Residential, or Residential Low Density, would enable a person on the street to know what the intention of the zone is and what it means for their property.</p>		