

Attachment I: Table of submission points

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
128.4	Trevor Reid	Support	Retain Rule 20.2.3.1 P3 Noise - General.	This rule provides existing residences with a safeguard against excessive noise from nearby Industrial Zones. Existing houses at Horotiu, near the Industrial Zone, do not have noise insulation and therefore need to have their amenity protected.	Accept	23.3.1
<i>FS1353.10</i>	<i>Tuakau Proteins Limited</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Amend the Permitted noise standards to include the interface noise provisions within the Rural zone as requested in the TPL submission.</i>	<i>TPL considers that it is necessary for the Council to include 'interface' permitted noise levels in the Industrial Zone.</i>	<i>Reject</i>	23.3.1
<i>FS1039.11</i>	<i>Colette Brown</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Seeks that the whole of the submission be allowed.</i>	<i>Rule provides existing residents with safeguard from Industrial zone. Protect existing houses.</i>	<i>Accept</i>	23.3.1
130.2	Kathleen Reid	Neutral/Amend	Amend the noise limits to match the Operative District Plan for the Industrial Zone.	No reasons provided.	Accept	23.2.1
<i>FS1353.11</i>	<i>Tuakau Proteins Limited</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Amend the Permitted noise standards to include the interface noise provisions within the Rural zone as requested in the TPL submission.</i>	<i>TPL considers that it is necessary for the Council to include 'interface' permitted noise levels in the Industrial Zone.</i>	<i>Reject</i>	23.2.1
<i>FS1039.4</i>	<i>Colette Brown</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Seeks that the whole of the submission be allowed.</i>	<i>Amend noise limits to match Operative district plan for Industrial Zone.</i>	<i>Accept</i>	23.2.1
130.6	Kathleen Reid	Support	Retain Rule 20.2.3.1 P3 Noise - General.	This rule provides existing residences with a safeguard against excessive noise from nearby industrial zones. Existing houses at Horotiu near the Industrial Zone do not have noise insulation and therefore need to have their amenity protected.	Accept	23.3.1
<i>FS1353.12</i>	<i>Tuakau Proteins Limited</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Amend the Permitted noise standards to include the interface noise provisions within the Rural zone as requested in the TPL submission.</i>	<i>TPL considers that it is necessary for the Council to include 'interface' permitted noise levels in the Industrial Zone.</i>	<i>Reject</i>	23.3.1
<i>FS1039.7</i>	<i>Colette Brown</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Seeks that the whole of the submission be allowed.</i>	<i>Noise insulation exempt for existing properties.</i>	<i>Accept</i>	23.3.1
133.2	Simon Gibson	Support	Ensure that the Industrial Zone noise limits are not increased.	No reasons provided.	Accept	23.2.1
<i>FS1039.14</i>	<i>Colette Brown</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Seeks that the whole of the submission be allowed.</i>	<i>Noise to not be increased.</i>	<i>Accept</i>	23.2.1
137.2	Michele Gamble	Not Stated	Amend the noise limits to match the Operative District Plan for the Industrial Zone.	No reasons provided.	Accept	23.2.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1039.18	Colette Brown	Support	Seeks that the whole of the submission be allowed.	Amend noise limits to match Operative District Plan.	Accept	23.2.1
138.2	Kim Crook	Neutral/Amend	Amend the noise limits to match the Operative District Plan for the Industrial Zone.	No reasons provided.	Accept	23.2.1
FS1039.2	Colette Brown	Support	Seeks that the whole of the submission be allowed.	Amend noise limits to match Operative district plan for Industrial Zone.	Accept	23.2.1
155.2	Karl Crook	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 20.2.3 Noise, to not increase the noise limits for the Industrial Zone.	No reasons given.	Accept	23.2.1
FS1353.13	Tuakau Proteins Limited	Oppose	Amend the Permitted noise standards to include the interface noise provisions within the Rural zone as requested in the TPL submission.	TPL considers that it is necessary for the Council to include 'interface' permitted noise levels in the Industrial Zone.	Reject	23.2.1
FS1039.16	Colette Brown	Support	Seeks that the whole of the submission be allowed.	Not to increase noise limits for Industrial Zone.	Accept	23.2.1
157.2	John Baillie	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 20.2.3 Noise, to not increase the noise limits for the Industrial Zone.	Not stated.	Accept	23.2.1
FS1353.14	Tuakau Proteins Limited	Oppose	Amend the Permitted noise standards to include the interface noise provisions within the Rural Zone as requested in the TPL submission.	TPL considers that it is necessary for the Council to include 'interface' permitted noise levels in the Industrial Zone.	Reject	23.2.1
167.2	Roger Heaslip	Support	Amend the Proposed District Plan to not increase the noise limits for the Industrial Zone.	No reasons provided.	Accept	23.2.1
FS1353.15	Tuakau Proteins Limited	Oppose	Amend the Permitted noise standards to include the interface noise provisions within the Rural zone as requested in the TPL submission.	TPL considers that it is necessary for the Council to include 'interface' permitted noise levels in the Industrial Zone.	Reject	23.2.1
299.8	2SEN Limited and Tuakau Estates Limited	Support	Retain Objective 4.6.6 Manage adverse effects as notified.	Industrial activities are required to manage effects in accordance with Regional and District Plan provisions and any relevant resource consents.	Accept	13.2
302.4	Jeremy Talbot for Barker & Associates Limited on behalf of EnviroWaste New Zealand Limited	Oppose	Add to Rule 20.1.1 Industrial Zone - Permitted Activities the following activities as permitted (as a minimum): Hire Centres Wholesale Trade Supply outlet Transport Depot Garden Centres Retailing of agricultural and industrial motor vehicles and machinery Processing, storage, distribution and sale (wholesale or retail) of aggregates. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential amendments or additional amendments to address the matters raised in the submission.	Under the Proposed Plan, there is no activity distinction between those activities provided for in the Heavy Industrial Zone and the Industrial Zone where the listed permitted activities are the same. This is inconsistent with Policy 4.6.2 which seeks to provide for "different functions" within the zones, but also a "range of activities". The range of permitted activities is too constrained and does not take into account more land intensive activities of a lower amenity value, which should be located an Industrial Zone rather than the Business Zone (where they	Reject	36.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				are otherwise provided for as "commercial activities"). The area of Business Zoned land nearby near Pokeno, where such activities could locate, is very limited (only around the Town Centre) and in close proximity to more services areas (i.e. residential). These activities could reasonably locate in an Industrial Zone (and be compatible with surrounding activities). Currently they are not considered in P1-P6, under rule 20.1.1 and unless specifically provided for would therefore default to a Non-Complying Activity (under NC1).		
FS1386.339	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	36.2
302.5	Jeremy Talbot for Barker & Associates Limited on behalf of EnviroWaste New Zealand Limited	Oppose	Delete from Rule 20.1.1 Permitted Activities any restriction on gross floor area AND Amend Rule 20.1.1 Permitted activities to allow for any office that is ancillary to a permitted activity. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential amendments or additional amendments to address the matters raised in the submission.	There is no reason to restrict offices associated with permitted activities where these support the efficient and effective operation of a permitted activity.	Reject	20.4.1
FS1386.340	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	Accept	20.4.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>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>		
302.6	Jeremy Talbot for Barker & Associates Limited on behalf of EnviroWaste New Zealand Limited	Oppose	Add a permitted activity for the construction of a building for any permitted activity (which complies with the development controls) to Rule 20.1.1 Permitted Activities. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential amendments or additional amendments to address the matters raised in the submission.	The activity status of buildings is unclear; this is to clarify the activity status.	Accept	20.3.1
FS1386.341	<i>Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C</i>	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Reject	20.3.1
302.7	Jeremy Talbot for Barker & Associates Limited on behalf of EnviroWaste New Zealand Limited	Oppose	Delete Rule 20.2.1 Servicing and hours of operation. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential amendments or additional amendments to address the matters raised in the submission.	This control is without precedent and represents a restrictive and inappropriate regime.	Accept	38.1.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
302.8	Jeremy Talbot for Barker & Associates Limited on behalf of EnviroWaste New Zealand Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 20.2.2 CI Landscape planting for landscape planting to change from a controlled activity to a permitted activity. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential amendments or additional amendments to address the matters raised in the submission.	This control is without precedent and represents a restrictive and inappropriate regime.	Reject	39.1.2
302.9	Jeremy Talbot for Barker & Associates Limited on behalf of EnviroWaste New Zealand Limited	Oppose	Delete Rule 20.2.2 CI (b) Landscape planting. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential amendments or additional amendments to address the matters raised in the submission.	This control creates a mandatory requirement for planting of streams irrespective of what the proposal is (for example a car parking shortfall) and without any consideration of the costs associated with the rule).	Reject	21.1.1
FS1353.16	Tuakau Proteins Limited	Support	Null	Agree with the submission of EnviroWaste NZ Ltd that this rule creates a mandatory requirement for planting of streams irrespective of what the proposal is (for example a car parking shortfall) and without any consideration of the costs associated with the rule.	Reject	21.1.1
341.7	Brian Croad for Tainui Group Holdings Limited	Support	Retain Chapter 21 Industrial Zone Heavy as notified, including the proposed structure and approach.	A Heavy Industrial zoning is proposed for the TGHL owned Huntly and Meremere Power Stations sites within the Proposed Plan as notified. Policy 4.6.2 of the Proposed Plan describes the Heavy Industrial Zone as providing 'for a range of industrial and other compatible activities that generate potentially significant effects on more sensitive zones, including relatively high levels of visual impact from buildings and associated parking and loading spaces, outdoor storage, lighting, noise, odour and heavy traffic, subject to appropriate separation distances.' Further to the comments above regarding the Rural Zone provisions, TGHL support the more 'activity based' structure and approach to Chapter 21 for the Heavy Industrial Zone. For ease of interpretation, TGHL also support the specific Heavy Industrial Zone chapter when compared to the lengthy combined Industrial Chapter in Operative Plan.	Accept in part	36.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
402.5	Tuakau Proteins Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend the definition of "Industrial Activity" in Chapter 13 Definitions to specifically include "rural industry activities" (or words to similar effect). OR Add "Rural Industry" to Rule 20.1.1 Permitted Activities as a permitted activity in the Industrial Zone (or words to similar effect). AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief to give effect to the concerns raised in the submission.	Tuakau Proteins Limited is concerned that their activities may not fit within the definition of Industrial activity. Tuakau Proteins Limited is confident that they would fit within definition of rural industry however, there is no confirmation in the plan as it written that rural industry fits within Industrial activity. Therefore, rural industry potentially is not considered as a permitted activity in the Industrial Zone.	Reject	203.1
FS1388.139	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	20.3.1
FS1326.13	Holcim (New Zealand) Limited	Support	Support insofar as it gives effect to the primary relief sought by HNZL.	The proposed changes provide clarity to activities permitted in the industrial zones.	Reject	20.3.1
FS1193.13	Van Den Brink Group	Support	The submission is allowed.	The proposed changes provide clarity to activities permitted in the industrial zones.	Reject	20.3.1
402.6	Tuakau Proteins Limited	Neutral/Amend	Retain the permitted noise levels in Rule 20.2.3 Noise, except for the amendments sought below AND Add new noise level standards to Rule 20.2.3.1 P2 - General, as follows (or words to similar effect): P2 (a) Noise measured within any other site: (i) In an Industrial Zone must not exceed: A. 75dBA (LAeq) 7am to 10pm; and B. 55dB (LAeq) and 85dB (LAmx) 10pm to 7am the following day. (ii) <u>At the Rural Zone interface, noise levels must not exceed the below noise levels when measured within the notional boundary of property in a rural zone: A. 55dB (LAeq) 7am to 10pm; and B. 45dB (LAeq) and 75dB (LAmx) 10pm to 7am the</u>	Tuakau Proteins Limited supports the permitted noise levels in the Industrial Zone, but considers that is necessary to include 'interface' permitted noise levels in the Industrial zone. As Tuakau Proteins Limited is located within the Industrial Zone but is the only industrial activity, the zoning changes at the site boundary to the adjacent Rural Zone. Therefore, although noisy activities are accepted in the Industrial Zone and higher permitted noise levels are provided, Industrial activities still need to fit within the Rural Zone's permitted noise levels, since the noise measured within any	Reject	23.2.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p>following day.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Add new noise level standards to Rule 20.2.3.1 P3 Noise General as follows (or words to similar effect): P3 (a) Noise measured within any site in any zone other, than the Industrial Zone and the Heavy Industrial Zone, must meet the permitted noise levels for that zone, <u>with the exception of the interface with the Rural Zone.</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief to give effect to the concerns raised in the submission.</p>	<p>site in any zone other than the Industrial Zone and Heavy Industrial Zone, must meet the permitted noise levels for that zone.</p> <p>Tuakau Protein Limited must meet the Rural Zone permitted noise levels, which are much lower than the Industrial Zone's, which creates an issue when considering future growth of the site. Tuakau Protein Limited notes that other councils have included interface noise levels to manage such situations where noise levels need to be considered on sites which are located on the boundary of another zone. It is considered that this is appropriate to ensure the District Plan does not unreasonably restrict future growth of rural industry located on the boundary of the Rural Zone.</p>		
FS1193.1	Van Den Brink Group	Support	The submission is allowed.	Agree that interface control for noise at the boundary would result in appropriate management for noise and activities.	Reject	23.2.1
FS1326.1	Holcim (New Zealand) Limited	Support	Support.	Agree that interface control for noise at the boundary would result in appropriate management for noise and activities.	Reject	23.2.1
404.4	Harry Mowbray for Mowbray Group	Oppose	Amend Rule 20.3.1 Building height to provide dispensation for existing buildings located at 452B Tauwhare Road, Matangi (Matangi Dairy Factory) to ensure the boiler house (22m), dryer tower (26m) and boiler flues (33m) remain at these heights when a change of use occurs.	Supports increase in building height to 15m from 10m for Rule 20.3.1. Matangi Dairy Factory is a site of significant history. Council records show that when a previous change of use for these buildings was requested, Council wanted the buildings reduced in height to 10m. The submitter does not want this to be a condition in future development.	Reject	28.2.1
FS1264.5	Bootleg Brewery	Support	Seek that the submission point is allowed.	Bootleg supports regeneration and intensification within Matangi town centre, and land use provisions which provide for the permissive operation of a brewery with on and off premise.	Reject	28.2.1
FS1305.14	Andrew Mowbray	Support	Seek that the whole submission be allowed.	We are a direct neighbour to the Matangi Factory at 452 Tauwhare Road and support the visions and all the points raised to grow the site into a Business Town Centre by first allowing Industrial zoning and a flexible zoning plan to realise sensible development of the Matangi village and site.	Reject	28.2.1
FS1323.184	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	That the changes sought are declined.	HNZPT is concerned at the unintended consequences that these amendments may have on the existing HNZPT listed NZ Co-operative	Accept	28.2.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>Dairy Company Limited Factory (former) List Nos 4935 located at 452 Matangi Road and would need to see the suite of associated and estimated effects to confirm their stance.</i>		
465.1	Buckland Marine Limited	Neutral/Amend	Add the following activities to Rule 20.1.1 Permitted Activities: <u>P7 Mechanical workshop P8 Ancillary yard P9 New buildings Include activity specific conditions specifying that building must be related to industrial activity. P10 Additions and Alterations to buildings P11 Demolition of buildings</u> AND Add the following terms to Chapter 13 Definitions : Mechanical workshop - to include Marine outboard servicing centre Ancillary yard	There is currently no provision to allow for a mechanical workshop within the Industrial Zone, nor is there provision within for an ancillary yard. The submitter's are a Marine Outboard Servicing Centre (including mechanical workshop) located specifically in the Industrial Zone because that is the most suitable area for their business to be situated, yet under the proposed rule framework this activity would be considered a Non-Complying activity. There is no provision for new buildings associated with industrial activities to develop on an industrial site, alterations to existing industrial premises to carry out or for demolition of buildings.	Accept	20.3.1
FS1388.393	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Reject	20.3.1
FS1326.14	Holcim (New Zealand) Limited	Support	<i>Support in part insofar as it gives effect to the primary relief sought by HNZL. Oppose in part. Allow - with the exception that permitted activity buildings should relate to any permitted activity (not just be permitted for industrial activities).</i>	<i>The proposed changes provide clarity to activities permitted in the industrial zones, with the exception that the clarity on building activity status limits permitted activity buildings to those associated with an industrial activity only.</i>	Accept	20.3.1
FS1193.14	Van Den Brink Group	Support	<i>Allow- with the exception that permitted activity buildings should relate to any permitted activity (not just be permitted for industrial activities).</i>	<i>The proposed changes provide clarity to activities permitted in the industrial zones, with the exception that the clarity on building activity status limits permitted activity buildings to those associated with an industrial activity only.</i>	Accept	20.3.1
465.2	Buckland Marine Limited	Support	Retain Rule 20.2.1 PI Servicing and hours of	The submitter supports the proposed hours	Reject	21.1.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			operation, as notified.	of operation adjoining zones of more sensitive land use.		
465.3	Buckland Marine Limited	Oppose	Delete Rule 20.2.2 CI Landscape planting, and impose buffer strips between zones at the time of rezoning and/or during subdivision.	The submitter supports the use of landscaping strips but considers that this provision would be more appropriately imposed during rezoning and at the time of subdivision as a buffer between zones and not imposed upon individual industrial development. Many industrial lots require hard fill and security fencing that will short if vegetation contacts this. Industrial land is expensive and often the entire area is required for the proposed industrial activity.	Reject	22.1.2
465.4	Buckland Marine Limited	Oppose	Delete Rule 20.2.5.IPI (vi) Earthworks.	The submitter considers that a 1.5m setback from all boundaries is unnecessary where erosion and sediment controls are established on site in accordance with the Waikato Regional Council Erosion and Sediment Control: Guidelines for Soil Disturbing Activities, Report: TR 2009/02. The rules should be effects-based. A 1.5m setback would be impractical for many industrial sites levelling the site for hard fill up to the boundary.	Accept	25.3.1
<i>FS1193.3</i>	<i>Van Den Brink Group</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>The submission is allowed.</i>	<i>Concur that a 1.5m setback for all earthworks may result in impracticalities for sites (and have the potential to result in unusable land in a zone).</i>	<i>Accept</i>	<i>25.3.1</i>
<i>FS1326.3</i>	<i>Holcim (New Zealand) Limited</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support.</i>	<i>Concur that a 1.5m setback for all earthworks may result in impracticalities for sites (and have the potential to result in unusable land in a zone).</i>	<i>Accept</i>	<i>25.3.1</i>
465.5	Buckland Marine Limited	Support	Retain Objective 4.6.1 Economic growth of industry, as notified.	The submitter supports the intention of this objective.	Accept	8.2
<i>FS1388.394</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</i>	<i>Reject</i>	<i>8.2</i>

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>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>		
465.6	Buckland Marine Limited	Support	Retain Policy 4.6.2 Provide Industrial Zones with different functions, as notified.	The submitter supports the effects-based basis for this policy.	Accept	9.2
FS1388.395	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	9.2
465.7	Buckland Marine Limited	Support	Retain Policy 4.6.3 Maintain a sufficient supply of industrial land, as notified.	The submitter supports locating industry in the Industrial Zone and ensuring adequate land is available to meet growing demands.	Accept	10.2
FS1388.396	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	10.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
465.8	Buckland Marine Limited	Support	Retain Objective 4.6.6 Manage adverse effects, as notified.	It is important the amenity values of sensitive land uses be protected.	Accept	13.2
465.9	Buckland Marine Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 4.6.7 Management of adverse effects within industrial zones, as follows: (a) Manage adverse effects including visual impact from buildings, parking, loading spaces and outdoor storage, lighting, noise, odour and traffic by managing the location of industrial uses, bulk and form of buildings, landscaping and screening <u>where appropriate</u> .	The submitter supports the management of adverse effects from within the Industrial Zone. It is considered that road frontage is an important aspect for many industrial premise and requiring screening at the interface with roads is impractical. Landscaping is supported if it is consistent with the nature and purpose of the Industrial Zone and does not impact on the proposed land use.	Reject	14.2
FS1353	Tuakau Protein Ltd	Support		TPL support this submission	Reject	
496.8	Andrea Millar for The Department of Corrections	Oppose	Add to Rule 20.1.1 Permitted Activities a new activity: <u>P7 Community corrections activity - Activity specific conditions: Nil</u> AND Any other consequential amendments required to give effect to this relief.	Because community correction facilities are not listed, this would result in community correction activities being non-complying in the Industrial Zone, but it is an appropriate and compatible activity within the Industrial Zone. Industrial Zones provide suitable sites for community corrections activities, in particular the community work components where large sites with yard-based activities and large equipment and/or vehicle storage are often required. This rule should provide for community corrections activities in the Industrial Zone.	Accept	20.3.1
FS1388.495	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	20.3.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
498.2	Kent Baigent for Tuakau Business Park Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 20.1.1 P6 Permitted Activities, as follows: Ancillary Detail - Does not exceed 10% 30% of all buildings on the site.	No reasons provided.	Reject	20.4.1
FS1388.499	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	20.4.1
498.3	Kent Baigent for Tuakau Business Park Limited	Neutral/Amend	Delete resource recovery centres and recovery operations from Rule 20.1.2 D3 Discretionary Activities AND Add "resource recovery centres and recovery operation" to Rule 20.1.1 Permitted Activities.	No reasons provided.	Reject	20.5.1
FS1388.500	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	20.5.1
498.4	Kent Baigent for Tuakau Business Park Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 20.4.1(a) Subdivision General, as follows: (a) Subdivision must comply with all of the following conditions: (i) Proposed lots must	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	33.3.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			have a minimum net site area of 1000m ² 700m ² (ii) Proposed lots must have an average area of at least 2000m ² 1200m ² (iii) No more than 20% 30% rear lots are created.			
FS1388.501	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept in part	33.3.1
498.5	Kent Baigent for Tuakau Business Park Limited	Not Stated	Add a new activity to Rule 20.1.1 Permitted Activities, as follows: <u>Living quarters above warehousing/manufacturing.</u>	No reason provided.	Reject	20.3.1
FS1388.502	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	20.3.1
543.3	Fellrock Developments Limited and TTT Products Limited	Support	Retain ancillary retail (P6) and offices ancillary to an industrial activity (P4) being permitted activities (Rule 20.1.1); AND Amend Rule 20.1.1 P4 and P6 Permitted Activities,	Many industrial activities involve outdoor processing and storage and the only buildings that may occupy the site are for offices and retail transactions. Retention of the work 'ancillary' is sufficient to ensure that the retail	Reject	20.4.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			as follows: Activity-specific conditions ... P4 ancillary to an industrial activity Less than 100m ² gfa; or 30% of all buildings on the site; Nil ... P6 retail +10% of all buildings on the site; Nil	Activity Office Does not exceed Ancillary Does not exceed	and office activities are secondary to the primary industrial activities on the site. Supports retail and office activities to the industrial use of the site being permitted activities within the Industrial Zone. Do not support the limitations on size.	
FSI388.752	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	20.4.1
543.4	Fellrock Developments Limited and TTT Products Limited	Oppose	Delete Rule 20.2.1 Servicing and hours of operation.	This rule is overly restrictive and the environmental outcome that it seeks is already addressed by other rules (such as those relating to noise and glare). Many industrial based business operate with shift work and/or require incoming and outgoing deliveries during off peak times. This trend is increasing given the need to minimise transport costs and delays from inadequate roading infrastructure. The restrictions in this rule may therefore hinder efficient operations by not enabling them to expand and adapt to markets. It is unreasonable to allow a courier to deliver to a residence at 7.00am but not to a nearby industrial business.	Accept	21.1.1
543.5	Fellrock Developments Limited and TTT Products Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 20.2.2 CI Landscape planting, as follows: (a) Any new activity on a lot that has a side and/or rear boundary adjoining any	Supports the inclusion of landscaping strips adjoining sensitive receiver and permanent waterways. The landscaping requirements	Reject	22.1.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			Residential, Village, Country Living or Reserve Zone shall provide a 3m 1m wide landscaped strip running parallel with the side and/or rear boundary; and (b) Any new activity on a lot that contains, or is adjacent to, a river or a permanent or intermittent stream shall provide an 8m wide landscaped strip measured from the top edge of the closes bank and extending across the entire length of the watercourse.	should only apply to new developments as existing activities may not be able to comply with this rule. A 3m wide landscaped strip is unnecessarily wide and will result in a considerable loss of land that could otherwise be used for industrial development or car parking. Maintenance of this landscaped width also places an unreasonable burden and cost on the owner/operator. A 1m landscaped strip is more appropriate and would provide for a well maintained hedge in an urban setting. Applying this rule to intermittent streams is onerous and may raise concerns in regard to overland flows and potentially restrict development.		
FS1353.18	Tuakau Proteins Limited	Support	Null	TPL support this submission.	Reject	22.1.2
FS1353.8	Tuakau Proteins Limited	Support	Null	TPL support the amended wording	Reject	22.1.2
543.6	Fellrock Developments Limited and TTT Products Limited	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 20.2.5.1 Earthworks, except for the amendments outlined below; AND Amend Rule 20.2.5.1 PI (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 2000m ³ ; (iii) not exceed an area of more than 1000m² 10,000m ² over any consecutive 12 month period; (iv) the total depth of any excavation or filling does not exceed 1.5m above or below ground level; ...	The notified area, volume and depth limits are too low given that most industrial sites are typically large and require a high degree of land modification for the installation of services, stormwater retention devices for hard stand, the high percentage of building coverage and hard surfaces. If the Industrial Zone was subdivided into lots with a minimum area of 1000m ² and average area of 2000m ² , this earthworks rule would likely be breached with every new development. For instance, a 1000m ² site with 0.2m of topsoil would create 200m ³ of earthworks for just the stripping of the topsoil. Controls on volume and areas are sufficient to manage environmental effects, so limit on excavation/fill depth are not needed.	Accept	25.3.1
543.8	Fellrock Developments Limited and TTT Products Limited	Support	Retain notified Rule 20.2.7.1 Signs - General.	The submitter states that this proposed rule is workable.	Accept	25.2.1
543.9	Fellrock Developments Limited and TTT Products Limited	Support	Amend Rule 20.2.8 PI Outdoor storage of goods or materials, as follows: PI (a) Outdoor storage of goods or materials must comply with all the following conditions: ... (iv) not exceed 30% site	The maximum site coverage of 30% is too restrictive as it does not enable appropriate industrial activities to be established in the Industrial Zone. A setback of 3m is	Accept	27.1.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			coverage;... (v) be set back at least 3m 1.5m from the boundary of any: ...	excessive, particularly given that outdoor storage is addressed elsewhere in the daylight admission rule (Rule 20.3.3) that ensures that neighbouring properties retain sufficient access to daylight.		
FS1134.72	Counties Power Limited	Support	Seeks that the submission point be allowed.	Any restriction on the percentage of the site allowable for storage use should be deleted, as storage activities are permitted.	Accept	27.1.2
548.7	Murray & Cathy McWatt for Grander Investments Limited	Support	Retain Objective 4.6.1 Economic Growth of Industry, as notified.	Support zones that provide for industrial uses.	Accept	8.2
FS1388.771	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	8.2
FS1306.14	Hynds Foundation	Support	Support.	Hynds Foundation support retention of this objective which recognises industry's contribution to the economic wellbeing of the District.	Accept	8.2
548.8	Murray & Cathy McWatt for Grander Investments Limited	Neutral/Amend	Retain Policy 4.6.2 Provide Industrial Zones with different functions, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Policy 4.6.2 Provide Industrial Zones with different functions as follows: (a) Recognise and provide for a variety of industrial activities within two industrial zones that have different functions depending on their purpose and effects as follows: (i)Industrial Zone A. Recognise and provide for a range of industrial, <u>waste management</u> and other compatible activities that can operate in close proximity to more sensitive zones due to the nature and relatively limited effects of these activities, including visual impact from buildings and associated parking and loading spaces, outdoor	Zoning appropriate for waste management and recycling activities. Industrial Zoning appropriate for waste management and recycling activities. Heavy Industrial Zoning appropriate for waste management and recycling activities. Waste management processes and facilities are compatible with outcomes sought for the Industrial Zone.	Reject	9.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			storage, lighting, noise, odour and traffic, subject to appropriate separation distances. (ii) Heavy Industrial Zone A. Recognise and provide for a range of industrial, <u>waste management</u> and other compatible activities that generate potentially significant effects on more sensitive zones, including relatively high levels of visual impact from buildings and associated parking and loading spaces, outdoor storage, lighting, noise, odour and heavy traffic, subject to appropriate separation distances.			
FSI306.15	Hynds Foundation	Support	Support.	Hynds Foundation support retention of this policy. In particular, the distinction between the levels of Industrial Zoning and recognition that Heavy Industrial Zones can have significant effects on sensitive zones.	Reject	9.2
FSI388.772	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	9.2
548.9	Murray & Cathy McWatt for Grander Investments Limited	Support	Retain Policy 4.6.3 Maintain a sufficient supply of Industrial Land.	Policy 4.1.6 identifies Pokeno as an "Industrial Strategic Growth node". Zoning the subject site Heavy Industrial is in keeping with policy 4.6.3 and the strategic direction of PDP.	Accept	10.2
FSI388.773	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	10.2

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.		
FS1049.1	Craig Hall	Oppose	Rezoning a piece of land to Heavy Industrial that is immediately surrounded on three sides by residences is not a good idea. This will have detrimental effects on all surrounding properties	As above	Reject	10.2
FS1306.16	Hynds Foundation	Support	Support.	Hynds Foundation supports the retention of this policy which includes recognition of Industrial Nodes.	Accept	10.2
567.5	Ngati Tamaoho Trust	Neutral/Amend	Amend Objective 4.6.1 - Economic growth of industry, as follows: The economic growth of the district's industry is supported and strengthened in industrial zones while maintaining a healthy environment.	No reasons provided.	Reject	8.2
FS1108.97	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)	Support	Null	General support for the principle.	Reject	8.2
578.1	Ports of Auckland Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 20.2.5.1 P3 Earthworks - General, as follows: (a) Earthworks for purposes other than creating a building platform for residential industrial within a site, using imported fill material (excluding cleanfill) must meet all of the following conditions: (i) not exceed a total volume of 2,500m ³ ; (ii) not exceed a depth of 1m; (iii) the slope of resulting filled area in stable ground must not exceed a maximum slope of 1:2 (1 vertical to 2 horizontal); (iv) fill material is setback 1.5m from all boundaries; (v) areas exposed by filling are revegetated to achieve 80% ground cover within 6 months of the commencement of the earthworks; (vi) sediment resulting from the filling is retained on the site through implementation and maintenance of erosion and sediment controls; and (vii) do not divert or change the nature of natural water flows, water bodies or established drainage paths; (viii) within overland flow paths, the extent of earthworks must maintain the same entry and exit point at the boundaries of the site and not result in any adverse changes in flood hazards beyond the site.	The extent of permitted earthworks proposed is insufficient to enable the comprehensive redevelopment of Industrial Zoned sites and in the context of greenfield industrial areas such as the Horotiu Industrial Plan. Therefore the permitted earthworks needs to be increased to 2500m ² and 2500m ³ per site within the Industrial Zone. Opposes the requirement for earthworks to be setback 1.5m from all boundaries. In the Industrial Zone there is a lower amenity expectation than other sensitive zones and these constraints are unnecessarily onerous and no justification has been provided for these provisions. Earthworks are not permitted to divert or change the nature of drainage paths and this is unnecessarily onerous, considering it can be enabled a permitted activity where the entry of exit point is not altered. References made to building platform for 'residential purposes' should be appropriately referenced 'industrial purposes'.	Accept in part	74.6.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			OR Add a new section 20.6 within Chapter 20 Industrial Zone, specifically providing for the Horotiu Industrial Park (see Schedule 2 of the submission for specific provisions). AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make alternative or consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.			
FS1388.832	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept in part	74.6.1
FS1193.4	Van Den Brink Group	Support	The submission is allowed.	The earthworks provisions could be more permissive and still appropriately manage potential effects.	Accept in part	74.6.1
FS1326.4	Holcim (New Zealand) Limited	Support	Support.	The earthworks provisions could be more permissive and still appropriately manage potential effects.	Accept in part	74.6.1
578.2	Ports of Auckland Limited	Support	Retain Rule 20.2.5.1 RDI Earthworks - General as notified, in that it is a restricted discretionary activity for earthworks that do not comply with Rule P1, P2, P3.	Supports the restricted discretionary activity status for earthworks that do not comply with rule P1, P2 and P3, and seek that RDI be retained as notified.	Accept	25.3.1
FS1388.833	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	25.3.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>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>		
578.5	Ports of Auckland Limited	Support	Amend Rule 20.2.7.1 P2 (c) Signs - General, as follows: (c) Where the sign is a freestanding sign, it must: (i) not exceed an area of 153m2 for one sign per site, and 24m2 for any other freestanding sign on the site; and (ii) be setback at least 5m from the boundary of any site a Residential, Village or Country Living Zone; OR Add a new section 20.6 within Chapter 20 Industrial Zone, specifically providing for the Horotiu Industrial Park (see Schedule 2 of the submission for specific provisions). AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make alternative or consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.	Supports rule 20.2.7.1 as notified, however does not agree with the maximum area for freestanding signs. In the Industrial Zone, where large buildings are provided for as a permitted activity, the receiving environment has the ability to accommodate larger freestanding signs than 3m2. A 15m2 freestanding sign can be accommodated as a permitted activity.	Reject	74.7.1
578.6	Ports of Auckland Limited	Support	Retain Rule 20.2.7.1 RDI Signs - General, as notified.	Supports the restricted discretionary activity status and seeks that RDI be retained as notified.	Accept	26.2.1
578.7	Ports of Auckland Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 20.2.8 PI Outdoor storage of goods or materials, to read: (a) Outdoor storage of goods or materials must comply with all the following conditions: (i) be associated with the activity operating from the site; (ii) not encroach on required parking or loading areas; (iii) not exceed a height of 9m unless located within the Horotiu Industrial Park where it must not exceed a height of 21m; (iv) not exceed 30% site coverage; OR Add a new section 20.6 within Chapter 20 Industrial Zone, specifically providing for the Horotiu Industrial Park (see Schedule 2 of the submission for specific provisions). AND	Does not support the application of the 'outdoor storage' rule to the Horotiu Industrial Park in its current form. The nature of the Port of Auckland Limited's activities are such that they will require stacking containers and other materials to heights up to 21 metres. The maximum permitted height for the Horotiu Industrial Park within the Operative District Plan is 25 metres. However given its location to more sensitive land uses, it is considered appropriate to enable the permitted outdoor storage of materials to 21 metres within the Horotiu Industrial Park.	Accept in part	74.8.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			Amend the Proposed District Plan to make alternative or consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.			
FS1388.836	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	74.8.1
578.8	Ports of Auckland Limited	Support	Retain Rule 20.2.8 RDI Outdoor storage of goods or materials, as notified.	Supports the restricted discretionary status and seeks that RDI be retained as notified.	Accept in part	74.8.1
FS1388.837	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	74.8.1
581.4	Penny Gallagher for Synlait Milk Ltd	Oppose	Amend Objective 4.6.1 Economic growth of industry to recognise that the economic growth of the district's industry is supported and strengthened by providing for heavy and general industrial activities.	Economic growth is strengthened where diversity in economic activity is provided for. The definition of industry covers a broad spectrum of activities from those industrial activities which operate at a service level through to heavier processing and	Reject	8.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				manufacturing. The district plan objectives and policies require greater articulation to recognise the range in industrial activity and further explanation as to how these activities will be provided for. Heavier industrial activities need to have confidence that there are locations within the district where their associated traffic, bulk, scale and amenity effects will be provided for.		
FS1388.946	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	8.2
581.5	Penny Gallagher for Synlait Milk Ltd	Oppose	Amend Policy 4.6.2(ii) Provide Industrial Zones with different functions to provide greater distinction between the General Industrial and Heavy Industrial Zones in terms of the activities and environmental outcomes anticipated.	The policy difference in the Proposed District Plan between Industrial and Heavy Industrial zones is limited to being either close to or separated from more sensitive zones. The policy fails to acknowledge that it is important for heavy industry to have a place to go where it can operate efficiently with more lenient provisions. The policy fails to recognise the economic benefits of heavy industry that require protection from reverse sensitivity or having to reduce operation to address high environmental outcomes sought by sensitive activities.	Accept	9.2
FS1341.21	Hynds Pipe Systems Limited	Support	Null	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This submission supports the industrial strategic growth node along McDonald Road an in particular the importance of appropriate land to enable heavy industrial use. Importantly the submission seeks to protect the location of Heavy Industrial Zone land from encroachment by sensitive activities and proposal for residential re-zoning. Hynds supports the submission as it 	Accept	9.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				relates to these matters because it is also concerned that rezoning of land adjacent to the Heavy Industrial land will create reverse sensitivity effects on the existing and proposed industrial business operations. • Ensuring there is no encroachment by sensitive activities on the heavy industrial land is the most appropriate way for the Council to exercise its functions and to ensure the efficiency and effectiveness of the proposed plan provisions.		
FSI388.947	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	9.2
FSI306.24	Hynds Foundation	Support	Support.	Hynds Foundation are supportive of this submitter's amendment to provide for greater distinction and recognition of the two levels of industrial zoning.	Reject	9.2
581.6	Penny Gallagher for Synlait Milk Ltd	Oppose	Amend Policy 4.6.3 Maintain a sufficient supply of industrial land as follows: Maintain a sufficient supply of <u>appropriately located</u> industrial land within strategic nodes to meet foreseeable future demands, having regard to the requirement of different industries to avoid the need for industrial activities to located in non-industrial zones <u>recognising the different locations required by heavy industry and general industry.</u>	Part of a wider concern that the Proposed District Plan does not provide sufficient articulation of the different requirements between general and heavy industrial land uses. The location of Heavy Industrial Zoning should also be protected from encroachment by sensitive activities and proposals for residential and rural-residential rezoning.	Accept in part	10.2
FSI306.25	Hynds Foundation	Support	Support.	Hynds Foundation are supportive of this submitter's amendment to provide for greater distinction and recognition of the two levels of industrial zoning.	Reject	10.2
FSI388.948	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	Accept	10.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FS1341.22	Hynds Pipe Systems Limited	Support	Null	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This submission supports the industrial strategic growth node along McDonald Road and in particular the importance of appropriate land to enable heavy industrial use. Importantly the submission seeks to protect the location of Heavy Industrial Zone land from encroachment by sensitive activities and proposal for residential rezoning. Hynds supports the submission as it relates to these matters because it is also concerned that rezoning of land adjacent to the Heavy Industrial land will create reverse sensitivity effects on the existing and proposed industrial business operations. Ensuring there is no encroachment by sensitive activities on the heavy industrial land is the most appropriate way for the Council to exercise its functions and to ensure the efficiency and effectiveness of the proposed plan provisions. 	Reject	10.2
581.7	Penny Gallagher for Synlait Milk Ltd	Oppose	Add a new objective and policy that recognises the adverse effects arising from General Industrial and Heavy Industrial Zones may require different management approaches with more lenient standards in the Heavy Industrial Zone being appropriate.	The current wording of Objective 4.6.6 is about managing effects on sensitive activities and ecosystem values outside industrial zones. It does not consider managing adverse effects between the two industrial zones. Managing effects approach should include the location of the zones. The role of the General Industrial Zone is to provide a buffer between Heavy industrial Zones and more sensitive zones. This policy approach would in turn enable different standards of management of environmental effects between the two zones, allowing the Heavy Industrial Zone to provide for heavier activities which have more noise, odour,	Reject	17.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				heavy traffic etc.		
FS1341.23	Hynds Pipe Systems Limited	Support	Null	<p>• This submission supports the industrial strategic growth node along McDonald Road and in particular the importance of appropriate land to enable heavy industrial use. Importantly the submission seeks to protect the location of Heavy Industrial Zone land from encroachment by sensitive activities and proposal for residential rezoning.</p> <p>• Hynds supports the submission as it relates to these matters because it is also concerned that rezoning of land adjacent to the Heavy Industrial land will create reverse sensitivity effects on the existing and proposed industrial business operations.</p> <p>• Ensuring there is no encroachment by sensitive activities on the heavy industrial land is the most appropriate way for the Council to exercise its functions and to ensure the efficiency and effectiveness of the proposed plan provisions.</p>	Reject	17.2
FS1306.26	Hynds Foundation	Support	Support.	Hynds Foundation are supportive of this submitter's amendment to provide for greater distinction and recognition of the two levels of industrial zoning.	Reject	17.2
FS1345.57	Genesis Energy Limited	Support	Accept submission point in part.	For the reasons provided in the Synlait Milk submission and subject to the exact wording of the objective.	Reject	17.2
FS1388.949	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	17.2
581.8	Penny Gallagher for Synlait Milk Ltd	Oppose	Amend Policy 4.6.7 Management of adverse effects within industrial zones to address management of adverse effects through the location of zones (relative to more sensitive environments) and the	Managing effects approach should include the location of the zones. The role of the General Industrial Zone is to provide a buffer between Heavy Industrial Zones and more	Reject	14.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			use of the General Industrial Zone as a buffer.	sensitive zones. This policy approach would in turn enable different standards of management of environmental effects between the two zones, allowing the Heavy Industrial Zone to provide for heavier activities which have more noise, odour, heavy traffic etc.		
FS1341.24	Hynds Pipe Systems Limited	Support	Null	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This submission supports the industrial strategic growth node along McDonald Road and in particular the importance of appropriate land to enable heavy industrial use. Importantly the submission seeks to protect the location of Heavy Industrial Zone land from encroachment by sensitive activities and proposal for residential rezoning. Hynds supports the submission as it relates to these matters because it is also concerned that rezoning of land adjacent to the Heavy Industrial land will create reverse sensitivity effects on the existing and proposed industrial business operations. Ensuring there is no encroachment by sensitive activities on the heavy industrial land is the most appropriate way for the Council to exercise its functions and to ensure the efficiency and effectiveness of the proposed plan provisions. 	Reject	14.2
FS1306.27	Hynds Foundation	Support	Support.	Hynds Foundation support this submission point. The location of light industrial and commercial zoning and land use can result in minimising adverse amenity effects on sensitive uses within an urban environment.	Reject	14.2
FS1377.151	Havelock Village Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	The location of Heavy Industry Zone should take into account surrounding sensitive environments but the use of the General Industrial Zone as a buffer is not always necessary or appropriate.	Accept	14.2
581.9	Penny Gallagher for Synlait Milk Ltd	Oppose	Amend Policy 4.6.7 Management of adverse effects within industrial zones so that "significant" adverse effects from heavy industrial sites are managed and mitigated where practicable but otherwise that adverse effects (that are not significant) should be considered consistent with the environmental outcomes anticipated for heavy industrial activity.	The policy approach for management of adverse effects does not distinguish between general and heavy industrial zones. There needs to be an appropriate zone for Heavy industry which allows heavy industry to produce adverse effects with a more lenient threshold than general industry and general industry should buffer those zones from sensitive activities. There is no policy for protecting heavy industry within Heavy Industrial Zones from encroaching residential and sensitive activities.	Reject	14.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1341.25	Hynds Pipe Systems Limited	Support	Null	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This submission supports the industrial strategic growth node along McDonald Road and in particular the importance of appropriate land to enable heavy industrial use. Importantly the submission seeks to protect the location of Heavy Industrial Zone land from encroachment by sensitive activities and proposal for residential rezoning. Hynds supports the submission as it relates to these matters because it is also concerned that rezoning of land adjacent to the Heavy Industrial land will create reverse sensitivity effects on the existing and proposed industrial business operations. Ensuring there is no encroachment by sensitive activities on the heavy industrial land is the most appropriate way for the Council to exercise its functions and to ensure the efficiency and effectiveness of the proposed plan provisions. 	Reject	14.2
FS1306.28	Hynds Foundation	Support	Support.	Hynds Foundation supports this submission point. The level of effect and whether appropriate needs to be considered against what the Plan provides for in the Heavy Industrial zone. Rules relating to land use and buildings should reflect the type of development that is anticipated within that zone setting a relatively high permitted baseline for adverse effects from Heavy Industry. Careful consideration of siting sensitive uses close to existing and proposed Heavy Industrial Zones would minimise the potential for most adverse effects.	Reject	14.2
633.2	Alan Henderson for Van Den Brink Group	Support	Retain Objective 4.6.1 Economic growth of industry, insofar as it gives effect to the relief sought.	Supports objective to the extent that the property at Whangarata Road retains its industrial zone. The enabling provisions to support economic growth are not reflected in the land use provisions.	Accept	8.2
FS1387.27	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	8.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
633.3	Alan Henderson for Van Den Brink Group	Support	Retain Policy 4.6.2 Provide Industrial Zones with different functions, insofar as it gives effect to the relief sought.	Supports the intention of the policy to enable a range of activities. This policy is not reflected in the land use provisions.	Accept	9.2
FSI387.28	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	9.2
633.4	Alan Henderson for Van Den Brink Group	Support	Retain Policy 4.6.3 Maintain a sufficient supply of industrial land, insofar as it gives effect to the relief sought.	Supports the intention of the policy to enable a sufficient supply of industrial zone land, which includes the rezoning of the land at Whangarata Road. This policy is not reflected in the land use provisions.	Accept	10.2
FSI387.29	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	Reject	10.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
633.5	Alan Henderson for Van Den Brink Group	Support	Retain Policy 4.6.4 Maintain Industrial land for industrial purposes, insofar as it gives effect to the relief sought.	Supports the intention of the policy to enable ancillary activities to industrial activities. This policy is not reflected in the land use provisions.	Accept	11.2
<i>FS1387.30</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>11.2</i>
633.6	Alan Henderson for Van Den Brink Group	Support	Retain Policy 4.6.5 Recognition of industrial activities outside of urban areas, insofar as it gives effect to the relief sought.	Supports the intention of the policy to recognise and provide for existing industrial activities. This policy is not reflected in the land use provisions.	Accept	12.2
<i>FS1387.31</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>12.2</i>
633.7	Alan Henderson for Van Den Brink Group	Support	Retain Objective 4.6.6 Manage adverse effects, insofar as it gives effect to the relief sought.	Supports the intention of the objective to manage adverse effects on sensitive activities in other zones and ecosystems. The provisions are unnecessarily restrictive and	Accept	13.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				could be modified to achieve the same outcome.		
FS1387.32	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	13.2
FS1087.18	Ports of Auckland Limited	Support	Support submission point 633.7.	Ports of Auckland Limited supports the intention of the objective to manage the adverse effects on sensitive activities on other ones and ecosystems.	Accept	13.2
633.8	Alan Henderson for Van Den Brink Group	Support	Retain Policy 4.6.7 Management of adverse effects within industrial zones, insofar as it gives effect to the relief sought.	Supports the intention of the objective to manage adverse effects on sensitive activities in other zones and ecosystems. The provisions are unnecessarily restrictive and could be modified to achieve the same outcome.	Accept in part	14.2
FS1087.19	Ports of Auckland Limited	Support	Support submission point 633.8.	Ports of Auckland Limited supports the intention of the policy to manage the adverse effects of development within the Industrial Zone.	Accept	14.2
717.1	Kim Willetts	Support	Retain Rule 20.2.3.1 P3 Noise - General.	Provides existing residences with a safeguard against excessive noise from nearby industrial zones. Existing houses at Horotiu near the industrial zone do not have noise insulation and therefore need to have their amenity protected.	Accept	40.3.1
790.3	Northgate Developments Ltd & Northgate Industrial Park Ltd	Oppose	Amend Rule 20.2.3.1 P2 Noise General, to revert back to Rule 24B.19 of the Operative Waikato District Plan for the Industrial Zone at Horotiu (Horotiu Industrial Park comprising the following titles: Lot 1 DP 390831 (364687), Lot 18 DP 494347 (723133), Lot 1 DPS 61620 (SA50B/598). Lot 2 DPS 61260 (SA50B/599), Lot 3 DPS 61260 (SA50B/600), Lot 16 DP 494347 (723131), Lot 17	Rule 24B.19 of the Operative District Plan enables noise limits up to 75dBA of noise 24hours per day. Rule 24B.19 requires noise levels to be less when received by other zones. Activities within Industrial zone which are near to other zone boundaries will need to constrain activities to achieve compliance with Rule 24B.19 of the Operative	Accept in part	75.1.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p>494347 (723132), Lot 1 DP 499692 (742155) and Lot 2 DP 499692 (822899); and The certificates of title that have frontage to Gateway Drive, Evolution Drive and Innovation Way.) OR Any further amendments as necessary to support the submission.</p>	<p>District Plan. Centralised Industrial activities are able to make higher noise levels over 24 hours as per Operative District plan Rule 24B.19. Rule 20.2.3.1 -P2 of the Operative District Plan seeks to reduce nighttime noise level limits from 75dB to 55dB between 10pm and 7am. Noise level limit changes may curtail industrial activities who were established because of current 24hour noise standard. Current landowners bought into industrial zoning knowing noise levels higher than other industrial environments. No justification in s32A analysis for noise level reduction limits in Proposed District Plan. It is not considered that 75dB noise level over 24hour period will increase external effects given adjoining zones will still need to comply with lower noise level limits such as the Living Zone. Define Horotiu Industrial Park in PDP and allow for current noise limits as per Rule 24B.19 of the Operative District Plan.</p>		
790.4	Northgate Developments Ltd & Northgate Industrial Park Ltd	Oppose	<p>Amend Rule 20.2.3.1 P3 Noise General, to revert back to Rule 24B.19 of the Operative District Plan for the Industrial Zone at Horotiu (Horotiu Industrial Park comprising the following titles: Lot 1 DP 390831 (364687), Lot 18 DP 494347 (723133), Lot 1 DPS 61620 (SA50B/598). Lot 2 DPS 61260 (SA50B/599), Lot 3 DPS 61260 (SA50B/600), Lot 16 DP 494347 (723131), Lot 17 494347 (723132), Lot 1 DP 499692 (742155) and Lot 2 DP 499692 (822899); and The certificates of title that have frontage to Gateway Drive, Evolution Drive and Innovation Way.) See submission for details of the rule. OR Any further relief or amendments as necessary to support the submission.</p>	<p>Rule 20.2.3.1 P3 requires noise to comply with noise standards in each Zone other than the Industrial Zone. This approach is generally consistent with current Horotiu Industrial Park Rule 24.19.1 (b) and (c). The land adjoining Horotiu Industrial Park is proposed to adjoin Rural or Residential land. The Proposed District Plan will introduce new noise levels between 7pm and 10pm. The Operative District Plan has continuous noise standard from 7am to 10pm, which drops after 7pm. The Proposed District Plan reduces day time noise from 55dBA (L10) to 50dB (LAeq) and introduces a 40dB (LAeq) noise level for activities between 10pm and 7am. The change may curtail Industrial activities established because of Horotiu Industrial Park or due to noise levels permitted at adjoining sites. Request Horotiu Industrial Park be defined in Proposed District Plan with noise standards for adjoining sites being consistent with current Rule 24B.19 (b)</p>	Accept in part	75.1.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				and (c) of the ODP.		
790.5	Northgate Developments Ltd & Northgate Industrial Park Ltd	Oppose	Delete Rule 20.2.5.1 P1 (a)(vi) Earthworks - General, or any further amendments. OR Any relief as necessary to support the submission.	It is likely earthworks undertaken within 1.5m of boundaries. Buildings can be built up to the boundary in Industrial Zone resulting in automatic resource consents required for earthworks even if volume and area are met in clauses (a)(ii) and (iii). It is unclear what environmental effect is proposed to be controlled as clause (a)(v) seeks to ensure appropriate fall is achieved. i.e. 1 vertical to 2 horizontal. This clause addresses stability issues for adjoining properties. The inclusion of this provision will have the consequence of requiring resource consents creating a time and cost disadvantage to landowners/developers.	Accept	75.2.1
790.6	Northgate Developments Ltd & Northgate Industrial Park Ltd	Oppose	Delete reference to "residential purposes" in Rule 20.2.5.1 P3 Earthworks - General OR Any further amendments or relief as necessary to support the submission.	Clause (a) of Rule 20.2.5.1 - P3 states that "earthworks for purposes other than creating a building platform for residential purposes within the site...". but these are not residential purposes proposed for Industrial Zone. Reference to residential activities in Industrial Zone not considered appropriate, should be amended to refer to either 'development' or 'industrial land uses'.	Accept	75.2.1
790.7	Northgate Developments Ltd & Northgate Industrial Park Ltd	Oppose	Amend Rule 20.2.7.1 P2(c)(i) Signs - General, to permit larger signage as site size increases OR Any further amendments or relief as necessary to support the submission.	Provision does not take into consideration site size and imposes a one size fits all rule. Acknowledge the purpose to avoid proliferation of signage while maintaining suitable visual, streetscape and amenity effects. Provision should enable increased signage as permitted activity when site size increases. Rule 20.4.1 of the PDP requires 1000m2 minimum for Industrial Subdivision. It would then follow that a site twice as large could have 6m2 signage for sites 2000m2 in size. This would not result in an unreasonable adverse effect when baseline is 3m2 per 1000m2. It is requested that the provision be amended to incrementally increase allowable signage on site as size of site	Reject	75.3.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				increases. Would enable larger sites with larger buildings to have signage that reflects the size of activities.		
790.8	Northgate Developments Ltd & Northgate Industrial Park Ltd	Oppose	Add a clause to Rule 20.3.1 - P1 Building height that enables building height within Horotiu Industrial Park to be consistent with that provided for in Rule 24B.22 of the Operative District Plan. Horotiu Industrial Park comprises the following titles: Lot 1 DP 390831 (364687), Lot 18 DP 494347 (723133), Lot 1 DPS 61620 (SA50B/598). Lot 2 DPS 61260 (SA50B/599), Lot 3 DPS 61260 (SA50B/600), Lot 16 DP 494347 (723131), Lot 17 494347 (723132), Lot 1 DP 499692 (742155) and Lot 2 DP 499692 (822899). OR Any further amendments or relief as necessary to support the submission.	Northgate Developments Ltd and Northgate Industrial Park owns significant portion of land within Horotiu Industrial Park located west of Great South Road and south of Horotiu Road, Horotiu. Northgate developed Northgate Business Park that has access via Gateway Drive, Evolution Drive and Innovation Way. Land remaining Industrially zoned under PDP. Horotiu Industrial Park zoning and framework established as a result of an appeal to the previous Waikato District Plan. Consent order agreement enforced by Environment Court. Horotiu Industrial Park provisions provided as a permitted activity in Chapter 24B of the ODP subject to timing of land release, scale of activities and management of potential effects. Provisions provide Industrial development as Permitted activity given compliance with performance standards that govern timing land release, scale of activities and management of potential external effects such as noise, bulk, height, setbacks, landscaping and traffic. Rule 20.3.1 -P3 of PDP specifies 15m maximum building height. Rule differs from provisions for Horotiu Industrial Park as per Rule 24B.22 of the ODP which enables/restricts development to; 25m maximum height when located over 400m from Horotiu Road provided 15m maximum height for 15% of site for Stages 1, 2, 3A and 3B, and up to 15m or 10m when located within 50m of Horotiu Road or within 50m of Stage 3C boundaries as per Rule 24B.22.1(a) of the ODP. Operative provisions demonstrate the closer development to external boundaries of Horotiu Industrial Park the more stringent height is. Buildings 15-25m can be accommodated within Horotiu Industrial Park. Rule changes may curtail Industrial activities in Horotiu Industrial Park which	Accept in part	75.5.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				have been bought due to higher height limits. All current landowners bought sites knowing height requirements. Consistent with amenity values for area. Requested Horotiu Industrial Park be defined in PDP while retaining existing height rules in Rule 24B.22 of the ODP. Northgate would accept further relief/amendments to the PDP to support the Northgate position.		
790.9	Northgate Developments Ltd & Northgate Industrial Park Ltd	Oppose	Delete Rule 20.4.1 RDI (a) (ii) Subdivision General. OR Any further relief or amendments as necessary to support the submission.	Rule 20.4.1 (a) (ii) - RDI imposes an averaging requirement of 2000m ² for subdivision within Industrial Zone being twice the size of minimum net site area enabled by clause (a)(i), reduces development potential. It is unclear the effect of averaging standard trying to achieve when minimum lot size is 1000m ² . If issue was around suitable lot sizes and shapes to accommodate future land uses an alternative approach would be minimum shape factor requirements. The lot size required for Industrial land is based on market demand as land is bought per m ² rate. Purchasers set lot sizes based on what is most cost effective. Industrial subdivision follows sale and purchase agreements. If subdivision standards require double minimum lot size as an average, it will lead to inefficient use of Industrial land.	Accept in part	75.4.1
FS1387.1241	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	75.4.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
798.7	Ngati Te Ata	Neutral/Amend	Amend Objective 4.6.1 Economic growth of industry as follows: The economic growth of the district's industry is supported and strengthened in Industrial zones <u>while maintaining a healthy environment.</u>	No reasons provided.	Reject	8.2
FS1387.1281	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	8.2
804.3	PLB Construction	Neutral/Amend	Add a preamble to Section 4.6 Industrial and Heavy Industrial Zones to refer to rezoning land in the Ohinewai area to Industrial Zone.	The Ohinewai area is undeveloped and largely constrained under the current Country Living Zone provisions. The land surrounding the Ohinewai area has an easy access to SH1 and presents a high potential concerning economic growth for the District. The submitter notes that Council will be discussing a Blueprinting initiative with the local community - in which potential economic enhancements to the Huntly environs (such as Ohinewai) would be relevant. The economic potential for the Ohinewai area should be suitably realised in the Proposed District Plan.	Defer consideration until Hearing 19	5.2
FS1207.17	Ohinewai Area Committee	Oppose	Seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed.	The Ohinewai Community fed back loud and clear in the Blue Print meeting that they do not want Industrial/Heavy Industrial zoning in Ohinewai. At the follow-up meeting to the Blue Print, it was clearly stated that the Blue Print response from the community has a precedence over the submissions made to the District Plan. We expect this to be supported by WDC as they stated. The reasons for this submission not to proceed, other than the community Blue Print feedback, are:	Defer consideration until Hearing 19	5.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p><i>Current Zoning: The Ohinewai Area is largely rural zoned, not Country Living zoned. To change Ohinewai from Rural to Industrial/Heavy Industrial is a huge step and will be impactful to the people, the environs, the infrastructure and the way of life. Because Ohinewai is currently largely under-developed for anything other than Rural or Rural Country Living does not mean to say that it has to be developed as per this submission. There are other areas available which are currently already zoned Industrial and should be explored first. Huntly already has zoned land for Industrial South of Huntly which is not utilised at all. PLB Construction: The Company making this submission are currently sited in Huntly with access to both the future North and South on/off ramps and have 2 established sites there. The owners of the company do not live in Ohinewai and will not have any adverse effects on their lifestyle- they have no vested interest in Ohinewai at all. The company has tried repetitively said they don't want it. The company wishes to have a SH1 facing business for advertising, with easy on/off ramp access which is beneficial only to the company and not to the community. The People of Ohinewai: The denizens of Ohinewai chose to live in this area due to its rural nature- to change it to Industrial is unfair on the occupants. They have expressed their response to proposed Industrial zoning at the Blue Print meeting where Rural Country Living was identified as the preferred option- to keep Ohinewai in line with the lifestyle of places like Tamahere. Because Ohinewai is on the main trunk line and is seen to be desired location for Industrial businesses, this is not the request of the people. The School: There is a school on the main road that PLB Construction wish to locate to- there is already an issue with trucks and traffic going too fast past this school- currently at 70km zone and not been accepted by the Council to change this any lower. We have a fear for the school children, as previously identified to the council, that there may be an impact sooner or later. The increased traffic passed a rural school is not an ideal situation at all as the school uses the Ohinewai Road for their</i></p>		

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>physical activities currently e.g. school runs, bike roads etc. The environment: The property submitted by PBL Construction to move to Industrial is a site that is below the existing water table from the Waikato River. To build this land up to an acceptable height will be a huge impact on the people living here. The concern is also for the impact on the environment- the water table is high along the properties between the Waikato River and the highway- there is a very real concern about run-off and the impact to the Waikato River as the water currently runs to the River, not away from it. Also, the soil on the Western side of the expressway is dominated by thin topsoil over Taupo pumice. This is highly draining, and means stock is well suited for the soils type over winter, as minimal pugging occurs. What does occur, is a water table rise, and this can lead to ponding at specific locations. And like any activity in winter, with a high water table, stock need to be wisely managed. But their assumptions are incorrect about soil type. To bring the land high enough to be developed would have a huge impact onto the community at Ohinewai with the amount of basic land infrastructure work that would need to be done. As mentioned, industrial development west of SH1, is not desired due to risks associated with development of flood risk land. Aesthetics: The community has expressed at the Blue Print meeting that they do not want to have Industrial in Ohinewai with the image in Ohinewai being Industrial buildings down the SH- the Rural or Rural Country Living has been identified repetitively by the people during the Blue Print meetings as the impression the community want to have. Industrial does not align with that statement as given by the community. Therefore OAC does not support any of this submission and request that the land change request is turned down.</p>		
FS1145.11	Ohinewai Area Committee	Oppose	The Ohinewai Community fed back loud and clearly in the Blue Print meeting that they do not want industrial/heavy industrial zoning in Ohinewai. At the follow-up meeting to the Blue Print, it was clearly stated that the Blue Print response from the		Defer consideration until Hearing 19	5.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p>community has a precedence over the submissions made to the District Plan. We expect this to be supported by WDC as they stated. The reasons for this submission not to proceed, other than the community Blue Print feedback, are: Current Zoning: The Ohinewai Area is largely rural zoned, not Country Living Zoned. To change Ohinewai from Rural to Industrial/Heavy Industrial is a huge step and will be impactful to the people, the environs, the infrastructure and the way of life. Because Ohinewai is currently largely under-developed for anything other than Rural or Rural Country Living does not mean to say that it has to be developed as per this submission. There are other areas available which are currently already zoned Industrial and should be explored first. Huntly already has zoned land for Industrial South of Huntly which is not utilised at all. PLB Construction: The Company making this submission are currently sited in Huntly with access to both the future North and South on/off ramps and have 2 established sites there. The owners of the company do not live in Ohinewai and will not have any adverse effects on their lifestyle - they have no vested interest in Ohinewai at all. The company has tried repetitively to have this area re-zoned Industrial/heavy industrial and the community have repetitively said they don't want it. The company wishes to have a SH1 facing business for advertising, with easy on/off ramp access which is beneficial only to the company and not to the community. The People of Ohinewai: The denizens of Ohinewai chose to live in this area due to its rural nature - to change it to Industrial is unfair on the occupants. They have expressed their response to proposed industrial zoning at the Blue Print meeting where Rural Country Living was identified as the preferred option - to keep Ohinewai in line with the lifestyle of places like Tamahere. Because Ohinewai is on the main trunk line and is seen to be desired location for industrial businesses, this is not the request of the people. The School: There is a school on the main road that PLB Construction wish to locate to - there is already an issue with trucks and traffic going too fast past this school - currently at a 70 k/h zone and not been accepted by the Council to change this any lower. We have a fear for the school children, as previously identified to the council, that there may be an impact</p>			

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p>sooner or later. The increased traffic passed a rural school is not an ideal situation at all as the school uses the Ohinewai Road for their physical activities currently e.g. school runs, bike roads, etc. The Environment: The property submitted by PBL Construction to move to Industrial is a site that is below the existing water table from the Waikato River. To build this land up to an acceptable height will be a huge impact on the people living there. The concern is also for the impact on the environment - the water table is high along the properties between the Waikato River and the Highway - there is a very real concern about run-off and impact to the Waikato River as the water currently runs to the River, not away from it. Also, the soil on the Western side of the express way is dominated by thin topsoil over Taupo pumice. This is highly draining, and means stock is well suited for the soil type over winter, as minimal pugging occurs. What does occur, is a water table rise, and this can lead to ponding at specific locations. And like any activity in winter, with a high water table, stock need to be wisely managed. But their assumptions are incorrect about soil type. To bring the land high enough to be developed would have a huge impact onto the community of Ohinewai with the amount of basic land infrastructure work that would need to be done. As mentioned, industrial development west of SH1, is not desired due to risks associated with development of flood risk land. Aesthetics: The community has expressed at the Blue Print meeting that they do not want to have industrial in Ohinewai with the image in Ohinewai being Industrial buildings down the SH - the Rural or Rural Country Living has been identified repetitively by the people during the Blue Print meetings as the impression the community want to have. Industrial does not align with that statement as given by the Community. Therefore OAC does not support any of this submission and request that the land change request is turned down.</p>			
FS1387.1296	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.	Defer consideration until Hearing 19	5.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				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.		
FS1202.55	New Zealand Transport Agency	Oppose	Oppose submission point 804.3.	The Transport Agency is a partner to the Future Proof Growth Strategy and supports its appropriate incorporation into the Plan. The area proposed for future urbanisation is inconsistent with the approved settlement pattern for the Future Proof sub-region. Any review of the sub-regional settlement pattern is best undertaken in collaboration with other wider forums such as the Future Proof growth partnership.	Defer consideration until Hearing 19	5.2
821.6	The Poultry Industry Association of New Zealand; I Brinks NZ Chicken; The Egg Producers Federation of on behalf of	Neutral/Amend	Add to Chapter 4.6 Industrial and Heavy Industrial Zones, a separate policy for poultry hatcheries as follows: <u>To enable poultry hatchery operations to be located where the anticipated effects are consistent with the underlying zone.</u>	Include a separate policy for poultry hatcheries in the Industrial Zone chapter.	Reject	7.2
FS1265.1	Mainland Poultry Limited	Support	Allow the submission point, which seeks the addition of a policy in section 4.6 which provides for poultry hatchery operations.	Support the intent of the submission to allow for poultry hatcheries in the Industrial Zone as well as the Rural Zone given that the effects associated with a hatchery is compatible with the Industrial Zone.	Reject	7.2
823.9	NZTE Operations Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 20.3.3 - Height - Buildings, structures and vegetation within an airport obstacle limitation surface as follows: PI Any building, structure, <u>tree</u> or <u>other</u> vegetation must not protrude through an airport obstacle limitation surface as shown on the planning maps. NCI Any building, structure, <u>tree</u> or <u>other</u> vegetation that does not comply with Rule 20.3.3. PI AND Amend the Proposed District Plan for any consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	The OLS (as notified) is necessary to ensure compliance with Civil Aviation Circular AC139-7 Aerodrome Standards and Requirements for Code I aerodromes operating on a VFR and an IFR (non-air transport) basis. The extent of the OLS is described in Chapter 29 - Appendix 9. Rules are also provided in the PWDP to protect the OLS from being breached by buildings, structures and vegetation. Although Rule 27.3.1 as notified correctly protects the proposed OLS from buildings, structures, trees and other vegetation, the corresponding height rules in other zones omits reference to 'trees'. It is critical that there is consistency amongst OLS provisions and that the provisions control 'trees' as well	Reject	29.1.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				as buildings, structures and other vegetation. It is proposed that the relevant rules in each chapter are amended to align with the (correct) wording in Chapter 27, Rule 27.3.1.		
FS1178.9	Kristine Stead on behalf of Marshall & Kristine Stead, Lloyd Davis, Kylie Davis Strongwick, Jason Strongwick, Nicola and Kerry Thompson.	Oppose	To be disallowed.	The proposed changes are severely impinging our rights to facilitate our development to its full potential whilst we have placed no restrictions on them. It's costly to move the runway to the south and bring noise control onto their property they are there for using our properties to achieve their proposed requirements when their property is able to contain the noise boundaries. Collectively we own approximately 750m along the airfields northern boundary. We are directly next to the actual airstrip in Te Kowhai where the new owners are proposing to expand their operations to include Instrument Flight Rules (IFR) and all that accompanying changes that come with it should it go ahead. Our submission considerations last October were based on the report from the acoustic specialist Hegley that was in the original proposed plan of NZTE with consultation based and discussed on their report. NZTE presented another proposal from Marshall Day acoustics which was dated 8/10/18 but not presented until mid January 2019, which have a damning effect over our property. They have entered this information by means of submitting on their plans which is where we are opposing this submission. We are especially concerned with the implications of this over our and neighbouring properties which would require building on land not owned by them to make us have to apply for Resource consents to build and do not think we should have to. All for their business venture.	Accept	29.1.2
FS1253.16	Waikato Regional Airport Ltd	Support	Seek that the whole part of this submission be allowed. Changes should also be made to the rule so that Section E, Designation N- Hamilton Airport is referenced, as provided for in the Residential and Business Zones.	The additional wording makes it clearer to the reader what applies to this rule.	Reject	29.1.2
829.3	Whenua Holdings Waikato Limited	Support	Retain the proposed structure and approach of Chapter 20 Industrial Zone; AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any consequential amendments to address the matters raised in the submission.	An Industrial Zone is proposed for the Wallbank Road property where a SIP home manufacturing and fabricating factory will be constructed. The submitter supports the activity-based structure for the Industrial Zone chapter.	Accept	36.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1105.1	Raewyn Williams	Oppose	Totally disallowed. All parts.	Extra traffic on road. Safety of pedestrians and animals. Noise pollution. Spoiling our environment.	Defer consideration until rezoning hearings in 2020	36.2
FS1099.2	Gregory Philip and Barabara Wiechern	Oppose	Seek that the whole submission is disallowed.	Having a 40ha Industrial zone in the middle of Residential and Country Living Zone doesn't make sense.	Defer consideration until rezoning hearings in 2020	36.2
FS1096.2	Ian Jospeh Robson and Sandra Joan Robson	Oppose	Seek for the submission to be disallowed.	Increase in traffic. Increase in noise. Taking away Rural Dairy land. Increase in air pollution. Taking away nature of birds. Fumes/Smell from manufacture. We agreed with the further submission from D.Derecourt and G.Kelly and Wellers. Group reasons: Waste/spills into waterways. Protect Nature bird species. Hakarimata Walkway- industry in front will visually impair enjoyment of the mountains. Light pollution at night. Increased traffic on narrow rural road. Country living view polluted by industrial buildings. Potential noise pollution. Would detract from beautiful country living. Increase flow of traffic to Old Taupiri Road or Galbraith Road.	Defer consideration until rezoning hearings in 2020	36.2
FS1100.2	Margaret Lindsay Mitchell	Oppose	Seek that the whole of the submission to be disallowed.	With the recent changes in the speed limit I have felt safer to bicycle on the road with my son. If the proposed development was to proceed, the increase in traffic on our road would stop me from doing this. Industrial zones can be busy day and night. This will impact on the country living experience of being a resident on Old Taupiri Road. Detracting from our unique lifestyle. Concerns for the potential pollution that increases in traffic, noise and generally condensed commercial buildings can generate. We chose to move here because of the beautiful location and connection with the river. Industrial zoning would completely destroy this experience.	Defer consideration until rezoning hearings in 2020	36.2
FS1094.2	Dorothy Derecourt and David Mckeown	Oppose	Seek that the whole of the submission in regard to the Wallbank Road Farm Industrial rezoning be disallowed.	Need clear buffers between zones- Chapter 20: Industrial Zone The distance from Industry to nearest residential areas- 3 metre wide landscape strip is not enough. Sensitive land buffers- The boundary between wastewater treatments and industry should be the same consideration as that which residential areas have to comply/observe when in close proximity to wastewater treatment plant (i.e. 300 metre buffer zone, and if closer, than 300 metre distance, needing to sign "no	Defer consideration until rezoning hearings in 2020	36.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				complaints covenants"). Close proximity to waterways- (ponds/streams) from Wastewater treatment plant. Height of Industrial buildings- Consideration to be given to height of any industrial structures/buildings. Waste management (Hazardous waste)- close proximity to residential areas, and next to streams and waterways. Also affecting wildlife in the area (birds), and cattle grazing nearby. Noise pollution- Construction noise. Air pollution (affecting neighbouring residences health) Effects on Traffic- Entrance/exit way for industry are limited. Concerns for traffic/road safety. Wall bank Road railway crossing- Tranzrail likely to object to further traffic over the Wallbank Road railway crossing (which is a raised crossing with no warning bells or barrier arms). Galbraith street access- narrow lane with a number of residences, entrance to Old Taupiri Road straight next to railway crossing and busy intersection at Bridge over Waikato River. Old Taupiri Road access (back of Wallbank Road farm location), a concentrated number of residences in close proximity to where entrance/exit ways may be. Northern traffic site lines at that exit/entrance way may be limited. Either entrance/exit way either end of Old Taupiri Road would be difficult for large trucks/trucks for home removal, to cross intersection.		
FS1103.1	Kevin Desmond Mattson	Oppose	Seek that the whole of the submission in regard to the Wallbank Road Farm Industrial Rezoning be disallowed.	Buffer zones between Industrial and Residential are not enough. Too close to water treatment plant. Streams and creeks potentially will be subject to pollution from Industrial area with flow into Waikato River. Visual pollution for current residents in the vicinity. Light pollution at night. Air pollution. Environmental impact on native bird life. Increased traffic on narrow rural road. Would detract from beautiful country living. Reduce potential farming support to dairy industry. Lower current property values in the area. Hakarimata walkway industry in front will visually impair. Potential noise pollution close to residents.	Defer consideration until rezoning hearings in 2020	36.2
FS1101.1	Christine McNeill	Support	Seek that the part of submission 829 relating to the rezoning of rural land to industrial be disallowed.	I wish to oppose the submission from Whenua Holdings to rezone 40 hectares of rural land at Wallbank Road into industrial. Industry in this	Defer consideration until rezoning hearings in 2020	36.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				area is not in keeping with the aesthetics of the area, nor would the current roads be able to accommodate such a proposal.		
FS1102.2	Eric and Vickie Finlay	Oppose	Seek that the whole of the submission rezoning be disallowed.	Increase of traffic on rural roads and larger vehicles. Damage to waterways by any runoff. Already pressure on sewerage systems and septic ponds. Interfere with quiet of country living. Other industrial parks already available. Unsightly view of industrial buildings.	Defer consideration until rezoning hearings in 2020	36.2
FS1387.1334	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.	Defer consideration until rezoning hearings in 2020	36.2
FS1104.1	Greg and Natalie Kelly	Oppose	Oppose the submission by Whenua Holdings Waikato Limited submitter 839. Submission point 829.3 Chapter 20 Industrial Zone. We seek that the whole of the submission in regard to the Wallbank Road Farm Industrial rezoning be disallowed.	We have lived on our property for 60 years and we enjoy the rural outlook towards the north, the wildlife that comes from the Hakarimata Ranges and the associated land around the Effluent Treatment Plant. The proposal will create noise pollution, air pollution, light and view associated with our current country living classification. Access to the proposed Industrial State would cause extra load on Galbraith, Old Taupiri Road and the Wallbank Crossing of the main trunk line. As part of the current country living zone we are currently using the road for recreational walking and biking and from our location there is no footpaths which would be a necessity if zoning is changed to industrial. Traffic currently is heavy but with the increased demand on the roadway this will make Old Taupiri Road unsafe for the recreational user. We currently live on the north western side of Wallbank and Old Taupiri Road and if Wallbank Road is opened from the Old Taupiri Road end this would be within the	Defer consideration until rezoning hearings in 2020	36.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>current country living area. We are currently life style farmers with beef stock and feel with the introduction of industry this would impede our total environment as mentioned above of noise, air pollution, water ways pollution, bird life that is abundant on our farm, e.g. tuis, pukeko, rosellas, plubbers, stilts, ducks and geese, magpies, pheasants all are seen frequently on our lifestyle block. With the increase of vehicles and industrial buildings to our are this would all sadly diminish. With the close proximity of industrial land at Horotiu and a proposal for Taupiri and Ohinewai we feel there is adequate commercial zoning that can be used.</p>		
FS1106.1	Greg and Shirley Weller	Oppose	Seek that the whole of the submission in regard to the Wallbank Road Farm Industrial rezoning be disallowed.	<p>Need clear buffers between zones- Chapter 20: Industrial Zone. The distance from Industry to nearest residential areas- 3 metre wide landscape strip is not enough. Sensitive land buffers- The boundary between wastewater treatment and industry should be the same consideration as that which residential have to comply/observe when in close proximity to wastewater treatment plant (i.e. 300m buffer zone, and it closer, than 300m distance, needing to sign "no complaints covenants"). Close proximity to waterways (ponds streams)- from Wastewater treatment plant. Height of Industrial buildings- Consideration to be given to height of any industrial structures/buildings. Waste management (Hazardous waste)- close proximity to residential areas, and next to streams and waterways. Also affecting wildlife in the area (birds), and cattle grazing nearby. Noise pollution- Construction noise. Air pollution (affecting neighbouring residences health). Effects on traffic- Entrance/exit way for industry are limited. Concerns for traffic/road safety. Wallbank Road railway crossing- Tranzrail likely to object to further traffic over the Wallbank Road railway crossing (which is a raised crossing with no warning bells or barrier arms). Galbraith street access- narrow land with a number of residences, entrance to Old Taupiri Road straight next to railway crossing and busy intersection at Bridge over Waikato River. Old Taupiri Road access (back of Wallbank Road</p>	Defer consideration until rezoning hearings in 2020	36.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>farm location), a concentrated number of residences in close proximity to where entrance/exit ways may be. Northern traffic site lines at that exit/entrance way may be limited. Either entrance/exit way either end of Old Taupiri Road would be difficult for large trucks/trucks for home removal, to cross intersection. Group reasons: Waste/spills into waterways. Protect Nature bird species. Hakarimata Walkway- industry in front will visually impair enjoyment of the mountains. Light pollution at night. Increased traffic on narrow rural road. Country living view polluted by industrial buildings. Potential noise pollution. Would detract from beautiful country living. Increase flow of traffic to Old Taupiri Road or Galbraith Road. Industrial area nearby e.g. Horotiu/Huntly. Reduce potential farming support to dairy industry.</p>		
833.9	Phil Page on behalf of Mainland Poultry Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Section 4.6 Industrial and Heavy Industrial Zone to provide for poultry farming where it can meet the performance standards.	Poultry farming does not result in adverse effects on soils or in contamination of soils or water and is therefore more consistent with the policies and objectives of the Proposed District Plan and the Regional Policy Statement, than other intensive farming and many permitted farming activities.	Reject	7.2
FSI387.1359	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	7.2
182.12	Kirriemuir Trustee Limited	Support	Retain Objective 4.6.6 Manage adverse effects, as notified.	Industrial activities are required to manage effects in accordance with Regional and District Plan provisions and any relevant resource consents.	Accept	13.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
299.12	2SEN Limited and Tuakau Estates Limited	Not Stated	Retain Rule 21.2.3.1 P3 Noise - General as notified.	It ensures that effects of Industrial zones on adjoining sites are appropriately managed.	Accept	54.3
299.13	2SEN Limited and Tuakau Estates Limited	Not Stated	Retain Rule 21.2.3.1 P4 Noise - General as notified.	It ensures that effects of Industrial zones on adjoining sites are appropriately managed.	Accept	54.3
299.19	2SEN Limited and Tuakau Estates Limited	Support	Retain Rule 21.2.3.1 P2 Noise - General as notified.	It ensures that effects of Industrial zones on adjoining sites are appropriately managed.	Accept	54.3
302.10	Jeremy Talbot for Barker & Associates Limited on behalf of EnviroWaste New Zealand Limited	Support	Retain Rule 20.2.3 Noise as notified.	The control is appropriate in managing effects between zones.	Accept	23.2.1
302.11	Jeremy Talbot for Barker & Associates Limited on behalf of EnviroWaste New Zealand Limited	Neutral/Amend	Add an exclusion to Rule 20.2.4 Glare and Artificial Light Spill so that it does not apply between sites in the Industrial Zones. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential amendments or additional amendments to address the matters raised in the submission.	These rules should only apply to sites adjoining a residential, reserve or countryside living zone (similar to the landscape screening and lower noise limits) and should not be applicable between Industrial sites.	Accept	24.1.2
302.12	Jeremy Talbot for Barker & Associates Limited on behalf of EnviroWaste New Zealand Limited	Support	Retain Rule 20.2.5.1 Earthworks - General as notified.	The control is appropriate in managing effects.	Accept in part	25.3.1
302.13	Jeremy Talbot for Barker & Associates Limited on behalf of EnviroWaste New Zealand Limited	Oppose	Add clarification to Rule 20.2.7.1 P2 (a) Signs - General that it applies to freestanding signs only. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential amendments or additional amendments to address the matters raised in the submission.	There is no valid reason to restrict signage of buildings.	Reject	25.2.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1323.85	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	That the amendment sought is 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.	Accept	25.2.1
302.14	Jeremy Talbot for Barker & Associates Limited on behalf of EnviroWaste New Zealand Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 20.2.7.1 P2 Signs - General to increase rules to 10m2 per site as a minimum. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential amendments or additional amendments to address the matters raised in the submission.	The signage rules are unnecessarily restrictive in terms of freestanding sign size being limited to one sign per site at 3m2. This does not take into account the use of a site for more than one activity and combined with the allowance for all other signs to be 1m2 would create more visual clutter than allowing a larger free standing in the first instance.	Reject	26.2.1
FS1323.86	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	That the amendment sought is 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.	Accept	26.2.1
302.15	Jeremy Talbot for Barker & Associates Limited on behalf of EnviroWaste New Zealand Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 20.2.7.2 Signs - Effects on traffic to specify that it does not apply to site identification signs. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential amendments or additional amendments to address the matters raised in the submission.	It is unclear what is meant by "any sign directed at road users" - arguably any sign for identification of a business could be deemed to be directed at road user - however effects associated with identification signs are already managed by Rule 20.2.7.1.	Reject	26.3.1
302.16	Jeremy Talbot for Barker & Associates Limited on behalf of EnviroWaste New Zealand Limited	Oppose	Delete Rule 20.2.8(iv) Outdoor storage of goods or materials. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential amendments or additional amendments to address the matters raised in the submission.	The submitter opposes any restriction on the percentage of the site allowable for storage use and this should be deleted, as storage activities are permitted. Any visual effects associated with outdoor storage are already mitigated by the maximum height, setback and screening requirements contained in this rule.	Accept	27.1.2
FS1353.17	Tuakau Proteins Limited	Support	Null	TPL agree with the submission on EnviroWaste NZ Ltd that opposes any restriction on the percentage of the site allowable for storage use and this should be deleted, as storage activities are permitted. Any visual effects associated with outdoor storage are already mitigated by the maximum height, setback and screening requirements contained in this rule.	Accept	27.1.2
FS1134.71	Counties Power Limited	Support	Seeks that the submission point be allowed.	Any restriction on the percentage of the site allowable for storage uses should be deleted, as storage activities are permitted.	Accept	27.1.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
302.17	Jeremy Talbot for Barker & Associates Limited on behalf of EnviroWaste New Zealand Limited	Support	Retain the 15m maximum height in Rule 20.3.1 Building height OR Amend Rule 20.3.1 Building height to increase the maximum height of 15m. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential amendments or additional amendments to address the matters raised in the submission.	A height of 15m is similar to that which has already started to develop/establish in the Pokeno Light Industrial 2 Zone, and there is no reason for this height to decrease. The submitter would support an increase in height.	Accept in part	28.2.1
302.18	Jeremy Talbot for Barker & Associates Limited on behalf of EnviroWaste New Zealand Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 20.3.3 Daylight admission to increase height from 2.5m to 3m. AND Amend Rule 20.3.3 Daylight Admission to specifically exclude roads from any daylight admission plane. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential amendments or additional amendments to address the matters raised in the submission.	There is no justification to reduce the height to boundary recession plane, to a height that is lower than the previous Franklin provisions when the maximum heights have been kept the same. There is no reason to apply a daylight recession plane against roads in the Industrial Zones as these areas are generally of a lower amenity and less have pedestrian traffic, therefore there is no reason to apply a daylight restriction against the road network.	Accept	30.1.2
302.19	Jeremy Talbot for Barker & Associates Limited on behalf of EnviroWaste New Zealand Limited	Support	Retain Rule 20.3.4.1 Building setback which requires a maximum front yard setback of 5m (which should not be increased).	A front yard setback of 5m is similar to that which has already started to develop/establish in the Pokeno Light Industrial 2 Zone, and there is no reason for setback to be increased. The submitter would support a decrease in setback.	Accept	31.3.1
302.20	Jeremy Talbot for Barker & Associates Limited on behalf of EnviroWaste New Zealand Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 20.3.4.1 (a)(ii) Building setbacks to not apply to boundaries of other industrial zone sites AND Amend Rule 20.3.4.1 (a)(ii) Building setbacks to reduce setback between sites with other zones from 7.5m to 3m. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential amendments or additional amendments to address the matters raised in the submission.	There is no justification to increase the yard setbacks between the Industrial Zones and other zones to 7.5m, when the previous Franklin provisions were more permissive. The 3m landscape buffer is sufficient, and there is no reason to have an additional 4.5m of building setback. The submitter supports the provisions for side yards to apply only to zones other than the Industrial and Heavy Industrial Zones - this is also backed up with the daylight provisions that also do not apply to adjoining industrial zoned	Reject	31.3.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				sites.		
FSI134.75	Counties Power Limited	Support	Seeks that the submission point be allowed.	There is no justification to increase the yard setbacks between industrial and other zones to 7.5m and the current proposed rule is acceptable.	Accept	31.3.1
302.21	Jeremy Talbot for Barker & Associates Limited on behalf of EnviroWaste New Zealand Limited	Support	Retain in Rule 20.4.1(a) Subdivision - General the minimum lot size of 1000m2 and average of 2000m2.	The proposed lot sizes are an efficient use of land for industrial activities. The submitter would also support a decrease in minimum area and average.	Accept	33.3.1
FSI386.342	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	33.3.1
302.22	Jeremy Talbot for Barker & Associates Limited on behalf of EnviroWaste New Zealand Limited	Oppose	Delete Rule 20.4.1 RDI (a) (iii) Subdivision - General. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential amendments or additional amendments to address the matters raised in the submission.	The 20% restriction on rear sites creation results in inefficiencies of land resources (which are already scarce), as it will significantly reduce the amount of land available for industrial activities (and other similar uses). These types of areas are generally of a "lower amenity" than town centre or residential areas, and subject to less (if any) pedestrian thoroughfare, there is no reason to restrict the number of rear lots created via subdivision.	Accept	33.3.1
FSI386.343	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	Reject	33.3.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
302.33	Jeremy Talbot for Barker & Associates Limited on behalf of EnviroWaste New Zealand Limited	Support	Retain Rule 4.6.2 Provide Industrial Zones with different functions insofar as it gives effect to the relief sought.	The submitter supports the intention of the policy to enable a range of activities; however, this is not reflected in the Land Use provisions.	Accept	9.2
FS1386.349	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	9.2
FS1353.4	Tuakau Proteins Limited	Support	Allow	TLA Support submission of EnviroWaste Supporting the intention of the policy to enable a range of activities; however, this is not reflected in the Land Use provisions.	Accept	9.2
302.35	Jeremy Talbot for Barker & Associates Limited on behalf of EnviroWaste New Zealand Limited	Support	Retain Rule 4.6.4 Maintain industrial land for industrial purposes insofar as it gives effect to the relief sought.	The submitter supports the intention of the policy to enable ancillary activities related to industrial activities; however, this is not reflected in the Land Use provisions.	Accept	11.2
FS1386.351	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	Reject	11.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
302.37	Jeremy Talbot for Barker & Associates Limited on behalf of EnviroWaste New Zealand Limited	Neutral/Amend	Retain the intent of Objective 4.6.6 Manage adverse effects insofar as it gives effect to the relief sought.	The submitter supports the intention of this objective to manage adverse effects on sensitive activities in other zones and ecosystems; however, the provisions are unnecessarily restrictive and could be modified as per the submitter's relief to achieve the same outcome.	Accept	13.2
302.38	Jeremy Talbot for Barker & Associates Limited on behalf of EnviroWaste New Zealand Limited	Neutral/Amend	Retain the intent of Policy 4.6.7 Management of adverse effects within industrial zones insofar as it gives effect to the relief sought.	The submitter supports the intention of this objective to manage adverse effects on sensitive activities in other zones and ecosystems; however, the provisions are unnecessarily restrictive and could be modified as per the submitter's relief to achieve the same outcome.	Accept in part	14.2
302.50	Jeremy Talbot for Barker & Associates Limited on behalf of EnviroWaste New Zealand Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend the Land Use provisions in Chapter 20 Industrial Zone to reflect the intentions of Policy 4.6.2 Provide Industrial Zones with different functions, Policy 4.6.4 Maintain industrial land for industrial purposes and Policy 4.6.5 Recognition of industrial activities outside of urban areas. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential amendments or additional amendments to address the matters raised in the submission.	The enabling of range of activities, ancillary activities, and existing industrial activities are not reflected in the land use provisions.	Accept	19.1.2
FS1386.357	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	Reject	19.1.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
302.51	Jeremy Talbot for Barker & Associates Limited on behalf of EnviroWaste New Zealand Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend the Land Use provisions in Chapter 21 Industrial Zone Heavy to reflect the intentions of Policy 4.6.2 Provide Industrial Zones with different functions, Policy 4.6.4 Maintain industrial land for industrial purposes as proposed and Policy 4.6.5 Recognition of industrial activities outside of urban areas. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential amendments or additional amendments to address the matters raised in the submission.	The enabling of range of activities, ancillary activities, and existing industrial activities are not reflected in the land use provisions.	Accept in part	37.2
<i>FS1386.358</i>	<i>Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C</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 in part</i>	<i>37.2</i>
367.25	Liam McGrath for Mercer Residents and Ratepayers Committee	Support	Retain Rule 20.2.2 Landscape planting.	No reasons provided.	Accept	22.1.2
367.26	Liam McGrath for Mercer Residents and Ratepayers Committee	Support	Retain Rule 20.2.1 Servicing and hours of operation.	No reasons provided.	Reject	52.3
367.27	Liam McGrath for Mercer Residents and Ratepayers Committee	Support	Retain Rule 21.2.2 Landscape planting.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	53.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
378.59	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Retain Policy 4.6.4 Maintain industrial land for industrial purposes, to the extent that it anticipates ancillary non-industrial activities in the Industrial Zone AND Add new clause (b) to Policy 4.6.4 Maintain industrial land for industrial purposes, as follows: <u>(b) Enable emergency services facilities that provide for the health, safety and well-being of the community and that service or support and identified local need.</u> 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 4.6.4 to the extent that the provision anticipates ancillary non-industrial activities in the Industrial 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-industrial activities in the Industrial Zones. 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 better achieve the purpose of the RMA by providing for the health and safety of people and communities.	Accept in part	11.2
FS1388.48	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept in part	11.2
FS1035.166	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	11.2
405.64	Counties Power Limited	Neutral/Amend	Add a matter of discretion to Rule 20.4.1 RDI(b) Subdivision - General as follows: <u>The subdivision layout and design in regard to how this may impact on the operation, maintenance, upgrading and development of existing infrastructure assets;</u>	To prevent assets becoming landlocked. Similar to Transpower rules.	Accept	33.3.1
405.65	Counties Power Limited	Neutral/Amend	Add a matter of discretion to Rule 21.4.1 RDI(b) Subdivision - General as follows: <u>The subdivision layout and design in regard to how this may impact on the operation, maintenance, upgrading and</u>	To prevent assets becoming landlocked. Similar to Transpower rules.	Accept	69.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<u>development of existing infrastructure assets;</u>			
405.88	Counties Power Limited	Not Stated	Add rules to limit the height of amenity planting in the front yard in Rural and Industrial zones to prevent potential interference with installation of overhead lines.	There are landscaping conditions that have been part of the consent process that may interfere with the construction or maintenance of infrastructure. Any front yard landscaping conditions should need to consider existing and future infrastructure that is in the road reserve.	Reject	22.1.2
465.11	Buckland Marine Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 20.4.1 RDI Subdivision - General, to allow for the creation of smaller industrial lot sizes to cater for smaller industrial operations.	An average lot size of 2000m ² with a minimum net site area of 1000m ² is too stringent. There are opportunities for smaller industrial activities to operate within the Industrial Zone and these lot sizes will exclude some suitable activities from relocating to this zone.	Accept in part	33.3.1
FS1388.397	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Accept in part	33.3.1
465.12	Buckland Marine Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 20.4.3 RDI (a) Road Frontage, to reduce the road frontage requirements from 15m to 10m.	The submitter supports the inclusion of a road frontage provision but considers that road frontage is an important aspect for some businesses within the Industrial Zone and considers that 15m is too wide.	Reject	33.6.1
FS1326.9	Holcim (New Zealand) Limited	Support	Support in part.	<i>A reduced frontage is supported particularly for rear lots (in the event that the relief sought by submission 697.666 is not granted).</i>	Reject	33.6.1
FS1193.9	Van Den Brink Group	Support	The submission is allowed in part.	<i>A reduced frontage is supported particularly for rear lots (in the event that the relief sought by</i>	Reject	33.6.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>submission 697.666 is not granted).</i>		
465.13	Buckland Marine Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 20.2.5.1 PI (vii), as follows: (vii) areas exposed by earthworks are re-vegetated stabilised through vegetation or another suitable <u>mechanism</u> to achieve 80% ground cover.	It is considered that areas exposed by earthworks may not require re-vegetation, where other stabilising mechanisms such as hard fill are being used.	Accept	25.3.1
535.24	Lance Vervoort for Hamilton City Council	Support	Retain Policy 4.6.3 Maintain a sufficient supply of industrial land.	As signalled in the Future Proof Strategy, industrial land supply for employment and economic benefit should be maintained to support the wider sub-regional needs. The National Policy Statement - Urban Development Capacity identifies the potential need, in the longer term, for additional industrial land in the Waikato.	Accept	10.2
FS1388.697	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Reject	10.2
FS1141.5	Shand Properties Limited	Support	Allow the retention of the policy that includes the direction to maintain a sufficient supply of industrial land.	The submitter supports the retention of Policy 4.6.3 Maintain a sufficient supply of industrial land.	Accept	10.2
FS1309.2	Bryan Morris	Support	Support submission point 535.24 for the retention of Policy 4.6.3.	To retain the policy that includes the direction to maintain a sufficient supply of industrial land.	Accept	10.2
535.25	Lance Vervoort for Hamilton City Council	Support	Retain Policy 4.6.4 Maintain industrial land for industrial purposes.	The policy supports the sub-regional need for industrial land to be managed and maintained and not lost to other non-industrial purposes, such as large format retail.	Accept	11.2
FS1388.698	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management</i>	Reject	11.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>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>		
535.68	Lance Vervoort for Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Delete 20.1.2 'D6 An office' and 'D7 A retail activity' from the list of discretionary activities. AND Add an office and a retailing activity to Rule 20.1.3 Non-Complying Activities, so that they are instead considered as non-complying activities. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	The relevant objective and policy contained in Chapter 4: Urban Environment are relatively directive that industrial land should not be lost to non-industrial activities, therefore it is more appropriate to match this with a non-complying status in the rules. Commercial activity should be directed to the town centres and business zones. The Hamilton City District Plan has a strong emphasis on keeping Industrial zones for industrial purposes. While it is not the expectation that adjoining districts have matching rules, in this instance, it would be preferable for a similar zoning approach be taken by Waikato District. It would seem appropriate there be some policy alignment to deliver on the Regional Policy Statement and Future Proof principles, by ensuring Hamilton remains the primary commercial hub of the sub-region. In industrial areas in Hamilton, industrial and office activities are non-complying activities to support the 'centres based' approach to business areas within the City are not impacted.	Reject	20.5.1
FS1089.10	Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Limited and Mobil Oil NZ Limited for 'Oil Companies'	Support	Support and oppose in part submission point 535.68.	The Oil Companies are not directly opposed to the activity status of office and retail activities within the Industrial Zone. However, it is noted that there is no definition for 'service stations' within the Proposed Waikato District Plan (a definition is sought in accordance with the Oil Companies primary submission) and therefore the Oil Companies has concerns that the 'retail' aspect of a 'service station' (that is, convenience	Reject	20.5.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				store), could inadvertently be captured by these changes-specifically, a service station could be considered a non-complying 'retail activity.' It is not considered appropriate for a service station to be a non-complying activity within the Industrial Zone. Therefore, the Oil Companies do not seek any specific changes in respect to the submitter (535.68), only that the Oil Companies concerns are noted in regard to the definition of 'service station.'		
FSI388.707	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	20.5.1
543.10	Fellrock Developments Limited and TTT Products Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 20.3.4.2 PI(a)(i)(B) Building setback - water bodies, as follows: PI (a) A building must be set back a minimum of 30m from: (i) the margin of any: A. lake; B. wetland identified as a Significant Natural Area of the planning maps; and ...	Supports Rule 20.3.4.2 PI in part, with the exception of 30m setback from wetlands. There is a wide variation as to what may meet the definition of a wetland and this may include any area inundated with water for a period of time with minimal vegetation, irrespective of its ecological function or biodiversity. A man-made wetland has been established on the property owned by Tuakau Timber Treatment Products Limited to assist with stormwater disposal from the industrial activity. It would be unreasonable to require a 30m setback in this instance as it would restrict development and potentially discourage wetlands being used for stormwater disposal and treatment. This disposal method is supported by local iwi groups.	Reject	31.4.1
543.11	Fellrock Developments	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 20.4.1 Subdivision General, except for	Most small scale subdivision creating 1-3	Accept in part	33.3.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
	Limited and TTT Products Limited		the amendments outlined below; AND Delete Rule 20.4.1 RD1 (a)(iii) Subdivision - General; AND Amend Rule 20.4.1 RD1 (b) Subdivision- General to add additional matters of discretion related to the design, layout and number of rear lots (or include this as a requirement where more than 5 lots are being created). AND Add a new Controlled Activity to Rule 20.4.1 Subdivision General for subdivision around an existing development with the matters of control being limited to design, layout, access and servicing.	additional lots could not satisfy this rule and would therefore become non-complying activities. Council could potentially address design and layout as a matter of restricted discretion to minimise rear lots or apply this to proposals that create more than 5 lots.		
FS1388.755	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept in part	33.3.1
543.12	Fellrock Developments Limited and TTT Products Limited	Support	Retain Rule 20.4.2 Subdivision - Boundaries for Records of Title.	The submitter supports the flexibility afforded by this rule to relocate boundaries in order to accommodate industrial activities.	Accept	33.5.1
543.14	Fellrock Developments Limited and TTT Products Limited	Support	Amend Rule 20.3.1 P1(a)(i) Building height, as follows: P1 (a) The maximum height of a building must not exceed: (i) 15m 20m; or	The proposed maximum building height of 15m is too restrictive and not appropriate for the type of activities seeking to locate in the Industrial Zone (such as manufacturing and warehousing). Shading and privacy in adjoining zones will remain protected through the daylight admission and setback rules (Rules 20.3.3 and 20.3.4.1).	Reject	28.2.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
543.16	Fellrock Developments Limited and TTT Products Limited	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 20.3.3 Daylight admission, except for the amendments outlined below; AND Amend Rule 20.3.3 Daylight Admission to exclude boundaries with the Heavy Industrial Zone.	Supports the daylight admission provisions and considers that these are workable. Seeks an exclusion of the Heavy Industrial Zone as well as Industrial Zone.	Accept	30.1.2
543.17	Fellrock Developments Limited and TTT Products Limited	Support	Retain Rule 20.3.4.1 Building setbacks.	The submitter considers that this rule is workable and that it is appropriate that side and rear setbacks not apply to buildings on sites that adjoin other sites in the Industrial or Heavy Industrial Zones.	Accept	31.3.1
548.11	Murray & Cathy McWatt for Grander Investments Limited	Support	Retain Policy 4.6.5 Recognition of Industrial Activities Outside of Urban Areas, as notified.	No reason provided.	Accept	12.2
FS1388.775	<i>Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E</i>	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Reject	12.2
FS1306.17	<i>Hynds Foundation</i>	Support	Support.	<i>Hynds Foundation supports the retention of this policy.</i>	Accept	12.2
548.13	Murray & Cathy McWatt for Grander Investments Limited	Neutral/Amend	Add P7 Waste Management Facility to Rule 21.1.1 Permitted activities and one new Activity Specific Condition as follows: <u>Excludes disposal of waste to land.</u>	Industrial activities should be incentivised to locate in Industrial Zones by way of a permitted activity status. Waste management facilities that do not dispose of waste to land (i.e. landfill, managed fill, cleanfill) should be permitted in the Heavy Industrial Zone. Recycling of materials is no different to the processing of materials. The effects of waste management processes	Reject	38.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				and facilities are within the anticipated outcomes for the Heavy Industrial Zone and should be provided for in that zone.		
FS1388.776	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	38.1
FS1049.2	Craig Hall	Oppose	Waste management facilities should remain Discretionary activities due to their very nature. By remaining Discretionary they will be subjected to more rigorous checks thereby alleviating possible negative future affects from the activity		Accept	38.1
548.14	Murray & Cathy McWatt for Grander Investments Limited	Oppose	Delete Rule 21.1.2 D2 Cleanfill as a Discretionary Activity; AND Add a new Restricted Discretionary Activity for Cleanfill in Rule 21.1 Industrial Zone Heavy; AND Add the following matters of discretion: Waste acceptance Design and construction Site operation procedures Response to natural hazards Management of non-complying material and monitoring. Monitoring	Activities within the Waste Management Facility definition are appropriate within the Heavy Industrial Zone without Resource Consent. Cleanfill does not generate objectionable odour, contamination or high dust emissions unlike other activities that involve disposal of material to land. Activity status for Cleanfill should be Restricted Discretionary in the Heavy Industrial Zone. With matters of discretion and assessment criteria restricted to waste acceptance, design and construction, site operation procedures, water quality, response to natural hazards, management of non-complying material and monitoring.	Reject	40.1
FS1388.777	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.	Accept	40.1

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>		
FS1049.3	Craig Hall	Oppose	<i>Cleanfill sites should remain part of waste management facilities. The activities of each facility are so closely aligned that they should be treated the same and remain a Discretionary activity</i>		Accept	40.1
559.83	Sherry Reynolds on behalf of Heritage New Zealand Lower Northern Office	Oppose	Amend Rule 20.2.7.1 P2 Signs - general to exclude any type of signage on Heritage Items and Maaori Sites of Significance. AND Amend Rule 20.2.7.1 RD1 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.	The submitter cannot support the P2 Signs General where the zone rules that relate to signage, including on heritage items or Maaori sites of significance are permitted activities with 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)).	Reject	26.2.1
559.84	Sherry Reynolds on behalf of Heritage New Zealand Lower Northern Office	Oppose	Amend Rule 21.2.7.1 P2 Signs - general to exclude any type of signage on Heritage Items and Maaori Sites of Significance. AND Amend Rule 21.2.7.1 RD1 Signs - general to include signage on Heritage items and Maaori Sites	The submitter cannot support the P2 Signs General where the zone rules that relate to signage, including on heritage items or Maaori sites of significance are permitted activities with variations between the zones as to the	Reject	59.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p>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.</p>	<p>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)).</p>		
578.10	Ports of Auckland Limited	Not Stated	<p>Add a new permitted activity rule in Rule 20.3.1 Building height, to specifically address building height within the Horotiu Industrial Park as follows: <u>(a) Despite Rule 20.3.3 Daylight Admission, within the Horotiu Industrial Park the construction or alteration of an aerial and its support structures is a permitted activity if: (i) the height of the aerial or support structures do not exceed: A. 15m; or B. 10m within 50m of the Horotiu Road boundary; or C. 5m more than the height of a building the aerial is mounted on, where that building is higher than 20m; and (b) no dish antennae exceed 5m diameter, and no panel antennae exceeds 2.5m in any dimension.</u> OR Add a new section 20.6 within Chapter 20 Industrial Zone, specifically providing for the Horotiu Industrial Park (see Schedule 2 of the submission for specific provisions). AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make alternative or consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the</p>	<p>The Operative District Plan provisions for the Horotiu Industrial Park relating to aerals have not been included within the Proposed District Plan. No justification is provided within the section 32 analysis to justify the deletion of the provisions. Seek the inclusions of the operative provisions within the Proposed District Plan.</p>	Reject	31.4.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			submission.			
578.11	Ports of Auckland Limited	Not Stated	Add a new permitted activity Rule in rule 20.3.1 Building height, to specifically provide for lighting masts within the Horotiu Industrial Park as follows: <u>Despite Rule 20.3.3 Daylight Admission, the construction or alteration of lighting masts is a permitted activity if: (a) the height of the lighting masts: (i) located more than 400m from Horotiu Road; and (ii) do not exceed 25m in height.</u> OR Add a new section 20.6 within Chapter 20 Industrial Zone, specifically providing for the Horotiu Industrial Park (see Schedule 2 of the submission for specific provisions). AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make alternative or consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.	Seek specific provisions for lighting masts within the Horotiu Industrial Park to a height of 25m. It is consistent with the maximum permitted height for other buildings within this part of the Industrial Zone and is consistent with the resource consent held by the Ports of Auckland Ltd. It is necessary to ensure the safe and efficient operation of industrial activities.	Accept in part	74.9.1
FS1388.838	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	74.9.1
578.12	Ports of Auckland Limited	Support	Retain Rule 20.3.1 RDI Building height, as notified.	Supports the restricted discretionary status and seeks that RDI be retained as notified.	Accept	74.9.1
578.14	Ports of Auckland Limited	Support	Retain Rule 20.3.3 Daylight admission, as notified.	Support rule 20.3.3 as notified.	Reject	30.1.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
578.15	Ports of Auckland Limited	Support	Retain Rule 20.3.4.1 Building setbacks, as notified.	Support Rule 20.3.4.1 as notified	Accept	31.3.1
578.16	Ports of Auckland Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 20.3.4.2 P1 Building setback - waterbodies, as follows: (a) A building must be setback a minimum of 30m from: (i) the margin of any: A. lake; B. wetland; and C. river bank <u>whose bed has an average width of 3m or more</u> , other than the Waikato River and Waipa River. OR Add a new section 20.6 within Chapter 20 Industrial Zone, specifically providing for the Horotiu Industrial Park (see Schedule 2 of the submission for specific provisions). AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make alternative or consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.	The Port of Auckland Limited's inland freight hub site is bound by an unnamed tributary of the Te Rapa Stream. The Proposed District Plan has removed the 3m qualifying bed width which applied in the Operative District Plan. Does not support Rule 20.3.4.2 in its current format as it has the potential to constrain future developments within the inland freight hub. The imposition of the building setback requirement has the potential to constrain the efficient development of the significant regional industrial node. As a minimum, the submitter seeks that the Operative District Plan's qualifying standard is applied to the rule.	Reject	74.10.1
FS1388.839	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Accept	74.10.1
578.17	Ports of Auckland Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 20.3.4.2 P3 Building setback - water bodies, as follows: A building must be setback a minimum of 10m from the bank of a perennial or intermittent stream <u>whose bed has an average width of 3m or more</u> . OR Add a new section 20.6 within Chapter 20 Industrial Zone, specifically providing for the Horotiu Industrial Park (see Schedule 2 of the	The Port of Auckland Limited's inland freight hub site is bound by an unnamed tributary of the Te Rapa Stream. The Proposed District Plan has removed the 3m qualifying bed width applied in the Operative District Plan. Does not support rule 20.3.4.2 in its current format as it has the potential to constrain future developments within the inland freight hub. The imposition of the building setback	Reject	74.10.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			submission for specific provisions). AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make alternative or consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.	requirement has the potential to constrain the efficient developments of the significant regional industrial node. Seeks as a minimum that the Operative District Plan's qualifying standard is applied to this rule.		
FS1388.840	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	74.10.1
578.18	Ports of Auckland Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 20.3.4.2 D1 from a discretionary activity rule to a restricted discretionary activity rule and as follows: <u>RDI A building that does not comply with Rule 20.3.4.2 P1, P2, P3 or P4. Council's discretion shall be restricted to the following matters: (a) effects of the location, intensity, scale and form of subdivision, use and development in relation to natural character; (b) the extent of indigenous vegetation clearance and modification (including earthworks, disturbance and structures); (c) cumulative effects on natural character and landscapes.</u> OR Add a new section 20.6 within Chapter 20 Industrial Zone, specifically providing for the Horotiu Industrial Park (see Schedule 2 of the submission for specific provisions). AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make alternative or consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.	Opposes the discretionary activity status and seeks a restricted discretionary activity.	Reject	31.4.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1388.841	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	31.4.1
FS1193.8	Van Den Brink Group	Support	The submission is allowed.	A restricted discretionary activity status for development control infringements is considered more suitable than a discretionary activity status.	Reject	31.4.1
FS1326.8	Holcim (New Zealand) Limited	Support	Support.	A restricted discretionary activity status for development control infringements is considered more suitable than a discretionary activity status.	Reject	31.4.1
578.21	Ports of Auckland Limited	Support	Retain Rule 20.4.2 Subdivision - Boundaries for Records of Title, as notified.	Supports Rule 20.4.2 as notified.	Accept	33.5.1
578.22	Ports of Auckland Limited	Not Stated	Amend Rule 20.4.4 RDI Subdivision - Esplanade Reserves and Esplanade Strips, as follows: (a) Subdivision must create an esplanade reserve or strip 20m wide (or other width stated in Appendix 4 (Esplanade Priority Areas) from every proposed lot: (i) less than 4ha and within 20m of any: A. mean high water springs; B. bank of any river whose bed has an average width of 3m or more and is not a perennial or intermittent stream; or C. lane whose bed ..." OR Add a new section 20.6 within Chapter 20 Industrial Zone, specifically providing for the Horotiu Industrial Park (see Schedule 2 of the submission for specific provisions). AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make	Supports the intent of Rule 20.1.1, however considers that item 'B' required further clarification that it is not intended to apply for a perennial or intermittent stream.	Reject	33.7.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			alternative or consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.			
578.23	Ports of Auckland Limited	Not Stated	<p>Add the staging plans for Horotiu Industrial Park, that reflects the resource consents that have been approved and granted to Ports of Auckland Limited. Refer to the staging plans, bunding map and proposed Horotiu Road intersection in the submission.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Add a new rule 20.2.10 Land Use Staging in Chapter 20 Industrial Zone, to provide for the staged release of the land within Horotiu Industrial Park (see submission for details of the new rule).</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend the Proposed District Plan to make alternative or consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>	<p>The Operative District Plan provided for a staged release of land in conjunction with staged improvements to the transport network and other infrastructure. An integrated approach to development within the Horotiu Industrial Park is required and there is concern that not including the 'Land Use Staging' within the Proposed District Plan will prevent this from occurring. Such an outcome would be contrary to the Waikato Regional Policy Statement. The staging plans shown in the submission reflect the resource consents that have been granted to the Ports of Auckland Limited. Under the Operative District Plan, subdivision within the Horotiu Industrial Park can be undertaken as a controlled activity subject to standards. No justification has been provided within the section 32 analysis which supports the Proposed District Plan as to why a restricted discretionary activity status is necessary and why different subdivision standards are appropriate within the Horotiu Industrial Park. The Operative District Plan provided for a staged release of land in conjunction with staged improvements to the transport network and other infrastructure. An integrated approach to development within the Horotiu Industrial Park is required and there is concern that not including the 'Land Use Staging' within the Proposed District Plan will prevent this from occurring. Such an outcome would be contrary to the Waikato Regional Policy Statement.</p>	Accept in part	74.11.1
FS1388.843	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	<p><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</i></p>	Accept in part	74.11.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				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.		
578.26	Ports of Auckland Limited	Not Stated	Add a new Section 20.6 to Chapter 20 Industrial Zone, that contains a set of standalone provisions for the Horotiu Industrial Park , as an alternative relief to amending the notified provisions for the Industrial Zone. Refer to Schedule 2 of the submission for the requested provisions. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make alternative or consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.	This request is an alternative to altering the Industrial Zone provisions, which is consistent with the approach taken for the Nau Mai Business Park.	Accept in part	74.11.1
FS1388.846	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept in part	74.11.1
578.57	Ports of Auckland Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 20.1.2 Discretionary Activities, to provide for activities that do not comply with Land Use-Effects Rule 20.2 or Land Use-Building Rule 20.3, as follows: <u>20.1.2A Restricted Discretionary Activities (a) The activities listed below are restricted discretionary activities. RD1 Any permitted activity that does not comply with an activity specific condition in Rule 20.1.1. RD2 Any</u>	The discretionary activity status rule required applicants to undertake a full assessment of the effects of the activity on the environment and infringements and this is considered unnecessary and onerous. A restricted discretionary activity status is more appropriate as it will enable applicants to undertake a focused analysis of the effects	Reject	74.11.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p>activity that does not comply with Land Use - Effects Rule 20.2 or Land Use - Building Rule 20.3 unless the activity status is specified as controlled, discretionary or noncomplying.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Add a new Section 20.6 within Chapter 20 Industrial Zone specifically providing for the Horotiu Industrial Park (see schedule 2 of the submission for specific provisions).</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend the Proposed District Plan to make alternative or consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>	<p>generated as a result of the infringement and therefore reducing inefficiencies, cost and time. Amendment is consistent with the Policies of the Industrial Zone that seek to maintain a sufficient supply of industrial land for industrial purposes.</p>		
FS1388.858	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	<p>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</p>	Accept in part	74.11.1
578.58	Ports of Auckland Limited	Oppose	<p>Amend Rule 20.1.3 Non-complying Activities, as follows: NC1 Any activity that is not listed as a permitted or discretionary activity. NC1A Retail not otherwise provided for NC2 Offices not otherwise provided for NC3 Commercial services NC4 Community activities N5 Noise sensitive activities N6 Places of assembly N7 Sensitive land uses</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend Rule 20.1.2-Discretionary Activities as a consequential amendment, as follows: D1 Any permitted activity that does not comply with an activity specific condition in Rule 20.1.1. D2 Any activity that does not comply with Land Use - Effects Rule 20.2 or Land Use - Building Rule 20.3</p>	<p>Submitter does not support the default non-complying activity status for activities. Instead POAL considers that a discretionary activity status be considered the default for activities that are not specifically provided for. Discretionary activity status will enable the district plan to respond to future developments and innovative methods, whereas the non-complying activity status will act as a bar to innovation and development. The default non-complying activity status is inconsistent with section 87B of the RMA, which provides for a default discretionary activity for activities not specifically provided for within a district plan. Submitter does</p>	Accept in part	20.6.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p>unless the activity status is specified as controlled, restricted discretionary or non-complying: D3 A waste management facility D4 Hazardous waste storage, processing or disposal D5 An extractive industry D6 An office Ancillary offices not provided for as a permitted activity D7 Any activity that is not listed as a permitted, discretionary or non-complying activity.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Add a new section 20.6 within Chapter 20 Industrial Zone, specifically providing for the Horotiu Industrial Park (see schedule 2 of the submission for specific reasons).</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend the Proposed District Plan to make alternative or consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>	<p>not agree that all office activities should be provided for as a discretionary activity. Offices not ancillary to industrial activities are not compatible with an industrial environment and have the potential to result in reverse sensitivity effects and/or constrain the efficient operation of the industrial activities. Considers it appropriate for the Proposed District Plan to identify activities that it wishes to actively discourage within the Industrial Zone as they would be inappropriate or inconsistent with the outcomes intended through a non-complying activity status. Amendments will be consistent with the objectives and policies of the Industrial zone. This is an outcome consistent with the policies of the Industrial Zone that seek to maintain a sufficient supply of industrial land for industrial purposes.</p>		
FS1388.859	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	<p>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</p>	Accept in part	20.6.1
FS1326.15	Holcim (New Zealand) Limited	Support	Support.	<p>The proposed amendments are considered to be an appropriate outcome.</p>	Accept in part	20.6.1
FS1193.15	Van Den Brink Group	Support	The submission is allowed.	<p>The proposed amendments are considered to be an appropriate outcome.</p>	Accept in part	20.6.1
578.59	Ports of Auckland Limited	Support	Retain Rule 20.2.1 Servicing and hours of operation, as notified.	<p>Submitter supports Rule 20.2.1 as notified and considers that it appropriately implements the policies for the Industrial Zone in respect of the management of adverse effects.</p>	Reject	21.1.1
578.60	Ports of Auckland Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 20.2.2 C1 (b) Landscape planting, as	<p>Ports of Auckland Limited sites share a</p>	Reject	22.1.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p>follows: C1 (a)... (b) Any activity on a lot that contains, or is adjacent to a river or a permanent or intermittent stream shall provide an 8m wide landscaped strip measured from the top edge of the closest bank and extending across the entire length of the watercourse. <u>(b) Any activity located in the Horotiu Industrial Park within 5m of the Horotiu Road boundary shall be planted and maintained with a 5m wide buffer strip of indigenous species that will achieve a height of at least 5m within 5 years and sufficient density to visually screen the activity from the Residential Zone. ...</u></p> <p>OR</p> <p>Add a new section 20.6 within Chapter 20 Industrial Zone, specifically providing for the Horotiu Industrial Park (see Schedule 2 of the submission for specific provisions).</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend the Proposed District Plan to make alternative or consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>	<p>boundary with a permanent or intermittent stream. The requirement for all activities to obtain a resource consent for matters pertaining to landscaping is onerous and will result in an inefficient and costly process. Will not support economic growth of the district's industry and does not provide for the efficient development of the industrial land resource. No justification has been provided in the section 32 analysis that supports the 8m landscape strip. To ensure consistency with the provisions of the Operative District Plan for the Horotiu Industrial Park, an amendment will require activities within 5m of Horotiu Road to provide a 5m wide buffer strip of planting to screen the Residential zone to appropriately manage adverse effects. The rule will constrain economic growth and reduce employment opportunities within the District.</p>		
578.61	Ports of Auckland Limited	Neutral/Amend	<p>Amend Rule 20.2.3.1 Noise - General, as follows:</p> <p>P1 Noise generated by emergency generators and emergency sirens. P2 (a) Noise measured within any other site: <u>(i) In the Horotiu Industrial Park must not exceed: A. 75 dBA (LAeq) at any time. Despite the above, construction noise and emergency sirens are not subject to this rule.</u> (i) In any <u>other</u> Industrial Zone must not exceed: A. 75dB (LAeq) 7am to 10pm; and B. 55dB (LAeq) and 85dB (LAmax) 10pm to 7am the following day.</p> <p>P3 (a) <u>Noise measured within the notional boundary of any site zoned Residential or Rural from an activity within the Horotiu Industrial Park must not exceed: (i) 55 dBA(LAeq), 7am to 10pm (ii) 45 dBA (LAeq) and 70 dBA(Lmax), 10pm to 7am the following day. Despite the above, construction noise and emergency sirens are not subject to this rule.</u> (a) Noise measured within any site in any zone other, than the Industrial Zone and the Heavy Industrial Zone, must meet the</p>	<p>Due to the deletion of the Horotiu Industrial Park schedule, the noise requirements are more stringent due to the Country Living Zone and Residential Zone boundaries. The Horotiu Industrial Park is identified within the Waikato Regional Policy Statement as a regionally significant industrial node and its proximity to the state highway and rail networks is intended to operate 24 hours a day. The imposition of the noise limit will constrain the efficient and effective operation of the industrial node and be detrimental to the economy. No justification has been provided within the section 32 analysis to impose the noise limits. Ports of Auckland limited have commenced the construction of a new inland freight hub which has good road and rail connections and will improve access to overseas markets for Waikato based exporters and encourage investment in the</p>	Accept in part	23.3.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p>permitted noise levels for that zone. P4 (a) Noise levels must be measured in accordance with the requirements of NZS 680:2008 Acoustics - Measurement of Environmental Sound. (b) Noise levels must be assessed in accordance with the requirements of NZS 6802:2008 "Acoustics Environmental noise". R02 (a) Noise that does not comply with Rule 20.2.3.1 P2, P3 or P4. (a) Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters: (i) effects on amenity values (ii) hours of operation (iii) location of noise sources in relation to boundaries (iv) frequency or other special characteristics of noise: (v) mitigation measures (vi) noise levels and duration</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Add a new section 20.6 within Chapter 20 Industrial Zone, specifically providing for the Horotiu Industrial Park (see Schedule 2 of the submission for specific provisions).</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend the Proposed District Plan to make alternative or consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>	<p>district. The proposed noise limits will undermine the delivery and operation of the freight hub. It is critical for the operation of the Horotiu Industrial Park that the noise standards under the Operative District Plan are retained.</p>		
578.62	Ports of Auckland Limited	Support	Retain Rule 20.2.3.2 Noise - Construction, as notified.	The New Zealand standard for construction noise is considered to be an appropriate mechanism to control the adverse effects of construction noise.	Reject	23.4.1
578.63	Ports of Auckland Limited	Neutral/Amend	<p>Amend Rule 20.2.4 P1 Glare and Artificial Light Spill, as follows: Glare and artificial light spill must not exceed 10 lux measured horizontally and vertically within any other site: <u>beyond the boundary of the Industrial Zone and the Heavy Industry Zone. Lighting associated with plant and machinery is excluded from this Rule.</u></p> <p>OR</p> <p>Add a new section 20.6 within Chapter 20 Industrial Zone, specifically providing for the Horotiu Industrial Park (see Schedule 2 of the submission for specific provisions).</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend the Proposed District Plan to make</p>	<p>The lighting levels proposed are considered to be unnecessarily onerous, and do not facilitate the safe and efficient use of the industrial land resource for industrial purposes and activities that require night time illumination. Given the remoteness of the Horotiu Industrial Park to any sensitive residential receivers, it is considered that this rule should be amended so 10 lux standard only applied to sites that contain a dwelling beyond the boundary of the Industrial zone. As the objective of the Industrial Zone is to protect the amenity values of sensitive activities and ecosystem values beyond the boundary of the Industrial</p>	Accept in part	74.5.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			alternative or consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.	Zone, it is appropriate for the rule to relate to sites not zoned industrial. Clarification is also required to confirm that lighting associated with plant and machinery is excluded from this control.		
FS1345.2	Genesis Energy Limited	Support	Accept submission point.	For the reasons provided in the Ports of Auckland submission.	Accept in part	74.5.1
578.64	Ports of Auckland Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 20.2.5.1 P1 Earthworks - General, as follows: (a) Earthworks within a site must meet the following conditions: (i) be located more than 1.5m from a public sewer, open drain, overland flow path or other service pipe; (ii) not exceed a volume of more than 250m³ 2500m ³ and an area of more than 1,000m² 2500m ² within a site; (iii) the height of the resulting cut, filled areas or fill batter face in stable ground, not including any surcharge, does not exceed 1.5m, with a maximum slope of 1:2 (1 vertical to 2 horizontal); (iv) areas exposed by earthworks are re-vegetated to achieve 80% ground cover within 6 months of the commencement of the earthworks; (v) sediment resulting from the earthworks is retained on the site through implementation and maintenance of erosion and sediment controls; (vi) Do not divert or change the nature of natural water flows, water bodies or established drainage paths ; (vii) <u>within overland flow paths, the earthworks must maintain the same entry and exit point at the boundaries of the site and not result in any adverse changes in flood hazards beyond the site.</u> OR Add a new section 20.6 within Chapter 20 Industrial Zone, specifically providing for the Horotiu Industrial Park (see Schedule 2 of the submission for specific provisions). AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make alternative or consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.	The extent of permitted earthworks proposed is insufficient to enable the comprehensive redevelopment of Industrial Zoned sites and in the context of greenfield industrial areas such as the Horotiu Industrial Plan. Therefore the permitted earthworks needs to be increased to 2500m ² and 2500m ³ per site within the Industrial Zone. Opposes the requirement for excavation or filling not to exceed 1.5m above or below ground level. In the Industrial Zone there is a lower amenity expectation than other sensitive zones and these constraints are unnecessarily onerous and no justification has been provided for these provisions. Earthworks are not permitted to divert or change the nature of drainage paths and this is unnecessarily onerous, considering it can be enabled as a permitted activity where the entry of exit point is not altered.	Accept in part	74.6.1
578.65	Ports of Auckland Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 20.2.5.1 P2 Earthworks - General, as follows: (a) Earthworks for the purpose of creating a building platform for residential industrial	References made to building platform for 'residential purposes' should be appropriately referenced 'industrial purposes'.	Accept	25.3.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p>purposes with a site using imported fill material must meet the following condition: (i) be carried out in accordance with NZS 4431: 1989 Code of Practice for Earth Fill for Residential Development.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Add a new section 20.6 within Chapter 20 Industrial Zone, specifically providing for the Horotiu Industrial Park (see Schedule 2 of the submission for specific provisions).</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend the Proposed District Plan to make alternative or consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>			
578.66	Ports of Auckland Limited	Support	Retain Objective 4.6.1 - Economic growth of industry, as notified.	The objective and associated policies are considered to appropriately give effect to the Waikato Regional Policy Statement.	Accept	8.2
<i>FSI388.860</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>	8.2
578.67	Ports of Auckland Limited	Support	Retain Policy 4.6.2 Provide Industrial Zones with different functions, as notified.	Supports this policy as notified.	Accept	9.2
<i>FSI388.861</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.</i>	<i>Reject</i>	9.2

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>		
578.68	Ports of Auckland Limited	Support	Retain Policy 4.6.3 Maintain a sufficient supply of industrial land, as notified.	Supports Policy 4.6.3 as notified.	Accept	10.2
FS1388.862	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Reject	10.2
578.69	Ports of Auckland Limited	Support	Retain Policy 4.6.4 - Maintain industrial land for industrial purposes, as notified.	Supports policy 4.6.4 as notified.	Accept	11.2
FS1388.863	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Reject	11.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
578.70	Ports of Auckland Limited	Support	Retain Policy 4.6.5 - Recognition of industrial activities outside of urban areas, as notified.	Support the policy as notified.	Accept	12.2
578.71	Ports of Auckland Limited	Support	Retain Objective 4.6.6 Manage adverse effects, as notified.	Supports this objective as notified.	Accept	13.2
578.72	Ports of Auckland Limited	Support	Retain Policy 4.6.7 - Management of adverse effects within industrial zones as notified.	Supports policy 4.6.7 as notified.	Accept in part	14.2
578.73	Ports of Auckland Limited	Not Stated	<p>Add new objectives and policies to Section 4.6 Industrial and Heavy Industrial Zones, that acknowledge the Horotiu Industrial Park, as follows: <u>Objectives 4.6.8 Industrial development is consistent with the long-term land use pattern for Horotiu and occurs in an integrated and coordinated manner. 4.6.9 The Horotiu Industrial Park is developed as a strategic industrial node in a manner which enables industrial activities to locate and function efficiently within the zone. 4.6.10 The Horotiu Industrial Park is protected from reverse sensitivity effects from activities sensitive to noise. 4.6.11 The Horotiu Industrial Park is serviced by efficient road and rail network connections. Policies 4.6.12 Industrial development in the Horotiu Industrial Park is enabled in a manner that aligns with the capacity improvements to the infrastructure, including roading. 4.6.13 Industrial development in the Horotiu Industrial Park is encouraged to make use of both road and rail network connections to enable the efficient use of the industrial land resource. 4.6.14 Industrial development, prior to the require infrastructure capacity improvements being completed, should be managed in order to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects on the existing and future planned road network, connections to that network, and on other infrastructure. 4.6.15 Traffic and transportation effects should be managed through land use planning, peak traffic generation controls and integrated, multi-modal transport approaches to ensure industrial development at the Horotiu</u></p>	Seeks a 'bespoke' set of provisions for Horotiu Industrial Park that recognise the importance of the Horotiu Industrial Node to the economic and social wellbeing of the Waikato Region. The provisions need to make a clear distinction between the Horotiu Industrial Park and other Industrial zoned land within the district and facilitate the efficient development of the Industrial Park without restricting the day-to-day practicalities within an industrial environment. Gives effect to the Waikato Regional Policy Statement by recognising the regional significance of the Horotiu Industrial Park and set the framework under which any residential growth may be enabled within the Horotiu area. The Horotiu Industrial Park connects to the State Highway network and North Island Main Trunk railway line, which are of strategic significance to the industrial node and need to be recognised.	Accept in part	74.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p><u>Industrial Park does not adversely affect the safety and efficiency of the wider roading network. 4.6.16 Activities within the Horotiu Industrial Park that do not support the primary function of the zone are to be avoided. 4.6.17 Activities that are sensitive to noise are required to protect themselves from noise arising from the operation of the Horotiu Industrial Park.</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend the Proposed District Plan to make alternative or consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>			
FS1202.54	New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Support submission point 578.73.	The Waikato Regional Policy Statement identifies Te Rapa North and Horotiu as strategic industrial nodes. The Transport Agency supports additional review of the Horotiu area to ensure that its strategic importance as an industrial node is not compromised.	Accept in part	74.1
FS1272.6	KiwiRail Holdings Ltd	Support	Null	KiwiRail supports the recognition of the strategic importance of the rail network to Horotui industrial activities.	Accept in part	74.1
FS1388.864	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept in part	74.1
578.74	Ports of Auckland Limited	Support	Add additional permitted activities in Rule 20.1.1, as follows: <u>P7 Workers accommodation Activity Specific conditions: 1 unit per site P8 Rail operations including associated sidings, structures, and earthworks within the Horotiu Industrial Park Activity specific conditions: Nil</u> OR	Supports the permitted activity status for the activities identified within Rule 20.1.1 for the Industrial zone for the activities and considers this is an efficient mechanism to achieve the objective of the zone and enable economic growth. A permitted activity status recognises and provides for a variety of	Accept in part	20.3.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			Add a new Section 20.6 within Chapter 20 Industrial Zone, specifically providing for the Horotiu Industrial Park (see schedule 2 of the submission for specific provisions). AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make alternative or consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.	industrial activities and the corresponding rules will ensure that the adverse effects are appropriately managed. Considers it necessary to provide for workers accommodation for people whose duties require them to live on site. Such activities are required from time to time to facilitate 24-hour operation of industrial activities as well as to provide safety and security that does not result in reverse sensitivity effects. Reference to rail operations and associated activities within the Horotiu Industrial Park are anticipated and provided for in this location and will enable the efficient use of the industrial land resource.		
FS1388.865	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	20.3.1
581.23	Penny Gallagher for Synlait Milk Ltd	Oppose	Amend Rule 21.1.1 Permitted Activities to broaden the range of ancillary activities permitted under the Heavy Industrial Zone.	The current list of ancillary activities provided for fails to acknowledge the broad range of activities which may be co-located or ancillary to a heavy industry activity. The submission provides as an example the ancillary activities at a dairy processing plant.	Accept	38.1
FS1341.40	Hynds Pipe Systems Limited	Support	Null	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This submission supports the industrial strategic growth node along McDonald Road in particular the importance of appropriate land to enable heavy industrial use. Importantly the submission seeks to protect the location of Heavy Industrial Zone land from encroachment by sensitive activities and proposal for residential re-zoning. Hynds supports the submission as it relates to these matters because it is also 	Accept	38.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				concerned that rezoning of land adjacent to the Heavy Industrial land will create reverse sensitivity effects on the existing and proposed industrial business operations. • Ensuring there is no encroachment by sensitive activities on the heavy industrial land is the most appropriate way for the Council to exercise its functions and to ensure the efficiency and effectiveness of the proposed plan provisions.		
FS1388.952	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	38.1
FS1134.81	Counties Power Limited	Support	Seek that the submission point be allowed.	The current list of ancillary activities fails to acknowledge the broad range of activities which may be co-located or ancillary to a heavy industrial activity such as infrastructure.	Accept	38.1
FS1306.33	Hynds Foundation	Support	Support.	Hynds Foundation support broadening the range of ancillary activities to be enabling of Industrial Activities. The proposed activities do not reflect the range of ancillary activities that occur in support of large heavy industrial businesses.	Accept	38.1
581.24	Penny Gallagher for Synlait Milk Ltd	Oppose	Amend Rule 20.2.2C1 (b) Landscape planting to require that where a lot contains a permanent or intermittent stream, a total width of 4m on both sides of the stream will provide an 8m wide landscape strip in total.	The creation of 8m wide landscape strips either side of a permanent or intermittent stream within an industrial zoned property may result in the loss of land available for efficient uses. A setback is not required for the purposes of enhancing a publicly accessible environment, although it is acknowledged that planting will assist in improved water quality.	Accept	53.1
FS1341.41	Hynds Pipe Systems Limited	Support	Null	• This submission supports the industrial strategic growth node along McDonald Road and in particular the importance of appropriate land to	Accept	53.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				enable heavy industrial use. Importantly the submission seeks to protect the location of Heavy Industrial Zone land from encroachment by sensitive activities and proposal for residential rezoning. • Hynds supports the submission as it relates to these matters because it is also concerned that rezoning of land adjacent to the Heavy Industrial land will create reverse sensitivity effects on the existing and proposed industrial business operations. • Ensuring there is no encroachment by sensitive activities on the heavy industrial land is the most appropriate way for the Council to exercise its functions and to ensure the efficiency and effectiveness of the proposed plan provisions.		
FS1306.34	Hynds Foundation	Support	Support.	Hynds Foundation support this submission as it would enable and encourage Heavy Industrial to site within the appropriate zone.	Accept	53.1
581.25	Penny Gallagher for Synlait Milk Ltd	Support	Retain Rule 21.2.3.1 Noise - General.	The proposed rule provides for an appropriate level of noise effects, consistent with activities in a Heavy Industrial Zone.	Accept in part	54.3
FS1341.42	Hynds Pipe Systems Limited	Support	Null	• This submission supports the industrial strategic growth node along McDonald Road an in particular the importance of appropriate land to enable heavy industrial use. Importantly the submission seeks to protect the location of Heavy Industrial Zone land from encroachment by sensitive activities and proposal for residential rezoning. • Hynds supports the submission as it relates to these matters because it is also concerned that rezoning of land adjacent to the Heavy Industrial land will create reverse sensitivity effects on the existing and proposed industrial business operations. • Ensuring there is no encroachment by sensitive activities on the heavy industrial land is the most appropriate way for the Council to exercise its functions and to ensure the efficiency and effectiveness of the proposed plan provisions.	Accept in part	54.3
FS1306.35	Hynds Foundation	Support	Support.	Hynds Foundation support this submission as it would enable and encourage Heavy Industrial to site within the appropriate zone.	Accept in part	54.3
581.26	Penny Gallagher for Synlait Milk Ltd	Support	Retain Rule 21.2.3.3 Noise - Construction.	The proposed rule provides for an appropriate level of noise effects, consistent with activities in a Heavy Industrial Zone.	Reject	56.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1341.43	Hynds Pipe Systems Limited	Support	Null	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This submission supports the industrial strategic growth node along McDonald Road and in particular the importance of appropriate land to enable heavy industrial use. Importantly the submission seeks to protect the location of Heavy Industrial Zone land from encroachment by sensitive activities and proposal for residential rezoning. Hynds supports the submission as it relates to these matters because it is also concerned that rezoning of land adjacent to the Heavy Industrial land will create reverse sensitivity effects on the existing and proposed industrial business operations. Ensuring there is no encroachment by sensitive activities on the heavy industrial land is the most appropriate way for the Council to exercise its functions and to ensure the efficiency and effectiveness of the proposed plan provisions. 	Reject	56.1
FS1306.36	Hynds Foundation	Support	Support.	Hynds Foundation support this submission as it would enable and encourage Heavy Industrial to site within the appropriate zone.	Reject	56.1
581.27	Penny Gallagher for Synlait Milk Ltd	Oppose	Delete Rule 21.2.5.1 PI (a), (ii), (iii) and (iv) Earthworks - General. AND Add new provisions to Rule 21.2.5.IPI that enable earthworks to be permitted at scale consistent with the scale of buildings anticipated in a Heavy Industrial Zone, for example: total depth of fill or cut: 5m not exceed an area greater than 10,000m ² for each earthwork project maximum volume: 10,000m ³ for each earthwork project no controls on imported fill material where it is to be used for a building platform for which building consent has been obtained.	Imported fill for a building platform with building consent, there are no or negligible environmental effects arising from the use of the material. There should not be a limit on the volume or area of such material. This is also a potential duplication of regulation, with a resource consent offering non environmental outcomes beyond those already achieved through building consent. The construction of large-footprint buildings can be anticipated within the Heavy Industrial Zone. Accordingly, an earthworks rule should establish an appropriate threshold for consideration of environmental effects for permitted activities. The district plan provisions should align with the earthworks controls under the Regional Plan and the Building Act.	Accept	58.3
FS1341.44	Hynds Pipe Systems Limited	Support	Null	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This submission supports the industrial strategic growth node along McDonald Road and in particular the importance of appropriate land to enable heavy industrial use. Importantly the submission seeks to protect the location of Heavy Industrial Zone land from encroachment by sensitive activities and proposal for residential re- 	Accept	58.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				zoning. • Hynds supports the submission as it relates to these matters because it is also concerned that rezoning of land adjacent to the Heavy Industrial land will create reverse sensitivity effects on the existing and proposed industrial business operations. • Ensuring there is no encroachment by sensitive activities on the heavy industrial land is the most appropriate way for the Council to exercise its functions and to ensure the efficiency and effectiveness of the proposed plan provisions.		
FS1306.37	Hynds Foundation	Support	Support.	Hynds Foundation support this submission as it would enable and encourage Heavy Industrial to site within the appropriate zone.	Accept	58.3
581.28	Penny Gallagher for Synlait Milk Ltd	Oppose	Delete Rule 21.2.5.IP3(a)(i) and (ii) Earthworks - General AND Add new provisions to Rule 21.2.5.IP3 that enable earthworks to be permitted at scale consistent with the scale of buildings anticipated in a Heavy Industrial Zone, for example: total depth of fill or cut: 5m not exceed an area greater than 10,000m ² for each earthwork project maximum volume: 10,000m ³ for each earthwork project no controls on imported fill material where it is to be used for a building platform for which building consent has been obtained.	There should not be a limit on the volume or area of such material. This is also a potential duplication of regulation, with a resource consent offering non environmental outcomes beyond those already achieved through building consent. The construction of large-footprint buildings can be anticipated within the Heavy Industrial Zone. Accordingly, an earthworks rule should establish an appropriate threshold for consideration of environmental effects for permitted activities. The district plan provisions should align with the earthworks controls under the Regional Plan and the Building Act.	Accept in part	58.3
FS1341.45	Hynds Pipe Systems Limited	Support	Null	• This submission supports the industrial strategic growth node along McDonald Road and in particular the importance of appropriate land to enable heavy industrial use. Importantly the submission seeks to protect the location of Heavy Industrial Zone land from encroachment by sensitive activities and proposal for residential rezoning. • Hynds supports the submission as it relates to these matters because it is also concerned that rezoning of land adjacent to the Heavy Industrial land will create reverse sensitivity effects on the existing and proposed industrial business operations. • Ensuring there is no encroachment by sensitive activities on the heavy industrial land is the most appropriate way for the Council to exercise its functions and to ensure the efficiency and effectiveness of the proposed plan provisions.	Accept in part	58.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1306.38	Hynds Foundation	Support	Support.	Hynds Foundation support this submission as it would enable and encourage Heavy Industrial to site within the appropriate zone.	Accept in part	58.3
581.29	Penny Gallagher for Synlait Milk Ltd	Oppose	Add a new rule to Rule 21.2.7.1 Signs - General to permit signs for way-finding, health and safety and other regulatory requirements e.g. signage required for storage of hazardous substances.	Signage relating to way-finding, health and safety and other regulatory requirements is typically internal to the operation of a site. These types of signs are generally sized to provide messages to users within a site and therefore have no external impact on the amenity values of the Heavy Industrial Zones.	Accept in part	59.3
FS1341.46	Hynds Pipe Systems Limited	Support	Null	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This submission supports the industrial strategic growth node along McDonald Road an in particular the importance of appropriate land to enable heavy industrial use. Importantly the submission seeks to protect the location of Heavy Industrial Zone land from encroachment by sensitive activities and proposal for residential rezoning. Hynds supports the submission as it relates to these matters because it is also concerned that rezoning of land adjacent to the Heavy Industrial land will create reverse sensitivity effects on the existing and proposed industrial business operations. Ensuring there is no encroachment by sensitive activities on the heavy industrial land is the most appropriate way for the Council to exercise its functions and to ensure the efficiency and effectiveness of the proposed plan provisions. 	Accept in part	59.3
FS1306.39	Hynds Foundation	Support	Support.	Hynds Foundation support this submission as it would enable and encourage Heavy Industrial to site within the appropriate zone.	Accept in part	59.3
FS1345.60	Genesis Energy Limited	Support	Accept submission point in part.	For the reasons provided in the Synlait Milk submission, subject to the exact wording of the amendments.	Accept in part	59.3
581.30	Penny Gallagher for Synlait Milk Ltd	Oppose	Amend Rule 21.3.1 PI (ii) Height - general as follows: 20 25m over the balance of the net site area.	Large buildings can be anticipated within the Heavy Industrial zone and may require height above 20m to accommodate the activities and storage associated with warehousing and distribution activities.	Reject	62.2
FS1306.40	Hynds Foundation	Support		Hynds Foundation support this submission as it would enable and encourage Heavy Industrial to site within the appropriate zone.	Reject	62.2
FS1341.47	Hynds Pipe Systems Limited	Support		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This submission supports the industrial strategic growth node along McDonald Road an in particular the importance of appropriate land to enable heavy industrial use. Importantly the 	Reject	62.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				submission seeks to protect the location of Heavy Industrial Zone land from encroachment by sensitive activities and proposal for residential rezoning. • Hynds supports the submission as it relates to these matters because it is also concerned that rezoning of land adjacent to the Heavy Industrial land will create reverse sensitivity effects on the existing and proposed industrial business operations. • Ensuring there is no encroachment by sensitive activities on the heavy industrial land is the most appropriate way for the Council to exercise its functions and to ensure the efficiency and effectiveness of the proposed plan provisions.		
581.31	Penny Gallagher for Synlait Milk Ltd	Oppose	Delete the requirement for a recession plane in the Heavy Industrial Zone in Rule 21.3.3 Daylight admission, except where a Heavy Industrial Zone site adjoins a Residential Zone site.	Heavy Industrial Zones are where activities with the potential to create more adverse environmental effects are located within a district. The land values, activities and large buildings require a high degree of land use efficiency. These factors do not support a high degree of amenity access and therefore the inclusion of recession plane control is unnecessary and results in inefficient land use within the Heavy Industrial Zone.	Accept in part	63.1
FS1341.48	Hynds Pipe Systems Limited	Support	Null	• This submission supports the industrial strategic growth node along McDonald Road an in particular the importance of appropriate land to enable heavy industrial use. Importantly the submission seeks to protect the location of Heavy Industrial Zone land from encroachment by sensitive activities and proposal for residential rezoning. • Hynds supports the submission as it relates to these matters because it is also concerned that rezoning of land adjacent to the Heavy Industrial land will create reverse sensitivity effects on the existing and proposed industrial business operations. • Ensuring there is no encroachment by sensitive activities on the heavy industrial land is the most appropriate way for the Council to exercise its functions and to ensure the efficiency and effectiveness of the proposed plan provisions.	Accept in part	63.1
FS1306.41	Hynds Foundation	Support	Support.	Hynds Foundation support this submission as it would enable and encourage Heavy Industrial to site within the appropriate zone.	Accept in part	63.1
581.38	Penny Gallagher for Synlait	Not Stated	Add a new rule to Rule 21.2.7.2 Signs - Effects on		Reject	60.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
	Milk Ltd		traffic to permit signs for way-finding, healthy and safety and other regulatory requirements e.g. signage required for storage of hazardous substances.			
FS1341.55	Hynds Pipe Systems Limited	Support	Null	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This submission supports the industrial strategic growth node along McDonald Road and in particular the importance of appropriate land to enable heavy industrial use. Importantly the submission seeks to protect the location of Heavy Industrial Zone land from encroachment by sensitive activities and proposal for residential rezoning. Hynds supports the submission as it relates to these matters because it is also concerned that rezoning of land adjacent to the Heavy Industrial land will create reverse sensitivity effects on the existing and proposed industrial business operations. Ensuring there is no encroachment by sensitive activities on the heavy industrial land is the most appropriate way for the Council to exercise its functions and to ensure the efficiency and effectiveness of the proposed plan provisions. 	Reject	60.1
FS1345.61	Genesis Energy Limited	Support	Accept submission point in part.	For the reasons provided in the Synlait Milk submission, subject to the exact wording of the amendments.	Reject	60.1
588.25	Peter Buchan for Woolworths NZ Ltd	Neutral/Amend	<p>Add a rule within Section 20.1 Land Use - Activities as follows: 20.1 [x] Restricted Discretionary Activities RDI (a) Supermarkets (b) The Council's discretion shall be limited to the following matters: i. Reverse sensitivity effects on industrial areas ii. Effects on vitality and amenity of nearby Business Town Centre zones.</p> <p>AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential or alternative relief to give effect to the specific amendments sought.</p>	Non-industrial activity that does not undermine the integrity of the Industrial Zone, in terms of avoiding reverse sensitivity, and compatible, should be able to be assessed via a resource consent process. Seeks that supermarkets be provided for as a restricted discretionary activity within the Industrial Zone and the assessment criteria appropriately address any potential effects on the amenity and vitality of town centres and reverse sensitivity effects on industrial activities.	Reject	20.3.1
FS1388.978	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	Accept	20.3.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>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>FS1087.15</i>	<i>Ports of Auckland Limited</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose submission point 588.25.</i>	<i>The use of Industrial-zoned land for supermarket activities has the potential to undermine the supply of industrial land within the Waikato district.</i>	<i>Accept</i>	<i>20.3.1</i>
588.26	Peter Buchan for Woolworths NZ Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 20.2.7.1 Signs - General as follows: P2 ... (c) where the sign is a freestanding sign, it must: A. Not exceed an area of <u>203m²</u> for one sign <u>face</u> and <u>1m²</u> for any other freestanding sign <u>on the site</u> ; B. <u>Must not exceed one sign per site</u> ; and C. Be set back at least 5m from the boundary of any site a Residential, Village or Country Living Zone. ... RD1 ... (b) Council's discretion shall be restricted to the following matters: ... (ix) <u>extent to which the signage is consistent with corporate branding and represents a cohesive visual appearance with the commercial activity on-site.</u> AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential or alternative relief to give effect to the specific amendments sought.	Permitted limits for signage are too prescriptive and unrealistic. Seek an increase in respect of the area per sign face for free-standing signs and suggests a restricted discretionary activity status is appropriate. Assessment of signage in commercial zones needs to consider the importance of corporate branding for consistency and cohesion and consideration sits alongside the urban design aspirations within the district. Effects arising from signage can be appropriately assessed via a restricted discretionary activity assessment.	Reject	26.2.1
<i>FS1323.84</i>	<i>Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>That the amendment sought is declined.</i>	<i>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.</i>	<i>Accept</i>	<i>26.2.1</i>
588.27	Peter Buchan for Woolworths NZ Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 20.3.4.1 Building setbacks as follows: P1 (a) A building must be set back at least: (i) 5m from a road boundary; (ii) <u>7.53m</u> from any other boundary where the site adjoins another zone, other than the Heavy Industrial Zone;... RD1 (b) The Council's discretion shall be limited to the following matters: (i) effects on amenity values; (i) (ii) effects on streetscape; (ii) (iii) traffic and road safety; and (iii) (iv). effects on the earth bund located on Lot 17 DP 494347 (53 Holmes Road, Horotiu).	7.5m yard setback from residential zones is excessive. The Auckland Unitary Plan suggests a side and rear yard to residential zones of 3m. Considering a height to boundary control also applies a 3m setback is considered suitable and allows for the efficient use of the commercial sites.	Reject	31.3.1
<i>FS1134.76</i>	<i>Counties Power Limited</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Seeks that the submission point be allowed.</i>	<i>There is no justification to increase the yard setbacks between industrial and other zones to</i>	<i>Reject</i>	<i>31.3.1</i>

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				7.5m and the current proposed rule is acceptable.		
588.55	Peter Buchan for Woolworths NZ Ltd	Support	Retain the objectives and policies for the Industrial Zone in Section 4.6 Industrial and Heavy Industrial.	The objectives and policies for the Industrial Zone as they sensibly allow consideration of non-industrial use in the zone where it is compatible with industrial activities and uses.	Accept in part	5.2
FS1388.990	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	5.2
602.50	Greig Metcalfe	Oppose	Amend Rule 20.2.7.1. 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 relates; (iii) There is no more than 1 real estate header sign measuring 1800mm x 1200mm on one other site; (iv) The sign is not illuminated; (v) The sign does not contain any moving parts, fluorescent, flashing or revolving lights or reflective materials; (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.	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. 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).	Accept in part	26.2.1
FS1323.188	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere	Oppose	That the amendments sought are declined.	The permitted activity signs rules are applicable to	Accept in part	26.2.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
	Taonga			heritage items and Maori Sites and Areas of significance. The additions proposed have the potential to cause adverse effects to these items.		
602.51	Greig Metcalfe	Oppose	<p>Amend Rule 21.2.7.1. 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 relates; (iii) There is no more than 1 real estate header sign measuring 1800mm x 1200mm on one other site; (iv) The sign is not illuminated; (v) The sign does not contain any moving parts, fluorescent, flashing or revolving lights or reflective materials; (vi) The sign does not project into or over road reserve. (vii) <u>Any real estate sign shall be removed from display within 60 days of sale/lease or upon settlement, whichever is the earliest.</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>	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. 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).	Accept in part	59.3
633.51	Alan Henderson for Van Den Brink Group	Oppose	<p>Add the following to include the following permitted activities as a minimum to Rule 20.1.1 Permitted Activities: (a) Hire Centres (b) Wholesale (c) Trade Supply outlet (d) Transport depot (e) Garden Centres (f) Retailing of agricultural and industrial motor vehicles and machinery (g) Processing, storage, distribution and sale (wholesale or retail) of aggregates</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>	There is no activity distinction between those activities provided for in the Heavy Industry zone and Industry zone - the listed permitted activities are the same. This is inconsistent with Policy 4.6.2 which seeks to provide for "different functions" with the zones, but also a "range of activities". The range of permitted activities is too constrained and does not take into account activities which are more land intensive and of a lower amenity value, which should locate in these areas rather than the Business Zone (where they are otherwise provided for as "commercial activities"). These activities could locate in an Industry area (and not be incompatible with surrounding activities) and do not fall under the listed P - P6 and unless specifically	Accept	20.3.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				provided for would therefore default to Non-Complying (under NCI).		
FS1387.51	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	20.3.1
633.52	Alan Henderson for Van Den Brink Group	Oppose	Delete any restrictions on gross floor area from Rule 20.1.1 Permitted Activities. AND Amend Rule 20.1.1 Permitted Activities to allow for any office which is ancillary to a permitted activity. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	There is no reason to restrict offices associated with permitted activities where these support the efficient and effective operation of a permitted activity.	Reject	20.4.1
FS1387.52	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	20.4.1
633.53	Alan Henderson for Van	Oppose	Add the construction of a building for any	The activity status of buildings is unclear.	Accept	20.3.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
	Den Brink Group		permitted activity as a permitted activity (which complies with the development controls) to Rule 20.1.1 Permitted Activities. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	The amendment is needed to clarify the activity status.		
FSI 387.53	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	20.3.1
633.54	Alan Henderson for Van Den Brink Group	Oppose	Delete Rule 20.2.1 Servicing and hours of operation in its entirety. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	This control is without precedent and represents a restrictive an inappropriate regime.	Accept	21.1.1
FSI 187.19	Greig Developments No 2 Limited	Oppose	Oppose submission point 633.54.	Restricting the hours of operation of businesses located in the Industrial zoned land where it adjoins Residential/Village zoned land is highly appropriate as it will assist in reducing reverse sensitivity effects between the two quite different zones. This will assist in and achieving a more appropriate level of amenity given the sensitivities between the two zones.	Reject	21.1.1
633.55	Alan Henderson for Van Den Brink Group	Oppose	Amend Rule 20.2.2 CI Landscape Planting from a Controlled Activity, to become a Permitted Activity instead. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	This control is without precedent and represents a restrictive and inappropriate regime.	Reject	22.1.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
633.56	Alan Henderson for Van Den Brink Group	Oppose	Delete Rule 20.2.2 CI (b) in its entirety. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	This control creates a mandatory requirement for planting of streams irrespective of what the proposal is (for example a car parking shortfall) and without any consideration of the costs associated with the rule.	Reject	22.1.2
633.57	Alan Henderson for Van Den Brink Group	Support	Retain the noise standards in Rule 20.2.3 Noise.	This control is appropriate in managing effects between zones.	Accept	23.2.1
633.58	Alan Henderson for Van Den Brink Group	Neutral/Amend	Add an exclusion to Rule 20.2.4 Glare and Artificial Light spill to ensure that it does not apply between sites in the industrial zones. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	These rules should only apply to sites adjoining a residential, reserve or countryside living zone (similar to the landscape screening and lower noise limits) and should not be applicable between Industrial sites.	Accept	24.1.2
633.59	Alan Henderson for Van Den Brink Group	Support	Retain the earthworks standards in Rule 20.2.5.1 Earthworks - General.	The control is appropriate in managing effects.	Accept	25.3.1
633.60	Alan Henderson for Van Den Brink Group	Oppose	Add clarification that Rule 20.2.7.1 P2 (a) Signs applies to free standing signs only.	There is no reason to restrict signage of buildings to the criteria in (a).	Reject	26.2.1
633.61	Alan Henderson for Van Den Brink Group	Oppose	Amend Rule 20.2.7.1 P2 Signs to increase the area to at least 10m2. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	The signage rules are unnecessarily restrictive in terms of free standing sign size being limited to one sign per site at 3m2. This does not take into account the use of a site for more than one activity and combined with the allowance for all other signs to be 1m2 would create more visual clutter than allowing a larger free standing in the first instance.	Reject	33.3.1
633.62	Alan Henderson for Van Den Brink Group	Oppose	Amend Rule 20.2.7.1 (Signs) to exclude signs from the yard setbacks;	Without the proposed exclusions signs would not be easily visible from the road, as they	Reject	26.2.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			AND If the above relief is not accepted, amend Rule 20.3.3 Daylight Admission to exclude signs; OR Amend the definition of "buildings" in Chapter 13 Definitions to exclude free-standing signs; AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	would be classified as a "building". This will create significant costs of compliance to achieve signage for site identification purposes.		
633.63	Alan Henderson for Van Den Brink Group	Oppose	Amend Rule 20.2.7.2 Signs - Effects on traffic to specify that this rule does not apply to site identification signs. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	It is unclear what is meant by "any sign directed at road users." Arguably any sign for identification of a business could be deemed to be directed at road users. Effects associated with identification signs are already managed by Rule 20.2.7.1.	Reject	26.2.1
633.64	Alan Henderson for Van Den Brink Group	Oppose	Delete Rule 20.2.8 PI (iv) Outdoor Storage of goods for material. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	Any restriction on the percentage of the site allowable to be used for storage should be deleted, as storage activities are permitted. Any visual effects associated with outdoor storage are already mitigated by the maximum height, setback and screening requirements contained in this rule.	Reject	27.1.2
FS1134.73	Counties Power Limited	Support	Seeks that the submission point be allowed.	Any restriction on the percentage of the site allowable for storage use should be deleted, as storage activities are permitted.	Reject	27.1.2
633.65	Alan Henderson for Van Den Brink Group	Oppose	Amend Rule 20.3.1 PI (a) Building Height to increase the maximum height to 18m or greater. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	A height of 18m is similar to that which has already started to develop/establish in the Whangarata Industrial zone and there is no reason for this height to be decreased to 15m.	Reject	28.2.1
633.66	Alan Henderson for Van Den Brink Group	Oppose	Amend Rule 20.3.3 PI Daylight Admission to increase height from 2.5m to 3m. AND Amend Rule 20.3.3 Daylight Admission to specifically exclude roads from any daylight	There is no justification to reduce the height to boundary recession plane to a height which is lower than the previous Franklin provisions when the maximum height has been kept the same. There is no reason to apply a	Accept	30.1.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			admission plane. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	daylight recession plan against roads in the Industrial zones, as these areas are generally lower amenity and less pedestrian trafficked. No reason to apply a daylight restriction against the road network.		
633.67	Alan Henderson for Van Den Brink Group	Support	Retain Rule 20.3.4.1 PI (i) Building setback in relation to the maximum front yard setback of 5m. OR Amend Rule 20.3.4.1 PI(i) Building Setback to have a reduced front yard setback, AND Retain Rule 20.3.4.1 PI (ii) Building setback so that the rule does not apply to boundaries of other industrial zoned sites. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	A front yard setback of 5m is similar to that which has already started to develop/establish in the Whangarata Industrial zone. There is no reason for the setback to be increased. Would support a decrease in setback. Supports the provisions for side yards to only apply to zones other than the Industrial and Heavy Industrial zones. Also backed up with the daylight provisions which also do not apply to adjoining industrial zoned sites.	Accept in part	31.3.1
FS1134.77	Counties Power Limited	Support	Seeks that the submission point be allowed.	There is no justification to increase the yard setbacks between industrial and other zones to 7.5m and the current proposed rule is acceptable.	Reject	31.3.1
633.68	Alan Henderson for Van Den Brink Group	Oppose	Amend Rule 20.3.4.1 PI (ii) Building setbacks to reduce the setback between sites with other zones to 3m. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	There is no justification to increase the yard setbacks between the industrial zoned site with other zones to 7.5m when the previous Franklin provisions were more permissive. The 3m landscape buffer is sufficient. No reason to have an additional 4.5m of building setback.	Accept in part	31.3.1
FS1187.20	Greig Developments No 2 Limited	Oppose	Oppose submission point 633.68.	Providing additional buffer setbacks between sites with other zones is highly appropriate and should be at least 7.5m, particularly where it adjoins a Residential/Village Zone. The additional setback will assist in providing an appropriate buffer between other zones, achieving a more appropriate level of amenity given the sensitivities between the zones.	Accept in part	31.3.1
633.69	Alan Henderson for Van Den Brink Group	Support	Retain Rule 20.4.1 RDI (a) General Subdivision in relation to a minimum lot size of 1,000m ² and average of 2,000m ² . OR Amend Rule 20.4.1 RDI (a) General subdivision to	The proposed lot sizes are considered an efficient use of land for industrial activities. Would also support a decrease in minimum area and average.	Accept	33.3.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			reduce the minimum lot size and average lot size. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.			
FS1387.54	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	33.3.1
633.70	Alan Henderson for Van Den Brink Group	Oppose	Delete Rule 20.4.1 RDI (a) (iii) General Subdivision in relation to the 20% restriction on rear lots. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	The restriction on 20% rear sites creates inefficiencies of land resources. It will significantly reduce the amount of land available for industrial activities (and other similar uses). These types of areas are generally of a "lower amenity" than town centre or residential areas and subject to less pedestrian thoroughfare. There is no reason to restrict the number of rear lots created via subdivision.	Accept	33.3.1
662.52	Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd	Oppose	Amend Rule 20.3.4.2 PI (a) Building setback - Waterbodies as follows: (a) Any building must be setback a minimum of: 30 from: (i) the margin of any: A. Lake over 4ha; and B. Wetland; and C. River bank, other than the Waikato River and Waipa River ... AND Amend Rule 20.3.4.2 Building setback to require the following setback for managed wetlands to match the amendments sought for other zones: <u>10m from a managed wetland</u> AND	A wetland as defined under the RMA is broad reaching and covers many features. Having a nominal setback applied to such a wide variation of water features is inappropriate and introduces significant inefficiencies which is contrary to Part 2 of the RMA and the sustainable management of natural and physical resources. A lake can constitute a large array of waterbodies and therefore a starting point of 4ha should be used before the setback applies.	Reject	31.4.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			Any consequential amendments.			
FS1387.125	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	31.4.1
662.53	Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd	Oppose	Amend Rule 21.3.4.2 PI (a) Building setback - Waterbodies as follows: (a) Any building must be setback a minimum of: 30 from: the margin of any: A. Lake <u>over 4ha</u> ; and B. Wetland; and C. River bank, other than the Waikato River and Waipa River. AND Amend Rule 21.3.4.2 Building setback- water bodies to require the following setback for managed wetlands to match the amendment sought for other zones <u>10m from a managed wetland</u> AND Any consequential amendments.	A wetland as defined under the RMA is broad reaching and covers many features. Having a nominal setback applied to such a wide variation of water features is inappropriate and introduces significant inefficiencies which is contrary to Part 2 of the RMA and the sustainable management of natural and physical resources. A lake can constitute a large array of waterbodies and therefore a starting point of 4ha should be used before the setback applies.	Reject	66.2
FS1387.126	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	Accept	66.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
742.28	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Retain Policy 4.6.2 Provide Industrial Zones with different functions as notified.	The submitter supports Policy 4.6.2 and the recognition of the different types of industrial activities and their relative potential to generate adverse effects.	Accept	9.2
FS1387.853	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Reject	9.2
FS1350.48	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Support	Allow the submission point.	<i>The submission is supported as the provision of a definition of Regionally Significant Infrastructure (reflecting that in the Waikato RPS) would assist in plan interpretation and application on the basis that submission point 924.16 (Genesis Energy Ltd) is allowed and specific policy recognition is provided for Regionally Significant Infrastructure. Such an approach would be consistent with Policy 6.6 of the Waikato RPS which explicitly recognises regionally significant infrastructure.</i>	Accept	9.2
742.29	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Neutral/Amend	Retain Policy 4.6.3 Maintain a sufficient supply of industrial land, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Policy 4.6.3 Maintain a sufficient supply of industrial land as follows: Maintain a sufficient supply of industrial land within strategic industrial nodes to meet the foreseeable future demands, having regard to the requirements of different industries to and avoiding the need for industrial activities to locate in non-industrial zones. AND Request any consequential changes necessary to	The submitter supports the development of accessible, liveable and resilient communities; A key part of this is providing employment opportunities. The Transport Agency also notes that the amount and location of industrial land will need to be reviewed over time based on the changing demands in the Waikato District and as a result of the Hamilton to Auckland Corridor Plan.	Reject	10.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			give effect to the relief sought in the submission.			
FS1387.854	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	10.2
FS1326.12	Holcim (New Zealand) Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	Amendments proposed by the submitter inadequately take into account differing needs for in industrial areas/activities.	Accept	10.2
FS1193.12	Van Den Brink Group	Oppose	Disallow amendments to Policy 4.6.3 proposed by the submitter.	Amendments proposed by the submitter inadequately take into account differing needs for industrial areas/activities.	Accept	10.2
FS1280.4	Dennis and Jan Tickelpenny	Support	Allowed.	The submission supports the policy of maintaining industrial zoned land for Industrial purpose, but notes the comments that the location of industrial land may need to be reviewed as a consequence of changing demand and the Hamilton to Auckland Corridor Plan. We support the submission provided there is no consequential increase in industrial zoned land in Newstead.	Reject	10.2
FS1166.8	Jarod Kowhai Huaki	Support	The submission supports the policy of maintaining industrial zoned land for Industrial purposes, but notes the comments that the location of industrial land may need to be reviewed as a consequence of changing demand and the Hamilton to Auckland Corridor Plan. We support the submission provided there is no consequential increase in industrial zoned land in Newstead.	Allow the retention of Industrial land for Industrial Purposes but disallow zoning of Industrial Land in Newstead	Reject	10.2
FS1183.2	Noel Gordon Smith	Support	Allow the retention of Industrial land for Industrial purposes but disallow zoning of Industrial land in Newstead.	The submission supports the policy of maintaining Industrial zoned land for industrial purposes, but note the comments that the location of industrial land may need to be reviewed as a consequence of changing demand and the Hamilton to Auckland Corridor Plan. We support the	Reject	10.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				submission provided there is no consequential increase in industrial zoned land in Newstead.		
FS1204.4	Christian & Natasha McDean	Support	Allowed.	The submission supports the policy of maintaining industrial zoned land for Industrial purposes, but notes the comments that the location of industrial land may need to be reviewed as a consequence of changing demand and the Hamilton to Auckland Corridor Plan. We support the submission provided there is no consequential increase in industrial zoned land in Newstead.	Reject	10.2
FS1182.5	Newstead Country Preschool	Support	Allow the retention of Industrial land for Industrial Purposes but disallow zoning of Industrial Land in Newstead.	The submission supports the policy of maintaining industrial zoned land for Industrial purposes, but notes the comments that the location of industrial land may need to be reviewed as a consequence of changing demand and the Hamilton to Auckland Corridor Plan. We support the submission provided there is no consequential increase in Industrial zoned land in Newstead.	Reject	10.2
FS1216.4	Newstead Residents Association	Support	Support in part Objective 4.6.3 Maintenance of sufficient Industrial Land supply.	The submission supports the policy of maintaining industrial zoned land for Industrial purposes, but notes the comments that the location of industrial land may need to be reviewed as a consequence of changing demand and the Hamilton to Auckland Corridor Plan. We support the submission provided there is no consequential increase in industrial zoned land in Newstead.	Reject	10.2
FS1322.20	Synlait Milk	Oppose	Disallow that part of the submission which deleted the wording acknowledging the requirements of different industries.	NZTA's proposed amendments to Policy 4.6.3 removes the ability to distinguish between different industrial activities and zones. This overlooks the fact that there are considerable differences in the nature of activities and the potential environmental effects between industry and heavy industry that require recognition and management in the District Plan.	Accept	10.2
FS1157.6	Gordon Downey	Support	The submission supports the policy of maintaining industrial zoned land for Industrial purposes, but notes the comments that the location of industrial land may need to be reviewed as a consequence of changing demand and the Hamilton to Auckland Corridor Plan. We support the submission provided there is no consequential increase in industrial zoned land in Newstead.	Allow the retention of Industrial land for Industrial Purposes but disallow zoning of Industrial Land in Newstead	Reject	10.2
FS1164.10	Tamara Huaki	Support	The submission supports the policy of maintaining industrial zoned land for Industrial purposes, but notes the comments that the location of industrial land may need to be reviewed as a consequence of changing	Allow the retention of Industrial land for Industrial Purposes but disallow zoning of Industrial Land in Newstead	Reject	10.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<i>demand and the Hamilton to Auckland Corridor Plan. We support the submission provided there is no consequential increase in industrial zoned land in Newstead.</i>			
FS1165.8	Pekerangi Kee-Huaki	Support	<i>The submission supports the policy of maintaining industrial zoned land for Industrial purposes, but notes the comments that the location of industrial land may need to be reviewed as a consequence of changing demand and the Hamilton to Auckland Corridor Plan. We support the submission provided there is no consequential increase in industrial zoned land in Newstead.</i>	<i>Allow the retention of Industrial land for Industrial Purposes but disallow zoning of Industrial Land in Newstead</i>	Reject	10.2
FS1149.9	Gavin Lovegrove and Michelle Peddie	Support	<i>The submission supports the policy of maintaining industrial zoned land for Industrial purposes, but notes the comments that the location of industrial land may need to be reviewed as a consequence of changing demand and the Hamilton to Auckland Corridor Plan. We support the submission provided there is no consequential increase in industrial zoned land in Newstead.</i>	<i>Allow the retention of Industrial land for Industrial Purposes but disallow zoning of Industrial Land in Newstead</i>	Reject	10.2
FS1110.21	Synlait Milk Limited	Oppose	<i>NZTA's proposed amendments to Policy 4.6.3 removes the ability to distinguish between different industrial activities and zones. This overlooks the fact that there are considerable differences in the nature of activities and the potential environmental effects between industry and heavy industry that require recognition and management in the District Plan.</i>	<i>That part of the submission which deletes text acknowledging the requirements of different industries.</i>	Reject	10.2
742.30	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Neutral/Amend	Retain Policy 4.6.8 Specific activities within Nau Mai Business Park, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Policy 4.6.8 Specific activities within Nau Mai Business Park to specify what types of activities are anticipated within the Nau Mai Business Park. AND Request any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the submission.	The submitter was involved with previous planning processes in relation to the Nau Mai Business Park and supports the continued development of this area consistent with the outcomes of these processes. There appears to be a typographical error ('specific types activities') in Policy 4.6.8. It is vague as to what outcomes are sought.	Reject	15.2
766.11	Nicky Hogarth for Holcim (New Zealand) Limited	Neutral/Amend	Add the following activities as a minimum to Rule 20.1.1 Permitted Activities: (a) Hire Centers (b) Wholesale (c) Trade Supply Outlet (d) Transport depot (e) Garden Centers (f) Retailing of agricultural and industrial motor vehicles and	Under the Proposed District Plan there is no activity distinction between those activities provide for in the Heavy Industrial Zone and the Industrial Zone whereby the listed permitted activities are the same. This is	Accept	20.3.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p><u>machinery (g) Processing, storage, distribution and sale (wholesale or retail) of aggregates</u> AND Any additional or consequential relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.</p>	<p>inconsistent with Policy 4.6.2 which seeks to provide for different functions within the zones but also a 'range of activities,' as the range of permitted activities is too constrained and does not take into account activities which are more land intrusive and of lower amenity value, which should be located in a Industrial Zone rather than the Business Zone. The area of Business Zoned land nearby in the vicinity of Pokeno is very limited and in close proximity to more services areas (i.e. residential). Activities could reasonably locate in an Industrial Zone and not be incompatible with surrounding activities. As they are not considered under P1-P6 they would default to Non-Complying (NC1).</p>		
FS1387.1145	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<p>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</p>	Reject	20.3.1
766.12	Nicky Hogarth for Holcim (New Zealand) Limited	Oppose	<p>Delete any restriction on gross floor area in Rule 20.1.1- Permitted Activities. AND Amend Rule 20.1.1 Permitted Activities to allow for any office which is ancillary to a permitted activity. AND Any additional or consequential relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.</p>	<p>There is no reason to arbitrary restrict offices associated with permitted activities where these support the efficient and effective operation of a permitted activity.</p>	Reject	20.4.1
FS1387.1146	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</p>	Accept	20.4.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>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>		
766.13	Nicky Hogarth for Holcim (New Zealand) Limited	Neutral/Amend	Add a new permitted activity to Rule 20.1.1 Permitted Activities as follows: <u>The construction of a building for any permitted activity (which complies with the development controls).</u> AND Any additional or consequential relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	The Activity status of building is unclear. The Amendment is needed to clarify activity status.	Reject	20.3.1
FS1387.1147	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	20.3.1
766.14	Nicky Hogarth for Holcim (New Zealand) Limited	Oppose	Delete Rule 20.2.1 Servicing and hours. AND Any additional or consequential relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	This control is without precedent and represents a restrictive and inappropriate regime.	Accept	21.1.1
766.15	Nicky Hogarth for Holcim (New Zealand) Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 20.2.2 Landscape planting by modifying the Controlled Activity requirement for landscape planting to be a Permitted Activity instead.	This control is without precedent and represents a restrictive and inappropriate regime.	Reject	22.1.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			AND Any additional or consequential relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.			
766.16	Nicky Hogarth for Holcim (New Zealand) Limited	Oppose	Delete Rule 20.2.2 CI (b) in its entirety. AND Any additional or consequential relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	This control creates a mandatory requirement for planting of streams irrespective of what the proposal is (e.g. carpark shortfall) and without any consideration of costs associated.	Reject	22.1.2
766.17	Nicky Hogarth for Holcim (New Zealand) Limited	Support	Retain Rule 20.2.3 Noise as notified.	The control is appropriate in managing effects between zones.	Accept	23.2.1
766.18	Nicky Hogarth for Holcim (New Zealand) Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 20.2.4 Glare and Artificial Light Spill to insert an exclusion so that the rule does not apply between sites in the Industrial Zones. AND Any additional or consequential relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	Rules should only apply to sites adjoining a residential, reserve or countryside living zone and should not be applicable between Industrial sites.	Accept	24.1.2
766.19	Nicky Hogarth for Holcim (New Zealand) Limited	Support	Retain the Earthworks standards in Rule 20.2.5.1 Earthworks - General as notified.	The control is appropriate in managing effects.	Accept	25.3.1
766.20	Nicky Hogarth for Holcim (New Zealand) Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 20.2.7.1 P2(a) Signs- General by inserting clarification that (a) applies to free standing signs only. AND Any additional or consequential relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	There is no valid reason to restrict signage of buildings to the criteria in (a).	Reject	26.2.1
766.21	Nicky Hogarth for Holcim (New Zealand) Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 20.2.7.1 P2 Signs- General by increasing the signage rules to allow for at least 10m ² per site. AND Any additional or consequential relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	The signage rules are unnecessarily restrictive in terms of free standing sign size being limited to one sign per site at 3m ² . Does not take into account the use of a site for more than 1 activity. Combined with the allowance for all other signs to be 1m ² would create more visual clutter than allowing a larger free standing sign in the first	Reject	26.2.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				instance.		
766.22	Nicky Hogarth for Holcim (New Zealand) Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 20.2.7.1 Signs- General so that Signs are excluded from yard setbacks. AND Amend Rule 20.3.3 Daylight admission to exclude signs, if the amendments sought on Daylight Admission are not granted. OR Amend the definition of "Building" in Chapter 13 Definitions to exclude free-standing signs. AND Any additional or consequential relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	Without the proposed exclusions, signs will not be easily visible from road as they would be classified as a "building" creating significant costs of compliance to achieve signage for site identification purposes.	Reject	26.2.1
766.23	Nicky Hogarth for Holcim (New Zealand) Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 20.2.7.2 Signs-Effects on traffic to specify that the Rule does not apply to site identification signs. AND Any additional or consequential relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	It is unclear what is meant by "any sign directed at road users" as arguably any sign for identification of a business could be deemed to be directed at a road user, however effects associated with identification signed are already managed by rule 20.2.7.1.	Reject	26.2.1
766.24	Nicky Hogarth for Holcim (New Zealand) Limited	Oppose	Delete Rule 20.2.8 PI (a)(iv) Outdoor storage of goods or materials. AND Any additional or consequential relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	Opposes any restriction on the percentage of the site allowable to be used for storage. Should be deleted as storage activities are permitted. Any associated visual effects with outdoor storage are already mitigated by maximum height, set back and screening requirements contained in this rule.	Awaiting recommendation	27.1.2
<i>FS1134.74</i>	<i>Counties Power Limited</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Seeks that the submission point be allowed.</i>	<i>Any restriction on the percentage of the site allowable for storage use should be deleted, as storage activities are permitted.</i>	<i>Accept</i>	<i>27.1.2</i>
766.25	Nicky Hogarth for Holcim (New Zealand) Limited	Support	Retain 15m as the maximum height or greater in Rule 20.3.1 Building height.	A height of 15m is similar to that which has already started to develop/establish in the Pokeno Light Industrial 2 Zone, and there is no reason for this height to be decreased.	Reject	28.2.1
766.26	Nicky Hogarth for Holcim (New Zealand) Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 20.3.3 Daylight Admission to increase the height from 2.5m to 3m. AND Amend Rule 20.3.3 Daylight Admission to	There is no justification to reduce the height to boundary recession plane, to a height which is lower than the previous Franklin provisions when the maximum heights have	Accept	30.1.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			specifically exclude roads from any daylight admission plane. AND Any additional or consequential relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	been kept the same. There is no reason to apply a daylight recession plane against roads in Industrial Zones as these areas are generally of a lower amenity and have less pedestrian traffic.		
766.27	Nicky Hogarth for Holcim (New Zealand) Limited	Support	Retain Rule 20.3.4.1 PI (a)(i) Building setbacks, which should not be increased. OR Amend Rule 20.3.4.1 PI(a)(i) Building setbacks to be less than 5m. AND Any additional or consequential relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	A front yard setback of 5m is similar to that which has already started to develop/establish in the Pokeno Light Industrial 2 Zone, and there is no reason for setback to be increased. Submitter would support a decrease in setback.	Accept in part	31.3.1
FS1134.78	Counties Power Limited	Support	Seeks that the submission point be allowed.	There is no justification to increase the yard setbacks between industrial and other zones to 7.5m and the current proposed rule is acceptable.	Accept in part	31.3.1
766.28	Nicky Hogarth for Holcim (New Zealand) Limited	Support	Retain Rule 20.3.4.1 PI(a)(ii) Building setbacks so that the setback requirement does not apply to boundaries of other Industrial Zone sites.	Submitter supports provisions for side yards to only apply to zones other than Industrial and Heavy Industrial Zones. This is consistent with daylight provisions which also do not apply to adjoining industrial zoned sites.	Accept	31.3.1
766.29	Nicky Hogarth for Holcim (New Zealand) Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 20.3.4.1 PI(a)(ii) Building setbacks to reduce the setback between sites with other zones to 3m. AND Any additional or consequential relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	There is no justification to increase the yard setbacks between the Industrial Zones and other zones to 7.5m, when previous Franklin provisions were more permissive. The 3m landscape buffer is sufficient and therefore there is no reason to have an additional 4.5m building setback.	Reject	31.3.1
766.30	Nicky Hogarth for Holcim (New Zealand) Limited	Support	Retain Rule 20.4.1 RDI(a)(i) General subdivision requiring new lots to have a minimum net site area of 1000m ² OR Amend Rule 20.4.1 RDI(a)(i) General subdivision to have a minimum net site area of less than 1000m ² AND Any additional or consequential relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	Proposed lot sizes are considered an efficient use of land for industrial activities. Submitter would also support a decrease in minimum area and average.	Accept in part	33.3.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
766.31	Nicky Hogarth for Holcim (New Zealand) Limited	Support	Retain Rule 20.4.1 RD1(a)(ii) general subdivision requiring new lots to have an average area of at least 2000m2 OR Amend Rule 20.4.1 RD1(a)(ii) General subdivision to have an average lot size of less than 2000m2. AND Any additional or consequential relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	Proposed lot sizes are considered an efficient use of land for industrial activities. Submitter would also support a decrease in minimum area and average.	Accept in part	33.3.1
FS1387.1148	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept in part	33.3.1
766.34	Nicky Hogarth for Holcim (New Zealand) Limited	Support	Retain Objective 4.6.1 Economic growth of industry insofar as it gives effect to the relief sought.	Submitter supports objective to the extent that its land retains proposed Industrial Zone. Land Use provisions are missing the enabling provisions to support economic growth.	Accept	8.2
FS1387.1149	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	Reject	8.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
766.35	Nicky Hogarth for Holcim (New Zealand) Limited	Support	Retain Policy 4.6.2 Provide Industrial Zones with different functions insofar as it gives effect to the relief sought.	Submitter supports intention of the policy to enable a range of activities however this is not reflected in the Land Use provisions. Supports the policy insofar as it gives effect to the relief sought.	Accept	9.2
<i>FS1387.1150</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>9.2</i>
766.36	Nicky Hogarth for Holcim (New Zealand) Limited	Support	Retain Policy 4.6.3 Maintain a sufficient supply of industrial land as notified insofar as it gives effect to the relief sought.	Submitter supports intention of the policy to enable a sufficient supply of Industrial Zoned land. Support the policy insofar as it gives effect to the relief sought.	Accept	10.2
<i>FS1387.1151</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>10.2</i>
766.37	Nicky Hogarth for Holcim (New Zealand) Limited	Support	Retain Policy 4.6.4 Maintain industrial land for industrial purposes as notified insofar as it gives	Submitter supports the intention of the policy to enable ancillary activities related to	Awaiting recommendation	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			effect to the relief sought.	industrial activities; however this is not reflected in land use provisions. Support the policy insofar as it gives effect to the relief sought.		
FS1387.1152	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.	Awaiting recommendation	
766.38	Nicky Hogarth for Holcim (New Zealand) Limited	Support	Retain Policy 4.6.5 Recognition of industrial activities outside of urban areas as notified insofar as it gives effect to the relief sought.	Submitter supports intention of policy to recognise and provide for existing industrial activities; however this is not reflected in land use provisions. Support the policy insofar as it gives effect to the relief sought.	Accept	12.2
FS1387.1153	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	12.2
766.39	Nicky Hogarth for Holcim (New Zealand) Limited	Support	Retain Objective 4.6.6 Manage adverse effects as notified insofar as it gives effect to the relief sought.	Submission supports the intention of the objective to manage adverse effects on sensitive activities in other zones and ecosystems; however, the provisions are unnecessarily restrictive and could be	Accept	13.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				modified as per the submitter's relief to achieve the same outcome.		
766.40	Nicky Hogarth for Holcim (New Zealand) Limited	Support	Retain Policy 4.6.7 Management of adverse effects within industrial zones insofar as it gives effect to the relief sought.	Submitter supports the intention of this objective to manage adverse effects on sensitive activities in other zones and ecosystems, however provisions are unnecessarily restrictive and could be modified as per the submitter's relief to achieve the same outcome.	Accept in part	14.2
766.50	Nicky Hogarth for Holcim (New Zealand) Limited	Oppose	Delete Rule 20.4.1 RDI (a)(iii) General subdivision requiring no more than 20% rear lots to be created. AND Any additional or consequential relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	The 20% restriction on rear sites creation results in inefficiencies of land resources, which are already scarce, as it will significantly reduce the amount of land available for industrial activities. These areas are generally of a lower amenity than town centre/residential areas and subject to less pedestrian thoroughfare therefore there is no reason for such restrictions.	Accept	33.3.1
766.56	Nicky Hogarth for Holcim (New Zealand) Limited	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, but the submission expresses the following concerns with the Industrial Zone: The use of outdated Waikato Section controls in the former Franklin Section, and these are more conservative and less enabling than the provisions of the current Franklin Section. The proposed Industrial Zone is significantly more restrictive than the Light Industrial Zone being applied by Auckland Council in Pukekohe, Waiuku and Drury South. The proposed Industrial Zone is less enabling than the existing Operative Industrial Zones are applied at Tuakau and Pokeno. Rules are outdated and less effective and efficient when compared with Industrial Zones applying to the current Franklin Section and other Districts where industrial activities are enabled.	If the rules for development are too onerous, industrial development and hence employment will move to a more enabling Industrial Zone in Auckland or another region. Does not support economic development, employment and the provision of wellbeing in the Waikato District. Council is placing industrial zoned land at a competitive disadvantage when compared with Auckland.	Reject	36.2
781.24	Ministry of Education	Oppose	Amend Rule 20.1.1 P2 Permitted Activities as follows: P2 Trade and industry training activity Any education facility which is not incidental to a trade and industry training activity is a restricted	The Ministry supports the permitted activity status for trade and industry training activities, although education facilities that are not incidental to these activities may need to be	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p>discretionary activity.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Add a new restricted discretionary activity rule for educational facilities in the Industrial Zone as follows: <u>20.1.2 Restricted Discretionary Activities</u> (1) <u>The activities listed below are restricted discretionary activities.</u> (2) <u>Discretion to grant or decline consent and impose conditions is restricted to the matters of discretion set out in the following table.</u> <u>Activity RDI Education Facilities Matters of discretion</u> <u>The extent to which it is necessary to locate the activity within the Industrial Zone.</u> <u>Reverse sensitivity effects of adjacent activities.</u> <u>The extent to which the activity may adversely impact on the transport network.</u> <u>The extent to which the activity may adversely impact on the streetscape.</u> <u>The extent to which the activity may adversely impact on the noise environment.</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend Rule 20.1.3 Non-Complying Activities as follows: <u>NC1 Any activity that is not listed as a permitted, restricted discretionary or discretionary activity.</u></p>	located in industrial areas as a convenience to parents and students and should not be non-complying activities. Education facilities that are not incidental to trade and industry training need to be considered as a restricted discretionary activity rather than a non-complying activity.		
FS1387.1223	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
FS1345.130	Genesis Energy Limited	Oppose	Reject submission point.	While Genesis appreciates the intent of this submission, it is considered that Discretionary Activity status rather than Restricted Discretionary Status is more appropriate for these type of	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>sensitive activities within a lower amenity environment such as the industrial zone.</i>		
781.25	Ministry of Education	Support	<p>Amend Rule 20.5.2 P10 Permitted Activities as follows: Activity P10 <u>Education facilities</u> Activity-specific conditions For no more than 10 students <u>Any education facility which exceeds this number of staff or students is a restricted discretionary activity</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Add a new restricted discretionary activity rule to provide for educational facilities in the Nau Mai Business Park as follows: <u>20.5.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities (1) The activities listed below are restricted discretionary activities. (2) Discretion to grant or decline consent and impose conditions is restricted to the matters of discretion set out in the following table. Activity RDI Education facilities Matters of discretion The extent to which it is necessary to locate the activity within the Nau Mai Business Park Specific Area. Reverse sensitivity effects of adjacent activities. The extent to which the activity may adversely impact on the transport network. The extent to which the activity may adversely impact on the streetscape. The extent to which the activity may adversely impact on the noise environment.</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend Rule 20.5.4 Non-Complying Activities as follows: NCI Any activity that is not listed as a permitted activity Rule 20.5.2 or <u>restricted discretionary.</u></p>	<p>Many education facilities may need to be located within the Nau Mai Business Park that will exceed the maximum of 10 students and a non-complying activity status is not appropriate. The inference is that the submitter requests consistency with their requested definition of 'Education facilities'. Education facilities in the Nau Mai Business Park that involve more than 10 students need to be considered as a restricted discretionary activity rather than a non-complying activity.</p>	Reject	34.2.1
<i>FS1202.84</i>	<i>New Zealand Transport Agency</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support submission point 781.25.</i>	<i>The Transport Agency supports the inclusion of c. the extent to which the activity may adversely impact on the transport network.</i>	<i>Reject</i>	<i>34.2.1</i>
781.26	Ministry of Education	Neutral/Amend	<p>Amend Rule 21.1.1 P2 Permitted Activities as follows: P2 Trade and industry training activity <u>Any education facility which is not incidental to a trade and industry training activity is a restricted discretionary activity.</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Add a new restricted discretionary activity rule for educational facilities as follows: <u>21.1.2 Restricted Discretionary Activities (1) The activities listed below are restricted discretionary activities. (2)</u></p>	<p>Supports the activity status for trade and industry training programs. Education facilities in the Industrial Zone Heavy that involve more than 10 students need to be considered as a restricted discretionary activity rather than a non-complying activity. Other education facilities such as tertiary education institutions and early childhood education centres may need to be located in industrial areas for the convenience</p>	Reject	50.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p><u>Discretion to grant or decline consent and impose conditions is restricted to the matters of discretion set out in the following table. Activity RDI Education Facilities Matters of discretion</u> <u>The extent to which it is necessary to locate the activity within the Industrial Zone Heavy.</u> <u>Reverse sensitivity effects of adjacent activities.</u> <u>The extent to which the activity may adversely impact on the transport network.</u> <u>The extent to which the activity may adversely impact on the streetscape.</u> <u>The extent to which the activity may adversely impact on the noise environment</u> AND Amend Rule 21.1.3 NCI Non-Complying Activities as follows: NCI: Any activity that is not listed as a permitted, <u>restricted discretionary</u> or discretionary activity.</p>	of parents and student. Education facilities in the Industrial Zone Heavy that are not incidental to a trade and industry training activity need to be considered as a restricted discretionary activity.		
FS1387.1224	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	50.1
FS1345.131	Genesis Energy Limited	Oppose	Reject submission point.	While Genesis appreciates the intent of this submission, it is considered that Discretionary Activity status rather than Restricted Discretionary Status is more appropriate for these type of sensitive activities within a lower amenity environment such as the Heavy Industrial Zone.	Accept	50.1
FS1202.85	New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Support submission point 781.26.	The Transport Agency supports the inclusion of c. the extent to which the activity may adversely impact on the transport network.	Awaiting recommendation	50.1
785.17	Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Limited and Mobil Oil	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 20.2.5.1 PI Earthworks - General, except for the amendments sought below;	The submitter seeks the retention of Rule 20.2.5.1.PI, subject to the deletion of the	Accept	25.3.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
	NZ Limited for 'Oil Companies'		<p>AND</p> <p>Amend Rule 20.2.5.1.P1 - Earthworks - General, as follows: P1 (a) Earthworks (excluding the importation of fill material) within a site must meet all of the following conditions: (vi) earthworks are set back 1.5m from all boundaries; (vii) Areas exposed by earthworks are re-vegetated to achieve 80% ground cover within 6 months of the commencement, or stabilised as soon as practicable at the completion of the earthworks; (viii) Sediment resulting from the earthworks is retained on the site through implementation and maintenance of erosion and sediment controls; and (ix) Do not divert or change the nature of natural water flows, water bodies or established drainage paths.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments or additional relief to give effect to the submission.</p>	<p>setback from boundaries standard and to clarify that earthwork areas must be stabilized, which may or may not include re-vegetation. There is no justification for setting all earthworks back 1.5m from the boundary. This control is not within the Business Zone or Business Town Centre Zone. The definition of earthworks would render a post hole within 1.5m of a boundary as a restricted discretionary activity (i.e earthworks within 1.5m of a boundary). In the absence of a Section 32 Report justifying its inclusion, it is considered that this control is unnecessary and unjustified and should be deleted. The submitter supports the intent of the requirement to re-vegetate exposed areas within 6 months of the commencement of earthworks as per P1 (a)(iv) - ie: to achieve stabilization of the exposed surface. However it is considered inappropriate to simply require areas exposed by earthworks to be re-vegetated. For example, earth-worked areas that are to be finished in hardstand will be stabilized, but will not be re-vegetated. Therefore, the submitter considers it appropriate to include additional wording to clause P1 (a) (vii) to ensure areas disturbed by earthworks are stabilized (which may or may not include re-vegetation) to avoid potential erosion and sediment issues effect. P1 (a) (iv) provides for the total depth of any excavation or filling at 1.5m above or below ground level. P2 (a) (ii) restricts imported fill material to 1m. This is contrary to the 1.5m maximum permitted depth provided through P1 (a) (iv). Therefore the submitter seeks the maximum permitted depth of imported fill material to 1.5m (from 1m). The intent of the difference in levels is not known in the absence of justification via a Section 32 Report. The control is unnecessary and unjustified and should be deleted.</p>		

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
785.18	Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Limited and Mobil Oil NZ Limited for 'Oil Companies'	Neutral/Amend	<p>Retain Rule 21.2.5.1 PI Earthworks - General, except for the amendments sought below; AND Amend Rule 21.2.5.1 PI Earthworks - General as follows: PI (a) Earthworks (excluding the importation of fill material) within a site must meet all of the following conditions: ... (vi) earthworks are set back 1.5m from all boundaries; (vii) Areas exposed by earthworks are re-vegetated to achieve 80% ground cover within 6 months of the commencement, or stabilised as soon as practicable at the completion of the earthworks; (viii) Sediment resulting from the earthworks is retained on the site through implementation and maintenance of erosion and sediment controls; and (ix) Do not divert or change the nature of natural water flows, water bodies or established drainage paths. AND Any consequential amendments or additional relief to give effect to the submission.</p>	<p>The submitter seeks the retention of Rules 20.2.5.1.PI and 21.2.5.1.PI subject to the deletion of the setback from boundaries standard and to clarify that earthwork areas must be stabilized, which may or may not include re-vegetation. There is no justification for setting all earthworks back 1.5m from the boundary. This control is not within the Business Zone or Business Town Centre Zone. The definition of earthworks would render a post hole within 1.5m of a boundary as a restricted discretionary activity (i.e earthworks within 1.5m of a boundary). In the absence of a Section 32 Report justifying its inclusion, it is considered that this control is unnecessary and unjustified and should be deleted. The submitter supports the intent of the requirement to re-vegetate exposed areas within 6 months of the commencement of earthworks as per PI (a)(iv) - ie: to achieve stabilization of the exposed surface. It is considered inappropriate to simply require areas exposed by earthworks to be re-vegetated. For example, earth-worked areas that are to be finished in hardstand will be stabilized, but will not be re-vegetated. Therefore, the submitter considers it appropriate to include additional wording to clause PI (a) (vii) to ensure areas disturbed by earthworks are stabilized (which may or may not include re-vegetation) to avoid potential erosion and sediment issues effect. PI (a) (iv) provides for the total depth of any excavation or filling at 1.5m above or below ground level. P2 (a) (ii) restricts imported fill material to 1m. This is contrary to the 1.5m maximum permitted depth provided through PI (a) (iv). The submitter seeks the maximum permitted depth of imported fill material to 1.5m (from 1m). The intent of the difference in levels is not known in the absence of justification via a Section 32 Report. The control is unnecessary and unjustified and should be deleted.</p>	Accept	58.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
785.19	Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Limited and Mobil Oil NZ Limited for 'Oil Companies'	Not Stated	Delete Rule 20.2.5.1 P2 - Earthworks - General. AND Any consequential amendments or additional relief to give effect to the submission.	Rule 20.2.5.1.P2 permits earthworks for the purpose of creating a building platform for residential purposes within the Industrial Zone. Residential activities are non-complying activities in this zone and therefore it is not considered appropriate to include a permitted activity rule for residential activities within the zone.	Accept	25.3.1
785.20	Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Limited and Mobil Oil NZ Limited for 'Oil Companies'	Oppose	Delete Rule 21.2.5.1 P2 - Earthworks - General. AND Any consequential amendments or additional relief to give effect to the submission.	Rule 21.2.5.1.P2 permits earthworks for the purpose of creating a building platform for residential purposes within the Industrial Zone Heavy. Residential activities are non-complying activities in this zone (a status that the Oil Companies support) and therefore it is not considered appropriate to include a permitted activity rule for residential activities within the zone.	Accept	58.3
785.21	Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Limited and Mobil Oil NZ Limited for 'Oil Companies'	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 20.2.5.1 P3 Earthworks - General, except for the amendments sought below; AND Amend Rule 20.2.5.1 P3 Earthworks - General, as follows: (a) Earthworks for purposes other than creating a building platform for residential purposes within a site, using imported fill material (excluding <u>cleanfill</u>) must meet all of the following conditions: (i) not exceed a total volume of 500m ³ ; (ii) not exceed a depth of 1.5m; (iii) the slope of the resulting filled area in stable ground must not exceed a maximum slope of 1:2 (1 vertical to 2 horizontal); (iv) fill material is setback 1.5m from all boundaries; (v) areas exposed by filling are re-vegetated to achieve 80% ground cover within 6 months of the commencement, <u>or stabilised as soon as practicable at the completion</u> of the earthworks; (vi) sediment resulting from the filling is retained on the site through implementation and maintenance of erosion and sediment controls; and Do not divert or change the nature of natural water flows, water bodies or established drainage paths. AND	The submitter seeks the retention of Rule 20.2.5.1.P3 subject to clarification that earthwork areas must be stabilized, (which may or may not include re-vegetation) and an increase in depth of fill allowed from 1m to 1.5m. The submitter supports the intent of the requirement to re-vegetate groundcover within 6 months of the commencement of earthworks as per P3 (a) (v) - ie: to achieve stabilization of the exposed surface. However, it is considered inappropriate to simply require areas exposed by earthworks to be re-vegetated. For example, earth-worked areas that are to be finished in hardstand will be stabilized, but will not be re-vegetated. The submitter considers it appropriate to include additional wording to clause P3 (a)(v) to ensure areas disturbed by earthworks are stabilized (which may include re-vegetation) to avoid potential erosion and sediment issues effects. P1 (a) (iv) provides for the total depth of any excavation or filling at 1.5m above or below ground level. P3 (a) (iii) restricts imported fill	Awaiting recommendation	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			Any consequential amendments or additional relief to give effect to the submission.	material to 1m. This is contrary to the 1.5m maximum permitted depth provided through P1 (a) (iv). Therefore the submitter seeks the maximum permitted depth of imported fill material to 1.5m (from 1m). The intent of the difference in levels is not known in the absence of justification via a Section 32 Report. The control is unnecessary and unjustified and should be deleted.		
785.22	Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Limited and Mobil Oil NZ Limited for 'Oil Companies'	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 21.2.5.1 P3 Earthworks - General, except for the amendments sought below; AND Amend Rule 21.2.5.1.P3 - Earthworks - General, as follows: Earthworks for purposes other than creating a building platform for residential purposes within a site, using imported fill material (excluding <u>cleanfill</u>) must meet all of the following conditions: not exceed a total volume of 500m ³ ; not exceed a depth of 1.5m; the slope of the resulting filled area in stable ground must not exceed a maximum slope of 1:2 (1 vertical to 2 horizontal); fill material is setback 1.5m from all boundaries; areas exposed by filling are re-vegetated to achieve 80% ground cover within 6 months of the commencement, <u>or stabilised as soon as practicable at the completion</u> of the earthworks; sediment resulting from the filling is retained on the site through implementation and maintenance of erosion and sediment controls; and do not divert or change the nature of natural water flows, water bodies or established drainage paths. AND Any consequential amendments or additional relief to give effect to the submission.	The submitter seeks the retention of Rule 21.2.5.1.P3 subject to clarification that earthwork areas must be stabilized, (which may or may not include re-vegetation) and an increase in depth of fill allowed from 1m to 1.5m. The submitter supports the intent of the requirement to re-vegetate groundcover within 6 months of the commencement of earthworks as per P3 (a) (v) - ie: to achieve stabilization of the exposed surface. However, it is considered inappropriate to simply require areas exposed by earthworks to be re-vegetated. For example, earth-worked areas that are to be finished in hardstand will be stabilized, but will not be re-vegetated. Therefore, the submitter considers it appropriate to include additional wording to clause P3 (a)(v) to ensure areas disturbed by earthworks are stabilized (which may include re-vegetation) to avoid potential erosion and sediment issues effects. P1 (a) (iv) provides for the total depth of any excavation or filling at 1.5m above or below ground level. P3 (a) (iii) restricts imported fill material to 1m. This is contrary to the 1.5m maximum permitted depth provided through P1 (a) (iv). Therefore the submitter seeks the maximum permitted depth of imported fill material to 1.5m (from 1m). The intent of the difference in levels is not known in the absence of justification via a Section 32 Report. The control is unnecessary and unjustified and should be deleted.	Accept	58.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
785.23	Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Limited and Mobil Oil NZ Limited for 'Oil Companies'	Support	Retain Rule 20.2.5.1 RD1 Earthworks - General as notified.	The submitter supports the Restricted Discretionary activity status for earthworks that do not comply with the permitted activity criteria. Any potential adverse effects resulting from earthworks can be adequately managed and controlled by way of matters of discretion.	Accept	25.3.1
785.24	Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Limited and Mobil Oil NZ Limited for 'Oil Companies'	Support	Retain Rule 21.2.5.1 RD1 Earthworks - General as notified.	The submitter supports the Restricted Discretionary activity status for earthworks that do not comply with the permitted activity criteria. Any potential adverse effects resulting from earthworks can be adequately managed and controlled by way of matters of discretion.	Accept	58.3
785.27	Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Limited and Mobil Oil NZ Limited for 'Oil Companies'	Support	Retain Rule 20.2.3.2 Noise - Construction as notified.	The submitter supports the measurement and assessment of construction noise against the limits in NZS 6803:1999 Acoustics - Construction Noise. The submitter supports a restricted discretionary activity requirement for construction noise which exceeds those limits identified within NZS 6803:1999.	Reject	23.4.1
785.28	Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Limited and Mobil Oil NZ Limited for 'Oil Companies'	Support	Retain Rule 21.2.3.3 Noise - Construction as notified.	The submitter supports the measurement and assessment of construction noise against the limits in NZS 6803:1999 Acoustics - Construction Noise. The submitter supports a restricted discretionary activity requirement for construction noise which exceeds those limits identified within NZS 6803:1999.	Reject	56.1
785.31	Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Limited and Mobil Oil NZ Limited for 'Oil Companies'	Support	Retain Rule 20.2.4 Glare and artificial light spill as notified.	The submitter supports the maximum permitted light spill standard (i.e. 10 lux). The submitter supports a restricted discretionary activity requirement for non-compliance with the permitted glare and artificial lighting standards. The potential adverse effects from glare and artificial lighting can adequately be managed and controlled through matters of discretion.	Accept in part	24.1.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
785.40	Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Limited and Mobil Oil NZ Limited for 'Oil Companies'	Neutral/Amend	Add a new activity to Rule 20.1.1 Permitted Activities, as follows: <u>Service Station activity</u> Activity Specific Conditions: Nil OR Retain commercial and retail activities as permitted activities in Rule 20.1.1 Permitted Activities, with service stations being clearly defined as one or both activities. AND Any consequential amendments or further relief to give effect to the submission.	The activity status of service stations in the Industrial Zone is considered inappropriate and inefficient. Service stations are inappropriately categorised as discretionary or non-complying activities within the Industrial Zone (assuming they are considered to be a retail activity or commercial activity respectively). Service stations should be permitted activities in the Industrial Zone. The submitter has sought to include a new definition for a 'service station activity'. The submitter's service station activities are afforded the following Industrial zoning under the proposed District Plan: - Z Huntly - BP Ngaruawahia.	Reject in part	20.3.1
785.50	Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Limited and Mobil Oil NZ Limited for 'Oil Companies'	Support	Retain Rule 21.2.4 Glare and artificial light spill as notified.	The submitter supports the maximum permitted light spill standard (i.e. 10 lux). The submitter supports a restricted discretionary activity requirement for non-compliance with the permitted glare and artificial lighting standards. The potential adverse effects from glare and artificial lighting can adequately be managed and controlled through matters of discretion.	Accept in part	57.2
785.53	Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Limited and Mobil Oil NZ Limited for 'Oil Companies'	Neutral/Amend	Add a new Permitted Activity Rule to Chapter 20 - Industrial Zone as follows: <u>PX Any Healthy and Safety signage required by legislation.</u> AND Add an additional definition (if necessary) of 'health and safety' sign as follows: <u>Health and Safety sign means any sign necessary to meet other legislative requirements (e.g. HSNO/Work-safe).</u> AND Any consequential amendments or additional relief to give effect to the submission.	There is no existing provision for Health and Safety signs - a new provision is sought by the submitter who opposes this omission. The submitter seeks a permitted activity rule in Chapter 20 to provide for health and safety required by legislation. The proposed policy framework does not exempt health and safety signage or signage required by legislation. It is not appropriate or necessary to require such signage to be assessed against the Proposed District Plan signage provisions and therefore a dedicated permitted activity rules is required. If further clarification of what is considered of what is considered as 'health and safety' signs is required then a definition that includes any signs required by other legislation, should be	Reject	26.2.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				adopted.		
785.54	Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Limited and Mobil Oil NZ Limited for 'Oil Companies'	Neutral/Amend	Add a new Permitted Activity Rule to Chapter 21 - Industrial Zone Heavy as follows: <u>PX Any Health and Safety signage required by legislation.</u> AND Add an additional definition (if necessary) of 'health and safety' sign as follows: <u>Health and Safety sign means any sign necessary to meet other legislative requirements (e.g. HSNO/Work-safe).</u> AND Any consequential amendments or additional relief to give effect to the submission.	There is no existing provision for Health and Safety signs - a new provision is sought by the submitter who opposes this omission. The submitter seeks a permitted activity rule in Chapter 21 to provide for health and safety required by legislation. The proposed policy framework does not exempt health and safety signage or signage required by legislation. It is not appropriate or necessary to require such signage to be assessed against the Proposed District Plan signage provisions and therefore a dedicated permitted activity rules is required. If further clarification of what is considered of what is considered as 'health and safety' signs is required then a definition that includes any signs required by other legislation, should be adopted.	Accept in part	59.3
FS1345.63	Genesis Energy Limited	Support	Accept submission point.	For the reasons provided in the Oil Companies submission.	Accept in part	59.3
785.58	Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Limited and Mobil Oil NZ Limited for 'Oil Companies'	Neutral/Amend	Add to Chapter 4.6 Industrial and Heavy Industrial Zones new policies as follows: <u>4.6.10 - Policy - Signage (a) In the Industrial Zone and Industrial Heavy Zone, provided for: (i) The establishment of signs where they are associated with the activity carried out on the site on which they are located; (ii) Public information and Health and Safety signs that are of benefit to community well-being; and (iii) Establishment of signage commensurate with the lower amenity and industrial function of the zones with controls on the size, location appearance and number of signs to ensure they do not detract from the visual amenity of the surrounding environment.</u> <u>4.6.11 - Policy- Managing the adverse effects of signs (a) In the Industrial Zone and Industrial Heavy Zone ensure that: (i) The location, colour, content and appearance of signs directed at traffic are controlled to ensure signs do not distract, confuse or obstruct motorists, pedestrians and other road users; (ii) Signs that generate adverse effects from illumination, light spill, flashing or reflection are avoided; (iii) the placement of signs do not</u>	The submitter seeks a similar Policy to 4.5.36 and 4.5.37 are incorporated into the Industrial and Heavy Zones, including the proposed amendment sought by the submitter with regards to Health and Safety signage and a reference to industrial rather than commercial function of the zone and the lower amenity of the industrial zone (as opposed to the 'commercial vibrancy' referenced in the policy relevant to the business zones), to complement the proposed signage rule framework. There is no proposed policy framework for signage within the Industrial and Heavy Industrial Zones framework. The submitter seeks that the policy framework proposed in the Business Zone and Business Town Centre Zone is carried across to the Industrial Heavy policy framework.	Accept in part	6.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p>obstruct the free movement of: Pedestrians along the footpath; Vehicle use of the road carriageway.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments or additional relief to give effect to the submission.</p>			
FS1110.20	Synlait Milk Limited	Support	Synlait supports the addition of a new policy that enables signage that is specific and appropriate for Heavy Industrial activities, including provision for signage related to Health and Safety. Within large industrial complexes a significant proportion of the signage provides information on way-finding and health and safety messages, many of which are required by regulation or statute. In this context it is appropriate to provide for 'official' signs.	The whole submission point.	Accept in part	6.2
FS1322.41	Synlait Milk	Support	Allow the whole submission point.	Synlait supports the addition of a new policy that enables signage that is specific and appropriate for Heavy Industrial activities, including provision for signage related to Health and Safety. Within large industrial complexes a significant proportion of the signage provides information on way-finding and health and safety messages, many of which are required by regulation or statute. In this context it is appropriate to provide for "official" signs.	Accept in part	6.2
FS1202.56	New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Support submission point 785.58.	The Transport Agency supports a policy framework for signage within the Industrial and Heavy Industrial Zones framework. The Transport Agency has requested amendments to the policy framework in 4.5.36 and 4.5.37 and requests these amendments are also applied here.	Accept in part	6.2
FS1345.65	Genesis Energy Limited	Support	Accept submission point.	For the reasons provided in the Oil Companies submission. Genesis considers that this policy should apply to all zones in the District Plan.	Accept in part	6.2
785.61	Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Limited and Mobil Oil NZ Limited for 'Oil Companies'	Neutral/Amend	<p>Retain Rule 20.2.7.1 P2 Signs - General, except for the amendments sought below;</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend Rule 20.2.7.1.P2 - Signs - General, as follows: P2 (a) A sign must comply with all of the following conditions: (i) The sign height does not exceed 150m; ... (c) Where the sign is a freestanding sign, it must: (i) not exceed an area of 3m² for one sign per site, and 1m² for any other freestanding sign on the site; and (ii) be set back at least 5m from the boundary of any site</p>	<p>The submitter supports in part the rule pertaining to signage in the Industrial Zone. The submitter considers the maximum permitted height of signage in the Industrial Zone Heavy (i.e 15m) to similarly apply to the Industrial Zone, and therefore seeks the maximum height limit of the Industrial Zone be increased from 10m to 15m.</p> <p>There is no expressed reason why a sign (which meets the definition of building) should have to conform to a lower height than</p>	Reject	26.2.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			a Residential, Village or Country Living Zone; and (iii) In addition to (A) above, one free standing sign not exceeding 15m2 per service station. ... AND Any consequential amendments or additional relief to give effect to the submission.	buildings per se. A prime sign is a standard and integral feature of service station sites and is important to ensuring the safe and efficient movement of traffic from the surrounding road network (as opposed to attracting attention from people across the street), it is considered that provision should be made for prime signs at service station sites in Industrial Zones.		
785.62	Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Limited and Mobil Oil NZ Limited for 'Oil Companies'	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 21.2.7.1 P2 Signs - General, except for the amendments sought below; AND Amend Rule 21.2.7.1 P2 Signs General, as follows: P2 (a) A sign must comply with all of the following conditions: ... (iv) Where the sign is a freestanding sign, it must: A. Not exceed an area of 3m2 for one sign per site, and 1m2 for any other freestanding sign on the site; and B. Be set back at least 5m from the boundary of the Residential Zone or Reserve Zone; and C. <u>In addition to (A) above, one free standing sign not exceeding 15m2 per service station. ...</u> AND Any consequential amendments or additional relief to give effect to the submission.	The submitter supports Rule 21.2.7.1 P2 within the Industrial Zone Heavy, however notes that a prime sign is a standard and integral feature of service station sites and is important to ensuring the safe and efficient movement of traffic from the surrounding road network (as opposed to attracting attention from people across the street). It is considered that provision should be made for prime signs at service station sites in Industrial Heavy zones.	Reject	59.3
785.65	Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Limited and Mobil Oil NZ Limited for 'Oil Companies'	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 20.2.7.1 Signs - General, except for the amendments sought below. AND Amend Rule 20.2.7.1 RD1 Signs - General to be consistent with the equivalent rules in Chapter 17, 18 and 21 as follows: <u>RD1 (a) A sign that does not comply with Rule XXX PX or PX. (b) Council's discretion shall be restricted to the following matters: (i) Amenity values; (ii) Character of the locality; (iii) Effects on traffic safety; (iv) Glare and artificial light spill; (v) Effects on a notable tree; (vi) Effects on the heritage values of any heritage item due to the size, location, design and appearance of the sign; (vii) Effects on cultural values of any Maaori Site of Significance; and (viii) Effects on notable architectural features of a building.</u> AND	The submitter supports the rule and seeks a consistent approach to the RDA including matters of discretion for signage across the Chapters 17, 18, 20 and 21 There is no section 32 report which specifically addresses signage. The section 32 reports addressing the various zones do not include a specific section for signage. Signage that does not comply with the permitted activity criteria is considered Restricted Discretionary Activities. The submitter supports this activity status. The matters of discretion for signage which does not comply with the permitted activity criteria are inconsistent across the various zone chapters. There is not rationale provided by Council to justify these	Accept in part	26.2.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			Any consequential amendments or additional relief to give effect to the submission.	inconsistencies in the absence of a section 32 analysis. The submitter supports the rule and seeks a consistent approach to the RDA including matters of discretion for signage across the Chapters 17, 18, 20 and 21.		
785.66	Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Limited and Mobil Oil NZ Limited for 'Oil Companies'	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 21.2.7.1 Signs - General, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Rule 21.2.7.1 RDI Signs - General to be consistent with the equivalent rules in Chapter 17, 18 and 20 as follows: <u>RDI (a) A sign that does not comply with Rule XXX PX or PX. (b) Council's discretion shall be restricted to the following matters: (i) Amenity values; (ii) Character of the locality; (iii) Effects on traffic safety; (iv) Glare and artificial light spill; (v) Effects on a notable tree; (vi) Effects on the heritage values of any heritage item due to the size, location, design and appearance of the sign; (vii) Effects on cultural values of any Maaori Site of Significance; and (viii) Effects on notable architectural features of a building.</u> AND Any consequential amendments or additional relief to give effect to the submission.	The submitter supports the rule and seeks a consistent approach to the RDA including matters of discretion for signage across the Chapters 17, 18, 20 and 21. There is no section 32 report which specifically addresses signage. The section 32 reports addressing the various zones do not include a specific section for signage. Signage that does not comply with the permitted activity criteria is considered Restricted Discretionary Activities. The submitter supports this activity status. The matters of discretion for signage which does not comply with the permitted activity criteria are inconsistent across the various zone chapters. There is not rationale provided by Council to justify these inconsistencies in the absence of a section 32 analysis.	Accept in part	59.3
785.69	Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Limited and Mobil Oil NZ Limited for 'Oil Companies'	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 20.2.7.2 Signs - Effects on Traffic to be consistent with the equivalent rule in Chapters 17, 18 and 21 as follows: <u>PI (a) Any sign directed at road users must: (i) Not imitate the content, colour or appearance of any traffic control sign; (ii) Not obstruct sight lines of drivers turning into or out of a site entrance and intersections; (iii) Contain no more than 40 characters and no more than 6 symbols; (iv) Have lettering that is at least 150mm high; DI Any sign that does not comply with Rule XXXX PI.</u> AND Any consequential amendments or additional relief to give effect to the submission.	Submitter seeks a consistent approach to signage across Chapters 17, 18, 20 and 21. There is no specific section 32 report which specifically addresses signage. The section 32 reports addressing the various zones do not include a specific section for signage. The rules addressing the effects of signage on traffic are inconsistent across the various zone chapters and The current signage rules in the proposed zone chapters include controls that are considered inappropriate, such as: Preventing signage directed at road users from locating within 60m of a controlled intersection, pedestrian crossing or any other sign as a permitted activity; and Preventing signage directed at road users from locating within 130m of a site entrance (where the	Reject	26.2.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				sign directs traffic to the entrance) as a permitted activity. There is not rationale provided by Council to justify these inconsistencies in the absence of a section 32 analysis.		
785.70	Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Limited and Mobil Oil NZ Limited for 'Oil Companies'	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 21.2.7.2 Signs - Effects on Traffic to be consistent with the equivalent rule in Chapters 17, 18 and 20 as follows: <u>PI (a) Any sign directed at road users must: (i) Not imitate the content, colour or appearance of any traffic control sign; (ii) Not obstruct sight lines of drivers turning into or out of a site entrance and intersections; (iii) Contain no more than 40 characters and no more than 6 symbols; (iv) Have lettering that is at least 150mm high; D1 Any sign that does not comply with Rule XXXX PI.</u> AND Any consequential amendments or additional relief to give effect to the submission.	Submitter seeks a consistent approach to signage across Chapter 17, 18, 20 and 21. There is no specific section 32 report which specifically addresses signage and the section 32 reports addressing the various zones do not include a specific section for signage. The rules addressing the effects of signage on traffic are inconsistent across the various zone chapters and The current signage rules in the proposed zone chapters include controls that are considered inappropriate, such as: Preventing signage directed at road users from locating within 60m of a controlled intersection, pedestrian crossing or any other sign as a permitted activity; and Preventing signage directed at road users from locating within 130m of a site entrance (where the sign directs traffic to the entrance) as a permitted activity. There is not rationale provided by Council to justify these inconsistencies in the absence of a section 32 analysis.	Awaiting recommendation	60.1
785.74	Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Limited and Mobil Oil NZ Limited for 'Oil Companies'	Not Stated	Retain the non-complying activity status for residential activities in the Industrial Zone (Rule 20.1.3 NC1 Non-Complying Activities).	It is not considered appropriate to include a permitted activity rule for residential activities in this zone.	Accept	20.6.1
785.75	Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Limited and Mobil Oil NZ Limited for 'Oil Companies'	Not Stated	Retain the non-complying activity status for residential activities in the Industrial Heavy Zone (Rule 21.1.3 NC1 Non-Complying Activities).	It is not considered appropriate to include a permitted activity rule for residential activities in this zone.	Accept	41.1
81.139	Waikato Regional Council	Support	Retain Objective 4.6.1 Economic growth of industry.	This objective will assist with maintaining the Future Proof settlement pattern and retaining industrial activities primarily within identified	Accept	8.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				industrial nodes. (Note WRPS Policy 6.1.4)		
FSI 280.7	Dennis and Jan Tickelpenny	Support	Allowed.	The submission supports the PWDP Policy that requires Industry to be only located in identified Industrial zones and strategic growth nodes. Such areas and growth nodes do not include Newstead.	Accept	8.2
FSI 164.9	Tamara Huaki	Support	The submission supports the PWDP Policy that requires Industry to be only located in identified Industrial zones and strategic growth nodes. Such areas and growth nodes do not include Newstead.	Allowed in full	Accept	8.2
FSI 166.7	Jarod Kowhai Huaki	Support	The submission supports the PWDP Policy that requires Industry to be only located in identified Industrial zones and strategic growth nodes. Such areas and growth nodes do not include Newstead.	Allowed in full	Accept	8.2
FSI 165.7	Pekerangi Kee-Huaki	Support	The submission supports the PWDP Policy that requires Industry to be only located in identified Industrial zones and strategic growth nodes. Such areas and growth nodes do not include Newstead.	Allowed in full	Accept	8.2
FSI 204.7	Christian & Natasha McDean	Support	Allowed.	The submission supports the PWDP Policy that requires Industry to be only located in identified Industrial zones and strategic growth nodes. Such areas and growth nodes do not include Newstead.	Accept	8.2
FSI 182.8	Newstead Country Preschool	Support	Allowed.	The submission supports the PWDP Policy that requires Industry to be only located in identified Industrial zones and strategic growth nodes. Such areas and growth nodes do not include Newstead.	Accept	8.2
FSI 216.7	Newstead Residents Association	Support	Support Objective 4.6.1 Industrial activities to be within identified industrial nodes.	The submission supports the policy that requires industry to be only located in identified Industrial zones and strategic growth nodes. Such areas and growth nodes do not include Newstead.	Accept	8.2
FSI 223.28	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.	Accept	8.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1157.5	Gordon Downey	Support	The submission supports the PWDP Policy that requires Industry to be only located in identified Industrial zones and strategic growth nodes. Such areas and growth nodes do not include Newstead.	Allowed in full	Accept	8.2
FS1149.8	Gavin Lovegrove and Michelle Peddie	Support	The submission supports the PWDP Policy that requires Industry to be only located in identified Industrial zones and strategic growth nodes. Such areas and growth nodes do not include Newstead.	Allowed in full	Accept	8.2
81.140	Waikato Regional Council	Support	Retain Policy 4.6.4 Maintain industrial land for industrial purposes.	The submitter supports this Policy as it will assist with maintaining the Future Proof settlement pattern; retaining industrial activities primarily within identified industrial nodes and managing reverse sensitivity issues. (Note WRPS Policies 6.1, 6.14 and Section 6A.)	Accept	11.2
81.141	Waikato Regional Council	Support	Retain Objective 4.6.6 Manage adverse effects.	The submitter supports this Objective as it assists with giving effect to the WRPS direction relating to the need to have regard to reverse sensitivity effects. (Note WRPS Policy 6.1 and Section 6A). The submission should be read in conjunction with submission point 81.147 (submission on Policy 4.6.7)	Accept	13.2
FS1322.32	Synlait Milk	Oppose	Disallow to the extent that the submission point fails to address reverse sensitivity.	The submitter supports Objective 4.6.6 on the grounds that it relates to reverse sensitivity effects. The objective does not concern reverse sensitivity but concerns protection of sensitive activities and ecosystems from the adverse effects of industrial activities. Reverse sensitivity concerns the protection of lawfully established industrial activities from encroachment by sensitive activities. The Proposed Plan is deficient in that it does not provide an objective or policy within Section 4.6 in respect of reverse sensitivity.	Reject	13.2
81.142	Waikato Regional Council	Support	Retain Policy 4.6.7 Management of adverse effects within industrial zones.	The submitter supports this Policy as it assists with giving effect to the WRPS direction relating to the need to have regard to reverse sensitivity effects. (Note WRPS Policy 6.1 and Section 6A) The submission should be read in conjunction with submission point 81.146 (submission on Objective 4.6.6).	Accept in part	14.2
81.158	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Add to Section 20.5 rules addressing the management of stormwater in the Nau Mai	It appears there are no rules in relation to managing stormwater from development in	Reject	34.1.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			Business Park.	the Nau Mai Business Park. Appropriate low impact stormwater management needs to be undertaken at the Nau Mai Business Park to ensure no adverse environmental effects from stormwater runoff.		
830.12	Linda Silvester	Neutral/Amend	Add new provisions to Chapter 20 Industrial Zone to include energy efficiency policies and rules (see submission for wording)	The Proposed District Plan only makes passing reference to climate change and says nothing about coal, gas and oil's effect on global warming. It is disappointing that Stage 2 of the Proposed District Plan is to be published in 2019 and that is not possible to consider it in context with this part of the Plan. Section 1.9.5 reflects the Resource Management Act requirements around climate change and renewable energy.	Defer consideration until Hearings for Chapter 14 and Stage 2	36.2
FS1276.177	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Support	WED seeks that the whole of the submission point be allowed.	Reasons for WED's support are that climate change issues can't be separated from the rest of the plan. Section 5.2.9 of the RMA states "Development should be designed and located to avoid or mitigate the predicted effects of global climate change on natural hazards, especially increased flooding, erosion, fire, and storms. Where there is incomplete information, a precautionary approach should be taken." Section 5.3.8 of the RMA states "Scientific opinion differs about the possible impacts of global impacts of global climate change, but majority opinion predicts that the effects could include a greater frequency and intensity of extreme weather events. Increased storms, floods and droughts may occur. The extent of these is uncertain and a precautionary approach is taken, because of the high potential for harm."	Defer consideration until Hearings for Chapter 14 and Stage 2	36.2
FS1387.1344	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	Defer consideration until Hearings for Chapter 14 and Stage 2	36.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
830.13	Linda Silvester	Neutral/Amend	Add new provisions to Chapter 21 Industrial Zone Heavy to include energy efficiency policies and rules (see submission for wording)	The Proposed District Plan only makes passing reference to climate change and says nothing about coal, gas and oil's effect on global warming. It is disappointing that Stage 2 of the Proposed District Plan is to be published in 2019 and that is not possible to consider it in context with this part of the Plan. Section 1.9.5 reflects the Resource Management Act requirements around climate change and renewable energy.	Defer consideration until Hearings for Chapter 14 (Infrastructure and Energy) and Stage 2.	36.2
FS1387.1345	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.	Defer consideration until Hearings for Chapter 14 (Infrastructure and Energy) and Stage 2.	36.2
FS1276.178	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Support	WED seeks that the whole of the submission point be allowed.	Reasons for WED's support are that climate change issues can't be separated from the rest of the plan. Section 5.2.9 of the RMA states "Development should be designed and located to avoid or mitigate the predicted effects of global climate change on natural hazards, especially increased flooding, erosion, fire, and storms. Where there is incomplete information, a precautionary approach should be taken." Section 5.3.8 of the RMA states "Scientific opinion differs about the possible impacts of global impacts of global climate change, but majority opinion predicts that the effects could include a greater frequency and intensity of extreme weather events. Increased storms, floods and droughts	Defer consideration until Hearings for Chapter 14 (Infrastructure and Energy) and Stage 2.	36.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>may occur. The extent of these is uncertain and a precautionary approach is taken, because of the high potential for harm."</i>		
831.35	Gabrielle Parson on behalf of Raglan Naturally	Support	Retain and strengthen Rule 20.4.2 RDI Subdivision - Boundaries for Records of Title, to celebrate and protect archaeological sites.	To celebrate and protect archaeological sites, so as to enhance understanding of our history, improve the tourist experience and preserve our inheritance for future generations.	Accept	33.5.1
923.64	Waikato District Health Board	Support	Retain Objective 4.6.1 Economic growth and industry, as notified.	Policy 4.6.1 Economic growth and industry will assist with maintaining the Future Proof settlement pattern and retaining industrial activities primarily within identified industrial nodes.	Accept	8.2
FS1387.1509	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Reject	8.2
923.65	Waikato District Health Board	Support	Retain Policy 4.6.4- Maintain Industrial land for Industrial purpose as notified.	The submitter supports the policy as it will assist with maintaining the Future Proof settlement pattern; retaining industrial activities primarily within identified industrial nodes and managing reverse sensitivity issues. This is important for maintaining prosperity for the community, certainty as to the location of industrial land uses, and protecting public health by separating industrial and residential land use.	Accept	11.2
FS1387.1510	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</i>	Reject	11.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>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>		
923.66	Waikato District Health Board	Support	Retain Objective 4.6.6- Manage adverse effects as notified.	Submitter supports this objective as it assists with giving effect to the Waikato Regional Policy Statement's direction relating to the need to have regard to reverse sensitivity effects, which can have potential to negatively impact community health and wellbeing.	Accept	13.2
923.67	Waikato District Health Board	Support	Retain Policy 4.6.7- Management of adverse effects within industrial zones.	Submitter supports this Policy as it assists with giving effect to the Waikato Regional Policy Statement's direction relating to the need to have regard to reverse sensitivity effects, which can have potential to negatively impact community health and wellbeing.	Accept in part	14.2
924.29	Alice Barnett for Genesis Energy Limited	Support	Retain Rule 21.2.3.2 P1- Noise-Permitted Activities- Huntly Power Station as notified.	The submitter supports the permitted activity for noise generated by emergency generators and emergency sirens.	Accept	55.1
924.30	Alice Barnett for Genesis Energy Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 21.2.3.2 P2- Noise-Permitted Activities- Huntly Power Station as follows (a) Noise measured at the notional boundary of any dwelling house existing as at 25 September 2004 within any site in the Rural Zone does not exceed: (i) 55 dB (LAeq), 7am to 10pm (ii) 45 dB (LAeq) and 75 dB (LAmax), 10pm to 7am the following day.	The submitter is supportive of including specific noise rules for Huntly Power Station. The wording of Permitted Activity Rule 2 and Rule 3 differs from the Operative District Plan in that it refers to noise measured within any site in the Residential Zone or at the notional boundary within any site in the Rural Zone. This means that if sites change within either zone, the noise standard that the Huntly Power Station is expected to meet will change, particularly within the Rural Zone. Development outside of the Huntly Power Station site could compromise operation of the Station as it is difficult to alter the current operating noise environment around the	Reject	55.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				Station. The submitter therefore recommends that the present rule framework providing for the existing noise emissions remains in place and protects the significant infrastructure from potential noise and reverse sensitivity effects. The submitter does not consider the Section 32 Report provides adequate justification as to why these changes to the permitted activity rules have been made.		
924.31	Alice Barnett for Genesis Energy Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 21.2.3.2 P3- Noise-Permitted Activities- Huntly Power Station as follows: (a) Noise measured within any site in the Residential Zone must meet the permitted noise levels for that zone, at the site boundary of any dwelling house existing as at 25 September 2004 in any other zone does not exceed: (i) 50dBA (L10), 7am to 7pm, Monday to Saturday, and (ii) 45dBA (L10), 7pm to 10pm, Monday to Saturday; and (iii) 40dBA (L10), and 65dBA (Lmax) all other times and public holidays.	The submitter is supportive of including specific noise rules for Huntly Power Station. The wording of Permitted Activity Rule 2 and Rule 3 differs from the Operative District Plan in that it refers to noise measured within any site in the Residential Zone or at the notional boundary within any site in the Rural Zone. This means that if sites change within either zone, the noise standard that the Huntly Power Station is expected to meet will change, particularly within the Rural Zone. Development outside of the Huntly Power Station site could compromise operation of the Station as it is difficult to alter the current operating noise environment around the Station. The submitter therefore recommends that the present rule framework providing for the existing noise emissions remains in place and protects the significant infrastructure from potential noise and reverse sensitivity effects. The submitter does not consider the Section 32 Report provides adequate justification as to why these changes to the permitted activity rules have been made.	Reject	55.1
924.33	Alice Barnett for Genesis Energy Limited	Support	Retain Rule 21.2.7.1 P1, P2, P3 and RD1-Signs - General in the same or similar form.	The submitter supports the rule framework proposed.	Accept ⁸	59.3
924.34	Alice Barnett for Genesis Energy Limited	Not Stated	Add a new clause (a) to Rule 21.2.8 P1- Outdoor storage of goods or materials as follows: (a) Stockpiles of coal located within existing stockpile areas on the Huntly Power Station site; or	Coal stockpiles are maintained at the Huntly Power Station in order to provide an ongoing supply of coal to the generation units, created specifically for the power station's operation	Reject in part	61.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			AND Amend Rule 21.2.8 PI Outdoor storage of goods or materials as follows: (b)(a) Outdoor storage of goods or materials must comply complying with all of the following conditions....	and can vary in dimension within the stockpile over time as generation demand varies. With such changes due to coal supplies arriving in bulk, or coal being stockpiled to provide generation resilience during potential power supply shortages The stockpiles are managed as a strategic fuel supply source. The submitter seeks the flexibility to operate the coal stockpiles within the site according to demand requirements rather than the specific limits in the Proposed Plan and therefore there should be no bulk limits in relation to these areas.		
924.35	Alice Barnett for Genesis Energy Limited	Oppose	Add a new permitted activity to Rule 21.3.1 PI Height-General as follows: <u>P2 (a) The construction or alteration of any building or structure at the Huntly Power Station may be up to: (i) A maximum height of 60m, and (ii) 35m on 90% of the site.</u>	The Operative District Plan contains specific rules for the construction or alteration of a building or structure at Huntly Power Station. The submitter requests that the Proposed Plan retains the specific provisions for Huntly Power Station from the Operative District Plan to ensure future development is not compromised.	Reject	62.2
924.44	Alice Barnett for Genesis Energy Limited	Neutral/Amend	Retain Policy 4.6.2- Provide Industrial Zones with different functions except for the amendments sought below AND Add a new clause (iii) to Policy 4.6.2-Provide Industrial Zones with different functions as follows: <u>(iii) Recognise and provide for the Huntly Power Station as a regionally significant industry.</u>	The submitter supports the inclusion of Industrial and Heavy Industrial Zones in the Waikato District Plan and their appropriate application to activities such as regionally significant industries. The submitter considers that Huntly Power Station should be recognized as a regionally significant industry in this policy context.	Accept in part	9.2
FS1387.1552	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	Accept	9.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
943.32	McCracken Surveys Limited	Oppose	<p>Delete Section 20.5 Nau Mai Business Park and consolidate the Nau Mai Business Park Area rules within Chapter 20 - Industrial Zone.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>In the event that the submission point above is successful, the following amendments apply for the business park area only: Amend Rule 20.5.7 P2 (a) (iv) - Signs General to delete references to Lot 1 DP454300 and to recognise the sign is located within Area BB DP 517948 secured by an existing easement that will endure if the parent Lot 1 DP 517948 is further subdivided.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Add a prohibited rule to Chapter 20 - Industrial Zone to prevent the storage or use of fireworks as per the Operative District Plan.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend Chapter 20 - Industrial Zone to consider including the rule 'no incineration of rubbish, waster or recreational fires'.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Retain Rule 20.5.12 Gross Floor Area, except for the amendment outlined below.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Add a new clause to Rule 20.5.12 - Gross Floor Area as follows; <u>the reduction of fire risk.</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Add specific rules to Chapter 20 - Industrial Zone, to retain "effective platform areas" and existing landscape areas which are interlinked to ensure development is contained and the local environment is maintained.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend Chapter 20 - Industrial Zone, to protect the existing and extensive landscaping and batters by adding a permitted earthworks activity rule to limit earthworks to repair and maintenance of the batters and replacement of planting.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Add a new rule to Chapter 20 - Industrial Zone as follows; <u>Any onsite liquid trade waste tanks are to installed, operated and maintained in accordance with manufacturer instructions.</u></p>	<p>If the zone is not deleted as submitted then Council will endure a chapter that is no future relevance and without amendment to the Industrial Zone Chapter will risk slow degradation of the business park current environment unless Council remains vigilant. The business park land area is subject to a lawful and land use consent that has not lapsed, has been given effect and has not and will not be surrendered thus being a live consent. The industrial activities authorised by the land use consent are more expansive than the proposed and operative zoning. The land use consent takes precedence over the district plan rules. The business park area has extensive planted areas and limited firefighting capacity to allow an increase risk this activity creates for buildings. All Operative District Plan fire rules have been drafted in consultation with the NZ Fire Service. The 800m² originated as a fire safety cell maximum area in order to minimise the fire and the spread of fire. Within the business park area there is a need to protect the existing and extensive landscaping and batters created as part of the original and operative land use consent which serves to provide amenity, prevents erosion and therefore helps to improve stream water quality. No protection of the landscaping and batters will result in significant change as the park is developed. Appropriate storage is also important to local Iwi (Ngati Mahanga).</p>	Reject	34.1.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			AND Amend the planning maps to provide hatching for the Nau Mai effective area overlays for clarity.			
FS1321.1	Tasman Lands Limited	Support	I seek that the whole of point 943.32 be allowed.	The original intent of the comprehensive resource consent has been lost in the detail of progressive re-zoning.	Reject	34.1.2
945.10	First Gas Limited	Neutral/Amend	Add a new Restricted Discretionary Activity to Rule 20.1 Land Use Activities as follows: <u>Establishment of a residential activity or use within 20m of a gas transmission pipeline. Establishment of a residential activity or use within 60m of the gas network (other than a gas transmission pipeline). Establishment of a sensitive land use (excluding residential activities) within 60m of the gas network.</u> AND Add a new matter of discretion to Rule 20.1 Land use - Activities as follows: <u>Effects on the safe, effective and efficient operation, maintenance and upgrade of infrastructure.</u> AND Any consequential amendments and other relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	In order to protect the gas network inclusive of delivery points the submitter seeks to include a minimum setback between a delivery point and sensitive land use. The submitter seeks to include an additional matter over which Council's discretion shall be limited under RD1 (b) to address potential reverse sensitivity effects on the gas network inclusive of delivery points.	Reject	20.2.1
FS1289.5	Mowbray Group	Oppose	Seeks that the sections referenced be disallowed.	In original submission #404, it was proposed to use the 2 acre site adjacent to the gas plant be re-zoned for mixed use. The land was to have small historic cottages placed on it facing the railway line. They would be restored to preserve this part on NZ's history and link back into the history of the factory the First Gas proposal essentially steals this land and the associated opportunity associated with this project. The Loss is to the Matangi Community who support Mowbray Groups plan. It is also a loss to NZ's Heritage that is being lost. Further to this the 60m encroaches on the factory site to land where we hope to place the Pukekohe railway station. This is another major restoration project to save an historic building that is being undertaken by Mowbray group (see attached drawing).	Accept	20.2.1
FS1087.31	Ports of Auckland Limited	Oppose	Oppose submission point 945.10.	While Ports of Auckland Limited agrees with the submitter that the gas network requires	Accept	20.2.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>protecting from sensitive land uses, it does not consider it necessary to apply the control to other forms of activity that are not 'sensitive' (such as industrial land uses).</i>		
FS1134.70	Counties Power Limited	Support	Seek that the submission point be allowed.	Counties Power agrees that discretion shall be limited to address potential reverse sensitivity effects on existing infrastructure in relation to adding a new matter of discretion to Rule 20.1 Land Use (second part of submission).	Reject	20.2.1
FS1134.87	Counties Power Limited	Support	Seek that the submission point be allowed.	Discretion shall be limited to address potential reverse sensitivity effects on existing infrastructure.	Reject	20.2.1
FS1305.18	Andrew Mowbray	Oppose	Seek that the whole of the submission point be rejected.	We understand what First Gas are proposing however Mowbray Group land at 464 and 492 Tauwhare Road will be directly adversely affected by the secondment of land available to develop by creating 60m exclusion zones around First Gas distribution plant.	Accept	20.2.1
945.11	First Gas Limited	Neutral/Amend	Add an additional condition to Rule 20.2.5.1 PI Earthworks-General as follows: <u>(a) (x) Earthworks to a depth of greater than 200mm must 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 an additional condition under the Earthworks-General Rules within the Industrial Zone. It is requested to include an additional condition requiring a 12m setback from gas transmission pipelines where earthworks are proposed to a depth of greater than 200m is requested within the Industrial Zone rules.	Reject	25.3.1
FS1289.1	Mowbray Group	Oppose	<i>I seek that the sections referenced be maintained at 6 metres.</i>	<i>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.</i>	Accept	25.3.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1305.21	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 11m of this strip would significantly reduce the value of the land and future potential development of the land	Accept	25.3.1
945.12	First Gas Limited	Neutral/Amend	Add a new matter of discretion to Rule 20.2.5.1 RD1 (b) as follows: <u>(b) (viii) 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	25.3.1
945.13	First Gas Limited	Neutral/Amend	Add a new rule to Chapter 20.4: Subdivision as follows: <u>Subdivision - Site containing a gas transmission pipeline: (a) The subdivision of land containing a gas transmission pipeline is a restricted discretionary activity. (b) Council's discretion shall be restricted to the following matters: (i) The extent to which the subdivision design avoids or mitigates conflict with the gas infrastructure and activities. (ii) The ability for maintenance and inspection of pipelines including ensuring access to the pipelines. (iii) Consent notices on titles to ensure on-going compliance with AS2885 Pipelines-Gas and Liquid Petroleum-Parts 1 to 3. (iv) The outcome of any consultation with First Gas Limited.</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 rule under the Subdivision rules within the Industrial zone. The addition of a new rule would make subdivision of a site containing a gas transmission pipeline a restricted discretionary activity.	Accept in part	32.2.1
945.14	First Gas Limited	Neutral/Amend	Add a new Restricted Discretionary Activity to Rule 21.1 Land Use - Activities as follows: <u>Establishment of a residential activity or use within 20m of a gas transmission pipeline. Establishment of a residential activity or use within 60m of the gas network (other than a gas transmission pipeline). Establishment of a sensitive land use (excluding residential activities within 60m of the gas network).</u> AND	In order to protect the gas network inclusive of delivery points the submitter seeks to include a minimum setback between a delivery point and sensitive land use. The submitter seeks to include an additional matter over which Council's discretion shall be limited under RD1 (b) to address potential reverse sensitivity effects on the gas network inclusive of delivery points.	Reject	39.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			Add a new matter of discretion to Rule 21.1 Land Use - Activities as follows: <u>(a) The extent to which the development will avoid or mitigate conflict with the gas network.</u> AND Any consequential amendments and other relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.			
945.15	First Gas Limited	Neutral/Amend	Add a new condition (x) to Rule 21.2.5.1 PI (a) Earthworks - General as follows: <u>(x) Earthworks to a depth of greater than 200mm must be located to 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 an additional condition under the Earthworks-General Rules within the Industrial Zone. It is requested to include an additional condition requiring a 12m setback from gas transmission pipelines where earthworks are proposed to a depth of greater than 200m is requested within Industrial Zone rules.	Accept	58.3
945.16	First Gas Limited	Neutral/Amend	Add a new matter of discretion to Rule 21.2.5.1 RD1 (b) Earthworks - General as follows: <u>(n) 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 pipelines.	Accept	58.3
945.17	First Gas Limited	Neutral/Amend	Add a new rule to Rule 21.4: Subdivision as follows: <u>Subdivision - Site containing a gas transmission pipeline: (a) The subdivision of land containing a gas transmission pipeline is a restricted discretionary activity. (b) Council's discretion shall be restricted to the following matters: (i) The extent to which the subdivision design avoids or mitigates conflict with the gas infrastructure and activities. (ii) The ability for maintenance and inspection of pipelines including ensuring access to the pipelines. (iii) Consent notices on titles to ensure on-going compliance with AS2885 Pipelines-Gas and Liquid Petroleum-Parts 1 to 3. (iv) The outcome of any consultation with First Gas Limited.</u>	To address reverse sensitivity effects, the submitter seeks the inclusion of a new rule under the Subdivision rules within the Industrial zone. The addition of a new rule would make subdivision of a site containing a gas transmission pipeline a restricted discretionary activity.	Accept in part	68.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			AND Any consequential amendments and other relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.			
986.59	Pam Butler on behalf of KiwiRail Holdings Limited (KiwiRail)	Neutral/Amend	Add a new rule to Rule 20.3.4 Building setbacks as follows (or similar amendments to achieve the requested relief): <u>Building setback - railway corridor (a) any new buildings or alterations to an existing building must be setback 5 metres from any designated railway corridor boundary</u> AND Any consequential amendments to link and/or accommodate the requested changes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KiwiRail seeks that a 5 metre setback apply to all new building development adjacent to operational railway corridor boundaries (i.e. not just sensitive land uses). • Ensuring all new structures in all zones are set back from the rail corridor allows access and maintenance to occur without the landowner or occupier needing to gain access to the rail corridor- potentially compromising their own safety. For these safety reasons setting back buildings from the rail corridor boundary is a means of ensuring people's health and wellbeing through good design. • Construction of buildings in close proximity to the rail corridor has significant safety risk if it is not managed appropriately in accordance with relevant standards. • A 5m setback allows for vehicular access to the backs of buildings (e.g. a cherry picker) and would also allow scaffolding to be erected safely. This in turn fosters visual amenity as lineside properties can then be regularly maintained. A setback is the most efficient method of ensuring intensification does not result in additional safety issues for activities adjacent to the rail corridor, whilst not restricting the ongoing operation and growth of activity within the rail corridor. • The proposed provisions would require any development within the setback to obtain consent with matters of discretion relating to: (i) location, design and use of the proposed building or structure as it relates to the rail network (ii) impacts on the safe operation, maintenance and development of the rail network (iii) construction and maintenance management. 	Reject	31.2.1
FS1033.12	Spark New Zealand Trading Limited	Oppose	Oppose in part.	These further submissions provide standing for us to work with KiwiRail to reach an agreed position regarding appropriate exclusions for telecommunications equipment.	Accept	31.2.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1031.12	Chorus New Zealand Limited	Oppose	Oppose in part.	These further submissions provide standing for us to work with Kiwi Rail to reach and agreed position regarding appropriate exclusions for telecommunications equipment.	Accept	31.2.1
FS1087.34	Ports of Auckland Limited	Oppose	Oppose submission point 986.59.	Ports of Auckland disagree with the relief sought by KiwiRail as it does not enable the efficient development of the industrial land resource.	Accept	31.2.1
FS1032.12	Vodafone New Zealand Limited	Oppose	Oppose in part.	These further submissions provide standing for us to work with KiwiRail to reach an agreed position regarding appropriate exclusions for telecommunications equipment.	Accept	31.2.1
986.60	Pam Butler on behalf of KiwiRail Holdings Limited (KiwiRail)	Neutral/Amend	Add a new rule to Rule 21.3.4 Building setbacks as follows (or similar amendments to achieve the requested relief): <u>Building setback - railway corridor (a) any new buildings or alterations to an existing building must be setback 5 metres from any designated railway corridor boundary</u> AND Any consequential amendments to link and/or accommodate the requested changes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KiwiRail seeks that a 5 metre setback applies 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. For these safety reasons 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 allows for vehicular access to the backs of buildings (e.g. a cherry picker) and would also allow scaffolding to be erected safely. This in turn fosters visual amenity as lineside properties can then be regularly maintained. A setback is the most efficient method of ensuring intensification does not result in additional safety issues for activities adjacent to the rail corridor, whilst not restricting the ongoing operation and growth of activity within the rail corridor. • The proposed provisions would require any development within the setback to obtain consent with matters of discretion relating to: (i) location, design and use of the proposed building or structure as it relates to the rail network (ii) impacts on the safe operation, maintenance and development of the rail network (iii) 	Reject	64.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				construction and maintenance management.		
986.65	Pam Butler on behalf of KiwiRail Holdings Limited (KiwiRail)	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 20.1 Land Use Activities as follows (or similar amendments to achieve the requested relief): <u>1. The size, nature and location of the buildings on the site.</u> <u>2. The extent to which the safety and efficiency of rail and road operations will be adversely affected.</u> <u>3. The outcome of any consultation with KiwiRail.</u> <u>4. Any characteristics of the proposed use that will make compliance unnecessary.</u> AND Any consequential amendments to link and/or accommodate the requested changes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 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. 	Reject	31.2.1
FS1087.35	Ports of Auckland Limited	Oppose	Oppose submission point 986.65.	Ports of Auckland Limited are opposed to the matters of discretion that are proposed by KiwiRail and consider that they are unnecessarily onerous.	Accept	31.2.1
FS1193.32	Van Den Brink Group	Oppose	The submission is disallowed.	Setbacks from the NIMT (greater than a normal yard control) imposes unnecessary development restrictions on the use of land.	Accept	31.2.1
986.66	Pam Butler on behalf of KiwiRail Holdings Limited (KiwiRail)	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 21.1 Land Use Activities as follows (or similar amendments to achieve the requested relief): <u>1. The size, nature and location of the buildings on the site.</u> <u>2. The extent to which the safety and efficiency of rail and road operations will be adversely affected.</u> <u>3. The outcome of any consultation with KiwiRail.</u> <u>4. Any characteristics of the proposed use that will make compliance unnecessary.</u> AND Any consequential amendments to link and/or accommodate the requested changes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 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. 	Reject	64.3
986.94	Pam Butler on behalf of	Neutral/Amend	Add a new matter of discretion to Rule 20.4.1	• The design, location and service	Reject	33.3.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
	KiwiRail Holdings Limited (KiwiRail)		Subdivision - general as follows (or similar amendments to achieve the requested relief): <u>Reverse sensitivity effects, including on land transport networks</u> AND Any consequential amendments to link and/or accommodate the requested changes.	arrangements for new development carried out in the subdivision process cannot be separated from the future use of the subdivided sites. New buildings, including those containing sensitive or noise sensitive activities, their location and the design and location of access ways may all have an influence on the ultimate impact development has on existing and planned infrastructure. The potential for reverse sensitivity effects is therefore a relevant consideration at this point in the development process. • KiwiRail seeks the addition of matters of discretion relating to reverse sensitivity effects on land transport networks to the subdivision consent criteria in the listed zones.		
986.95	Pam Butler on behalf of KiwiRail Holdings Limited (KiwiRail)	Neutral/Amend	Add a new matter of discretion to Rule 21.4.1 Subdivision - general as follows (or similar amendments to achieve the requested relief): <u>Reverse sensitivity effects, including on land transport networks</u> AND Any consequential amendments to link and/or accommodate the requested changes.	• The design, location and service arrangements for new development carried out in the subdivision process cannot be separated from the future use of the subdivided sites. New buildings, including those containing sensitive or noise sensitive activities, their location and the design and location of access ways may all have an influence on the ultimate impact development has on existing and planned infrastructure. The potential for reverse sensitivity effects is therefore a relevant consideration at this point in the development process. • KiwiRail seeks the addition of matters of discretion relating to reverse sensitivity effects on land transport networks to the subdivision consent criteria in the listed zones.	Reject	69.1
986.97	Pam Butler on behalf of KiwiRail Holdings Limited (KiwiRail)	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 20.2.5.1 P1(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	Reject	25.3.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				network is maintained.		
FS1176.310	Watercare Services Ltd	Support	Null	Watercare supports the approach in principle, however is seeking additional changes to protect existing infrastructure.	Reject	25.3.1
986.98	Pam Butler on behalf of KiwiRail Holdings Limited (KiwiRail)	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 21.2.5.1 P1(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	58.3
FS1176.311	Watercare Services Ltd	Support	Null	Watercare supports the approach in principle, however is seeking additional changes to protect existing infrastructure.	Reject	58.3
378.102	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Oppose	Add new activities to Rule 20.1.1 Permitted Activities, as follows: <u>(x) Emergency services training and management activities (x) 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.	Fire and Emergency New Zealand opposes the range of activities listed in Rule 20.1.1 as no provision is explicitly made for emergency services training and management activities, or emergency service facilities. The rules should be expanded to provide for emergency services training and management activities and emergency service facilities 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. Such activities are strongly compatible with an industrial environment.	Accept	20.3.1
FS1388.68	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	Reject	20.3.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
FS1035.209	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	20.3.1
378.103	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Retain Rule 20.2.3.1 Noise - General.	Fire and Emergency New Zealand supports Rule 20.2.3.1 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 the on-going health and safety of people and communities.	Accept	23.3.1
FS1035.210	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	23.3.1
378.105	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Retain Rule 20.3.1 Building height.	Fire and Emergency New Zealand supports the height requirements of Rule 20.3.1 in that it provides for the operational requirements of Fire and Emergency New Zealand in relation to the height of buildings and structures associated with emergency service facilities. Fire stations are single storied buildings of approximately 8-9m in height. Some fire stations also include a hose drying tower of between 12-15m in height. Fire and Emergency New Zealand considers that the provision for fire station buildings and associated structures better provides for the health and safety of the community by enabling the efficient functioning of Fire and Emergency New Zealand.	Accept	28.2.1
FS1035.212	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	28.2.1
378.106	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Retain Rule 20.3.4.2 Building setbacks - Waterbodies.	Fire and Emergency New Zealand supports the building setback in Rule 20.3.4.2 and considers that it 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	31.4.1
FS1035.213	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	31.4.1
FS1388.70	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	Reject	31.4.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>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>		
378.107	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 20.4.1 Subdivision general, as subdivision of land is a restricted discretionary activity. AND Amend Rule 20.4.1 Subdivision- General as follows: (a) Subdivision must comply with all of the following conditions: (i) Proposed lots must have a minimum net site area of 1000m ² ; (ii) Proposed lots must have an average area of at least 2000m ² ; and (iii) No more than 20% rear lots are created. <u>(iv) Proposed lots must be connected to public-reticulated water supply or water supply sufficient for firefighting purposes.</u> (b) Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters: (i) The extent to which a range of future individual activities can be accommodated; and (ii) Amenity values. <u>(iii) Provision of infrastructure, including water supply for firefighting purposes.</u> 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 Rule 20.4.1 as subdivision of land in the Industrial Zone is a Restricted Discretionary activity, however Fire and Emergency New Zealand requires that proposed lots shall be connected to public-reticulated water supply or water supply sufficient for firefighting purposes. Subdivision that does not comply is a Discretionary Activity. The changes sought promote consistency across all zones in the District Plan.	Accept	33.3.1
FS1388.71	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This</i>	Reject	33.3.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				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.		
FS1035.214	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	33.3.1
FS1134.79	Counties Power Limited	Support	Seeks that the submission point be allowed.	The provision of existing infrastructure should be considered.	Accept	33.3.1
378.108	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Oppose	Add new activities to Rule 21.1.1 Permitted Activities to include the following: <u>(x) Emergency services training and management activities.</u> <u>(x) 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.	Fire and Emergency New Zealand opposes the range of activities listed in Rule 21.1.1 as no provision is explicitly made for emergency services training and management activities, and emergency service facilities. The rules should be expanded to provide for emergency services training and management activities, and emergency service facilities 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. Such activities are strongly compatible with an industrial environment.	Accept	38.1
FS1388.72	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	
FS1035.215	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	
378.109	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Retain Rule 21.2.3.1 Noise - General.	Fire and Emergency New Zealand supports Rule 21.2.3.1 as it permits noise generated by emergency sirens. This exemption	Accept	54.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				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 the on-going health and safety of people and communities.		
FS1035.216	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	54.3
378.111	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Retain Rule 21.3.1 Height - General.	Fire and Emergency New Zealand supports height requirements of Rule 21.3.1 in that it provides for the operational requirements of Fire and Emergency New Zealand in relation to the height of buildings and structures associated with emergency service facilities. 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 and is consistent with the typical height of similar network utility structures.	Accept	62.2
FS1035.218	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	62.2
378.112	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Retain Rule 21.3.4.2 Building setback - Waterbodies.	Fire and Emergency New Zealand supports the building setback in Rule 21.3.4.2 and considers it will safeguard the wellbeing of communities in accordance with the purpose of the RMA and purpose of Fire and Emergency New Zealand in the effective protection of lives, property and the surrounding environment.	Accept	66.2
FS1035.219	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	66.2
FS1388.73	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.	Reject	66.2

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>		
378.113	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 21.4.1 Subdivision - General, as subdivision of land is a restricted discretionary activity. AND Amend Rule 21.4.1 Subdivision - General, as follows: RD1 a) Subdivision must comply with all of the following conditions: (i) proposed lots must have a minimum net site area of 1000m ² ; (ii) proposed lots must have an average area of at least 2000m ² ; and (iii) no more than 20% rear lots are created. <u>(iv) proposed lots must be connected to public-reticulated water supply or water supply sufficient for firefighting purposes.</u> RD2 (a) Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters: (i) the extent to which a range of future industrial activities can be accommodated; and (ii) Amenity values. <u>(iii) Provision of infrastructure, including water supply for firefighting purposes.</u> 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 support Rule 20.4.1 as subdivision of land in the Industrial Zone is a Restricted Discretionary activity, however, Fire and Emergency New Zealand requires that proposed lots shall be connected to public-reticulated water supply or water supply sufficient for firefighting purposes. Subdivision that does not comply is a Discretionary Activity. The changes sought promote consistency across all zones in the District Plan.	Accept	69.1
FS1035.220	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	69.1
FS1388.74	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	Reject	69.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>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>		
697.452	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 20.3.3 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	29.1.2
<i>FSI253.13</i>	<i>Waikato Regional Airport Ltd</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Seek that the whole part of this submission be disallowed.</i>	<i>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.</i>	<i>Accept</i>	<i>29.1.2</i>
697.465	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 20.3.4.2 Building setback Waterbodies, to be consistent in terms of the terminology of structures across all zone chapters.	Consistency with the equivalent rule in other chapters.	Reject	31.4.1
<i>FSI387.570</i>	<i>Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	<i>Accept</i>	<i>31.4.1</i>
<i>FSI108.14</i>	<i>Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>Unclear as to what is sought by the submission.</i>	<i>Accept</i>	<i>31.4.1</i>
<i>FSI139.13</i>	<i>Turangawaewae Trust Board</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>Unclear as to what is sought by the submission.</i>	<i>Accept</i>	<i>31.4.1</i>
697.466	Waikato District Council	Not Stated	Amend Rule 21.3.4.2 Building setback - Waterbodies, to be consistent in terms of the terminology of structures across all zone chapters.	Consistency with the equivalent rule in other chapters.	Reject	66.2
<i>FSI139.14</i>	<i>Turangawaewae Trust Board</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>Unclear as to what is sought by the submission.</i>	<i>Accept</i>	<i>66.2</i>

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1108.15	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)	Oppose	Null	Unclear as to what is sought by the submission.	Accept	66.2
FS1387.571	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	66.2
697.551	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 4.6.3 (a) Maintain a sufficient supply of industrial land as follows: ... requirements of different industries to avoid the need for industrial activities to locate in non-industrial zones.	Provides additional clarification to the policy.	Reject	10.2
FS1387.604	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	10.2
FS1326.11	Holcim (New Zealand) Limited	Support	Support insofar as it gives effect to the primary relief sought by HNZZL.	The proposed changes provide clarity to the policy.	Reject	10.2
FS1193.11	Van Den Brink Group	Support	The submission is allowed.	The proposed changes provide clarity to the policy.	Reject	10.2
697.552	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 4.6.8 (a) Specific activities within Nau Mai Business Park as follows: Nau Mai Business Park is developed with specific types of	The grammar is incorrect - there is a missing word.	Accept	15.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			activities...			
697.553	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 4.6.9 (a) Management of adverse effects within Nau Mai Business Park as follows: ... generated by them are managed within <u>the Nau Mai Business Park</u> and ...	Provides additional clarification to the policy.	Accept	16.2
697.605	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Chapter 20: Industrial Zone heading, as follows: Chapter 20: Industrial Zone - <u>Rules</u>	To assist in clarifying that all of the provisions within the chapter are rules.	Accept	36.2
FS1387.621	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	36.2
697.606	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule Chapter 20 (2), as follows: The rules that apply to subdivision in the Industrial Zone are contained in Rule 20.4 <u>and the relevant rules in 14 Infrastructure and Energy and 15 Natural Hazards and Climate Change (Placeholder).</u>	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.	Reject	36.2
FS1223.129	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 perspective. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan	Accept	36.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>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>		
697.607	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 20.1.1 (1) Permitted Activities, as follows: (a)Activity-specific conditions; (a)(b)Land Use - Effects rules in Rule 22.2 (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 22.3 (unless the activity specific 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	20.4.1
<i>FS1264.15</i>	<i>Bootleg Brewery</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Seek that either the submission point is disallowed OR The Matangi site is excluded/exempt from these rules, on the basis effects from the operation of the site on local community are addressed through a bespoke precinct zone, commercial agreement, or effects are negligible and there is no need to apply a restriction.</i>	<i>Bootleg supports a framework which provides for the permissive operation of a brewery with on and off premise, as well as promotes economic growth and regeneration of the site to realise its full potential. The rules unnecessarily restrict or result in additional cost to operators, which there is no significant adverse effect to be managed. The anticipated effects are either negligible or can be managed through commercial outcomes. On this basis, the proposed rules will have a negative effect on economic growth and regeneration of the site, which will benefit the local community.</i>	<i>Reject</i>	<i>20.4.1</i>
<i>FS1387.622</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>20.4.1</i>
697.608	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete the word "Nil" from Rule 20.1.1 PI	Currently rule 20.2.2 aims to ensure	Reject	22.1.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			Industrial activity the activity specific conditions wording; AND Add to Rule 20.1.1 PI Industrial activity activity specific conditions, as follows: <u>(a) where the industrial activity adjoins a Residential, Village, Reserve or Country Living Zone on the side or rear boundary of the site, a 3m wide landscaped strip must be provided running parallel with the side and/or rear boundary. (b) where the industrial site contains, or is adjacent to a river or a permanent or intermittent stream, an 8m wide landscaped strip must be provided, measured from the top edge of the closest bank and extending across the entire length of the watercourse.</u>	landscape planting is provided as a controlled activity where an industrial site adjoins a residential, village, country living, reserve or business zone or a river or stream. Having the criteria as a permitted activity is more likely to ensure planting is provided with the development.		
FS1193.16	Van Den Brink Group	Oppose	Disallow.	The control is a mandatory requirement for planting of streams irrespective of what the proposal is (for example a car parking shortfall) and without any considerations of the costs associated with these rules.	Reject	22.1.2
FS1345.76	Genesis Energy Limited	Oppose	Reject submission point.	Genesis opposes these rules as they do not recognise or provide for industrial activities established prior to the other more sensitive zones. Should the industrial activity be developed secondary to the other sensitive uses (residential etc) then it should be required to manage its amenity related effects. However, if a newer residential or other sensitive activity develops beside the industrial activity that industrial activity should not be required to address the potential reverse sensitivity effects. If a rule of this nature is proposed, then it needs to be drafted to ensure it only captures new industrial activities. Genesis is also concerned with the drafting of (b) in respect of the requirement for an 8-metre-wide landscape planting strip. This does not recognise existing activities beside waterbodies, and those which have critical infrastructure at a water body. For example, the Huntly Power Station is on the banks of the Waikato River and has a large cooling water intake and outfall - which cannot be planted. This rule needs to be drafted in a different manner to ensure there are no unintended consequences.	Reject	22.1.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1326.16	Holcim (New Zealand) Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	The control is a mandatory requirement for planting of streams irrespective of what the proposal is (for example a carparking shortfall) and without any considerations of the costs associated with these rules.	Reject	22.1.2
FS1387.623	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	22.1.2
697.609	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 20.1.1 P4(a) Office ancillary to an industrial activity, as follows: (a) Less than 100m2 gross floor area gfa; or	Including the words "gross floor area" provide clarity.	Accept	20.4.1
FS1264.16	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	20.4.1
FS1387.624	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	20.4.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
697.610	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 20.1.1 P5(a) Food outlet, as follows: (a) Less than 200m2 gross floor area gfa.	Including the words "gross floor area" provide clarity.	Accept	20.4.1
FS1264.17	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	20.4.1
697.611	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 20.1.1 P6(a) Ancillary retail, as follows: (a) Does not exceed 10% gross floor area of all buildings on the site.	Including the words "gross floor area" provide clarity.	Accept	20.4.1
FS1264.19	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	20.4.1
FS1387.625	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	Reject	20.4.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>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>		
697.612	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Add a new rule numbered 20.1.2A for "caretaker accommodation" as a restricted discretionary activity, as follows: <u>20.1.2A Restricted Discretionary Activities RDI Caretaker accommodation (a) Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters: (i) Purpose of the caretaker accommodation; (ii) Health and safety of the occupants; (iii) Noise; (iv) Amenity.</u> AND Consequential amendment to Rule 20.1.3 NCI, as follows: NCI Any activity that is not listed as a permitted, <u>restricted discretionary</u> or discretionary activity.	Caretaker accommodation needs to be provided for as a Restricted Discretionary activity to enable activities that require a caretaker to live on site.	Accept in part	20.3.1
FS1387.626	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	20.3.1
697.613	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 20.1.2 D1 Discretionary Activities, to read as follows: Any permitted activity that does not comply with <u>one or more of the</u> an activity specific conditions in Rule 20.1.1.	Consistency with other chapters and additional clarity of the rule.	Accept	20.5.1
FS1387.627	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor</i>	Reject	20.5.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
697.614	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 20.1.2 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.	Reject	20.5.1
FS1387.628	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	20.5.1
697.615	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 20.2.1 PI Servicing and hours of operation, to read as follows: Servicing and operation of an industrial activity adjoining any Residential, Village or Country Living Zone may <u>must</u> load or unload vehicles or receive customers or deliveries between 7.30am 6.00am and 6.30pm <u>8.00pm.</u> "	The word "must" is more definite than "may". Hours of operation need to reflect more realistic business hours, particularly where sites are close to Auckland.	Reject	21.1.1
697.616	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 20.2.2 Landscape planting.	Planting adjoining sensitive zones should be a condition for a permitted activity to occur. Where this is not complied with, a	Reject	22.1.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				Discretionary Activity consent would be required.		
697.617	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 20.2.3.1 P2 Noise - General, as follows: (a) Noise measured within any other site: (i) In an Industrial Zone must not exceed: A. 75dB (LAeq) 7am to 10pm; and B. 55dB (LAeq) and 85dB (LAmax) 10pm to 7am the following day. (b) <u>Noise measured within any site in any other zone, other than the Industrial Zone and the Heavy Industrial Zone, must meet the permitted noise levels for that zone.</u> (c) <u>Noise levels must be measured in accordance with the requirements of NZS 6801:2008 "Acoustics - Measurement of Environmental Sound".</u> (d) <u>Noise levels must be assessed in accordance with the requirements of NZS 6802:2008 "Acoustics- Environmental noise".</u>	P3 and P4 need to be conditions of P2 as they are the standards which need to be met.	Accept in part	23.3.1
FS1264.22	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.	Accept in part	23.3.1
FS1117.1	2CEN and Tuakau Estates Ltd	Support	Support for increased clarity in application of noise provisions.		Accept in part	23.3.1
697.618	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 20.2.3.1 P3 Noise - General; AND Make consequential amendments to Rule 20.2.3.1 D1 Noise - General to delete reference to P3 and P4, as follows: D12 Noise that does not comply with Rule 20.2.3.1 P2. P3 or P4.	P3 and P4 need to be conditions of P2 as they are the standards which need to be met.	Accept in part	23.3.1
697.619	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 20.2.3.2 P1 (a) Noise - Construction, as follows: (a) Construction noise must not exceed meet the limits in NZS 6803:1999 (Acoustics - Construction Noise);	Additional clarity of the rule. Construction noise should not exceed the limits, rather than meet the limits in the NZS.	Reject	23.4.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
697.620	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 20.2.4 P1 Glare and Artificial Light Spill, to read as follows: <u>Illumination from</u> Gglare and artificial light spill must not exceed 10 lux measured horizontally and vertically within any other site zoned Residential, Village or Country Living.	Consistency of wording with other zone chapters. It is more important to control light spill in the Residential, Village or Country Living zones than other zones.	Accept in part	24.1.1
697.621	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 20.2.5 Earthworks (1), as follows: (1) Rule 20.2.5 - Earthworks General, provides the permitted rules for earthworks activities for the Industrial Zone. <u>This rule does not apply in those areas specified in Rule 20.2.5.1A, 20.2.5.2 and 20.2.5.3</u>	The wording of the rule does not make it clear that the rules specified in 20.2.5(2) apply instead of the general earthworks rule.	Accept in part	25.2.1
FS1350.95	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 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	Accept	25.2.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>points as to the relationship between chapters 14, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24 and 25 and the National Grid provisions within 14.1.1 provides the zone provisions do not apply to infrastructure and energy activities. As such, any other network utility activities would appear to be subject to the National Grid provisions and this requires further clarification. If council wishes to pursue splitting the National Grid provisions into the respective chapters, supply of a revised full set of provisions would be beneficial to enable Transpower to fully assess the implications and workability of the requested changes. Notwithstanding the location of National Grid provisions relating to earthworks within the proposed plan, Transpower seeks the specific changes to earthwork provisions as sought in its original submission point 576.55. Note: It is not evident from the summary if there is a submission point applicable for Chapter 17. If so, this further submission covers that point.</p>		
697.622	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	<p>Amend Rule 20.2.5.1 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 250500m3 <u>and an area of more than 10,000m2 over any single consecutive 12 month period;</u> (iii) not exceed an area of more than 1000 10,000m2 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; and (ix) do not divert or change the nature of natural water flows, water bodies or established drainage</p>	<p>The volume threshold in (ii) and area threshold in (iii) have been entered in error. They need to be corrected to enable significantly larger volumes of earthworks as permitted activities within the Industrial Zone. 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. The words "single" and "at least" provide clarity to the rule.</p>	Accept in part	25.3.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			paths.			
FS1326.5	Holcim (New Zealand) Limited	Support	Support.	The earthworks provisions could be more permissive and still appropriately manage potential effects.	Accept	25.3.1
FS1193.5	Van Den Brink Group	Support	The submission is allowed.	The earthworks provisions could be more permissive and still appropriately manage potential effects.	Accept	25.3.1
697.623	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 20.2.5.1 P2 Earthworks - General, as follows: (a) Earthworks for the purpose of creating a building platform for residential purposes within a site, using imported fill material. must meet the following condition: (i) be carried out in accordance with NZS 4431:1989 Code of Practice for Earth Fill for Residential Development.	The NZS 4431:1989 Code of Practice for Earth Fill for Residential Development does not apply to industrial sites.	Accept	25.3.1
FS1193.6	Van Den Brink Group	Support	The submission is allowed.	Corrections are proposed would enable more permissive earthworks controls.	Accept	25.3.1
FS1326.6	Holcim (New Zealand) Limited	Support	Support.	Corrections are proposed that would enable more permissive earthworks controls.	Accept	25.3.1
697.624	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 20.2.5.1 P3 Earthworks - General, as follows: (a) Earthworks for purposes other than creating a building platform for residential purposes within a site, using imported fill material (excluding cleanfill) must meet all of the following conditions: (i) not exceed a total volume of 500m ³ ; (ii) not exceed a depth of 1m; (iii) the slope of the resulting filled area in stable ground must not exceed a maximum slope of 1:2 (1 vertical to 2 horizontal); (iv) fill material is setback at least 1.5m from all boundaries; (v) areas exposed by filling are re-vegetated to achieve 80% ground cover within 6 months of the commencement of the earthworks; (vi) sediment resulting from the filling is retained on the site through implementation and maintenance of erosion and sediment controls; and (iii) do not divert or change the nature of natural water flows, water bodies or established drainage paths.	In respect to (a), building platforms in the industrial zone are not for residential purposes. In respect to (a)(iv), the words "at least" provide clarity to the rule.	Accept	25.3.1
FS1193.7	Van Den Brink Group	Support	The submission is allowed.	Corrections are proposed would enable more permissive earthworks controls.	Accept	25.3.1
FS1326.7	Holcim (New Zealand) Limited	Support	Support.	Corrections are proposed that would enable more permissive earthworks controls.	Accept	25.3.1
697.625	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 20.2.5 Earthworks (2), as follows:	Replicate the earthworks rule within the	Reject	25.2.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p>There are specific standards for earthworks within rules: (a) Rule 20.2.5.1A - Earthworks within the National Grid Yard (a b) Rule 20.2.5.2 Earthworks - Within Significant Natural Areas; (b c) Rule 20.2.5.3 Earthworks - Within Landscape and Natural Character Areas.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Add new rule after Rule 20.2.5.1 Earthworks-General as follows: <u>20.2.5.1A Earthworks within the National Grid Yard P1</u> (a) <u>The following earthworks within the National Grid Yard:</u> (i)<u>Earthworks undertaken as part of domestic cultivation; or repair, sealing or resealing of a road, footpath or driveway;</u> (ii)<u>Vertical holes not exceeding 500mm in diameter that are more than 1.5m from the outer edge of the pole support structure or stay wire;</u> (iii) <u>Earthworks for which a dispensation has been granted by Transpower under New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safe Distances 34:2001 ISSN 0114-0663.</u></p> <p><u>P2</u> (a) <u>Earthworks activities within the National Grid Yard near National Grid support poles or any stay wires must comply with the following conditions:</u> (i)<u>Do not exceed a depth of 300mm within 2.2m of the pole or stay wire; and</u> (ii)<u>Do not exceed a depth of 750mm between 2.2m and 5m of the pole or stay wire.</u></p> <p><u>P3</u> (a) <u>Earthworks within the National Grid Yard near National Grid support towers (including any tubular steel tower that replaces a steel lattice tower) must comply with all of the following conditions:</u> (i) <u>Do not exceed 300m depth within 6m of the outer edge of the visible foundation of the tower;</u> (ii) <u>Do not exceed 3m between 6m and 12m of the outer edge of the visible foundation of the tower;</u> (iii) <u>Do not compromise the stability of a National Grid support structure;</u> (iv) <u>Do not result in the loss of access to any National Grid support structure; and</u> (v) <u>Must be less than the minimum ground to conductor clearance distances in Table 4 of the New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safe Distances 34:2001 ISSN 0114-0663.</u></p> <p><u>RD1</u> (a) <u>Earthworks within the National Grid Yard that do not comply with one or more of the conditions of Rules 20.2.5.1A P1, P2 or P3.</u></p> <p>(b) <u>Discretion is restricted to:</u> (i) <u>Impacts on the</u></p>	<p>National Grid from Chapter 14 into Chapter 20 (where these are relevant to the Industrial Zone) for increased clarity and usability of the Plan.</p>		

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p><u>operation, maintenance, upgrading and development of the National Grid; (ii) The risk to the structural integrity of the affected National Grid support structure(s); (iii) Any impact on the ability of the National Grid owner (Transpower) to access the National Grid; (iv) The risk of electrical hazards affecting public or individual safety, and the risk of property damage.</u></p>			
FS1350.96	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Oppose	<p><i>Disallow in terms of sought relocation of National Grid provisions. Notwithstanding the location of the provisions, Transpower seeks that all amendments sought in its original submission be included.</i></p>	<p><i>Related to the original submission by Waikato District Council seeking relocation/replicating of the National Grid earthworks provisions (submission point 697.6), Transpower's further submission point in response to Submission point 697.6 apply to the earthwork provisions listed. Transpower supports and prefers a standalone set of provisions (for the reason it avoids duplication and provides a coherent set of rules which submitters can refer to, noting that the planning maps clearly identify land that is subject to the National Grid provisions). A stand-alone set of provisions as provided in 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</i></p>	Accept	25.2.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>respective chapters, supply of a revised full set of provisions would be beneficial to enable Transpower to fully assess the implications and workability of the requested changes. Notwithstanding the location of National Grid provisions relating to earthworks within the proposed plan, Transpower seeks the specific changes to earthwork provisions as sought in its original submission point 576.55. Note: It is not evident from the summary if there is a submission point applicable for Chapter 17. If so, this further submission covers that point.</p>		
697.630	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	<p>Amend Rule 20.2.7.1 P2 Signs - General, as follows: (a) A sign must comply with all of the following conditions: (i) The sign height does not exceed 10m; (ii) The sign is wholly contained on the site; (iii) An illuminated sign must: A. not have a light source that flashes or moves; and B. not contain moving parts or reflective materials; and C. be set back at least 15m from a state highway or the Waikato Expressway; (b) Where the sign is attached to a building, it must: (i) not extend more than 300mm from the building wall; and (ii) not exceed the height of the building; (c) Where the sign is a freestanding sign, it must: (i) not exceed an area of 3m² for one sign per site, and 1m² for any other freestanding sign on the site; and (ii) be set back at least 5m from the boundary of any site <u>within</u> a Residential, Village or Country Living Zone; (d) The sign is not attached to a heritage item listed in Schedule 30.1 (Heritage Items), except for the purpose of identification and interpretation; (e) <u>The sign is for the purpose of identification and interpretation not attached to</u> of a Maaori site of significance listed in Schedule 30.3 (Maaori Sites of Significance), <u>except for the purpose of identification and interpretation</u>; (f) The sign relates to: (i) goods or services available on the site; or (ii) a property name sign.</p>	The additional wording provides clarification.	Reject	26.2.1
FS1264.23	Bootleg Brewery	Oppose	<p>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</p>	<p>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</p>	Accept	26.2.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<i>precinct zone, commercial agreement, or effects are negligible and there is no need to apply a restriction.</i>	<i>potential. The rules unnecessarily restrict or result in additional cost to operators, which there is no significant adverse effect to be managed. The anticipated effects are either negligible or can be managed through commercial outcomes. On this basis, the proposed rules will have a negative effect on economic growth and regeneration of the site, which will benefit the local community.</i>		
697.631	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 20.2.7.1 P3 Signs - General, as follows: (a) 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) The sign relates to the sale of the site on which it is located; (ii) There is no more than 4 3 signs per site agency; (iii) The sign is not illuminated; (iv) The sign does not contain any moving parts, fluorescent, flashing or revolving lights or reflective materials; (v) The sign does not project into or over road reserve.	The additional wording provides clarification. In respect to condition (v), this is not a condition as the Residential Zone provisions do not apply to the road reserve.	Accept in part	26.2.1
FS1264.24	Bootleg Brewery	Oppose	<i>Seek that either the submission point is disallowed OR The Matangi site is excluded/exempt from these rules, on the basis effects from the operation of the site on local community are addressed through a bespoke precinct zone, commercial agreement, or effects are negligible and there is no need to apply a restriction.</i>	<i>Bootleg supports a framework which provides for the permissive operation of a brewery with on and off premise, as well as promotes economic growth and regeneration of the site to realise its full potential. The rules unnecessarily restrict or result in additional cost to operators, which there is no significant adverse effect to be managed. The anticipated effects are either negligible or can be managed through commercial outcomes. On this basis, the proposed rules will have a negative effect on economic growth and regeneration of the site, which will benefit the local community.</i>	Reject	26.2.1
697.632	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 20.2.7.2 PI (a) Permitted Activities, as follows: (a) Any sign directed at road users must <u>meet the following conditions:</u>	The additional wording provides clarification.	Accept	26.2.1
FS1264.25	Bootleg Brewery	Oppose	<i>Seek that either the submission point is disallowed OR The Matangi site is excluded/exempt from these rules, on the basis effects from the operation of the site on local community are addressed through a bespoke precinct zone, commercial agreement, or effects are negligible and there is no need to apply a restriction.</i>	<i>Bootleg supports a framework which provides for the permissive operation of a brewery with on and off premise, as well as promotes economic growth and regeneration of the site to realise its full potential. The rules unnecessarily restrict or result in additional cost to operators, which there is no significant adverse effect to be managed. The anticipated effects are either negligible or can be managed through commercial outcomes. On this basis, the proposed rules will have a negative</i>	Reject	26.2.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>effect on economic growth and regeneration of the site, which will benefit the local community.</i>		
697.633	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 20.2.8 PI(a)(vi) Outdoor storage of goods or materials, as follows: (vi) be screened from any public road, public reserve and adjoining <u>site</u> in another zone, other than the Heavy Industrial Zone, by <u>either</u> of the following: A. a landscaped strip consisting of plant species that achieve a minimum height of 1.8m at maturity; or B. a close-boarded or solid fence or wall to a height of 1.8m. AND Add new condition as PI(a)(vii) Outdoor storage of goods or materials as follows; (vii) <u>complies with rule 20.3.3 (daylight admission)</u>	The additional wording in (vi) provides clarification. New (vii) provides cross referencing to the daylight admission rule which is also relevant.	Reject	27.1.2
697.634	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rules 20.2.8(a)(vi) Outdoor storage of goods or materials A and B, to ensure the condition is enforceable and satisfies a section 32 evaluation.	Council has concerns that these rules do not achieve good planning outcomes. They are problematic rules that have issues in their practical application on industrial sites. These rules need further investigation and refinement to ensure the condition is enforceable and satisfies a section 32 evaluation.	Reject	27.1.2
<i>FS1193.17</i>	<i>Van Den Brink Group</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>The submission is allowed in part.</i>	<i>Agree that there could be issues of enforceability (particularly when reliant on planting heights), but full support cannot be given until such time that revised provisions are viable from the Council on this matter.</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>27.1.2</i>
<i>FS1326.17</i>	<i>Holcim (New Zealand) Limited</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support in part.</i>	<i>Agree that there could be issues of enforceability (particularly when reliant on planting heights), but full support cannot be given until such time that revised provisions are viable from the Council on this matter.</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>27.1.2</i>
697.640	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 20.3.1 Building height heading, as follows: <u>Height - Building General height</u>	Consistency with other zone chapters.	Accept in part	28.2.1
697.641	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 20.3.1 PI(a) Building height, as follows: (i) +520m; or	Council would like consistency in building height between the heavy industrial and the industrial zones.	Accept in part	28.2.1
697.642	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 20.3.3 PI Height - Buildings, structures and vegetation within an airport	This rule relates only to the Waikato Regional Airport and needs to specifically identify this.	Reject	29.1.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			obstacle limitation surface, as follows: Any building, structure or vegetation must not protrude through an the airport obstacle limitation surface as shown identified on the planning maps and defined in Section E Designation N - Waikato Regional Airport.	Additional wording provides clarity to the rule.		
FS1253.14	Waikato Regional Airport Ltd	Support	Seek that this submission be allowed, subject to the following changes: PI- Any building, structure, tree or other vegetation must not protrude through the airport obstacle limitation surface as identified on the planning maps and in Appendix 9- Te Kowhai Airfield park and defined in Section E Designation N- Waikato Regional Hamilton Airport.	The additional wording makes it clearer to the reader what applies to this rule, subject to the suggested changes we have proposed which ensures that the wording aligns with that proposed for the Residential and Business Zones. Reference to Waikato Regional Airport needs to be amended to be Hamilton Airport as per the original submission from Waikato Regional Airport Ltd.	Reject	29.1.2
697.643	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 20.3.3 NCI Daylight Admission, to be changed to DI as follows: NC+ DI Any building, structure or vegetation that does not comply with Rule 20.3.3. PI	Additional wording provides clarity to the rule. Activity status to be more consistent with other zone chapters.	Reject	301.2
697.644	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 20.3.3 Daylight admission to be Rule 20.3.4; AND Undertake consequential renumbering of subsequent rules within the Industrial Zone Chapter.	Needs to be renumbered to avoid confusion with duplicated numbering.	Accept	30.1.2
697.645	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 20.3.3 PI(a)(i) Daylight Admission, as follows: (i) 45 degrees commencing at an elevation of 2.5m above ground level at any boundary of the Industrial Zone with any other Residential, Village, Reserve, Business or Country Living Zone;	Provides clarity that we are referring to these specific zones.	Accept	30.1.2
697.646	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 20.3.3 PI(a)(ii) Daylight Admission, as follows: (ii) 37 degrees commencing at an elevation of 2.5m above ground level at any boundary of the Industrial Zone with any other zone between south-east or south-west of the building or stockpile of goods or materials.	Provides clarity that this rule includes stockpiles of goods and materials.	Reject	30.1.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
697.647	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	<p>Add to Rule 20.3.4 Building setbacks by new clause (3), as follows: (3) Rule 20.3.4.3 Buildings and structures within the National Grid Yard AND</p> <p>Add the following rule into Chapter 20, after Rule 20.3.4.2: 20.3.4.3 Buildings and structures within the National Grid Yard P1 (a) Within the National Grid yard, building alterations and additions to an existing building or structure must comply with the following conditions: (i) Not involve an increase in the building height or footprint; (ii) Comply with the New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safe Distances 34:2001 ISSN 0114-0663 under all National Grid transmission line operating conditions. 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 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 20.3.4.3 P1. NC2 Any new buildings or structures within the National Grid Yard that does not comply with Rule 20.3.4.3 P2 or P3.</p>	Replicate the rule regarding buildings and structure within the National Grid from Chapter 14 into Chapter 20 (where this is relevant to the Industrial Zone) for increased clarity and usability of the Plan.	Reject	31.2.1
697.649	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 20.3.4.1 Building setbacks heading, as follows: (i) Building setbacks - All boundaries	Consistency with the heavy industrial zone and other zones.	Accept	31.3.1
697.650	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 20.3.4.2 P3 Building setback - water	This rule is not required. Consistency	Reject	31.4.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			bodies.	equivalent rules in other chapters.		
FS1387.632	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	31.4.1
697.651	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 20.3.4.2 P4 Building setback - water bodies, to read as follows: A public amenity of up to 25m ² , or a pump shed (public or private), within any building setback identified in Rule 20.3.4.2 P1, P2 or P3.	The words "public or private" clarify that the pump shed is both private and public.	Reject	31.4.1
FS1387.633	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	31.4.1
697.652	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 20.3.4.2 Building setback - water bodies, as follows: P1 (a) A building must be set back a minimum of 30 <u>27.5m</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>32.5m</u>	Amend the rule so that the setback represents 25m esplanade reserve plus the yard setback for the Waikato and Waipa Rivers, and 20m esplanade plus the yard setback for all other waterbodies.	Reject	31.4.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			from a bank of the Waikato River and Waipa River.			
FS1387.634	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	31.4.1
FS1108.21	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)	Oppose	Null	Clarity sought as to why setbacks would be reduced.	Accept	31.4.1
FS1139.20	Turangawaewae Trust Board	Oppose	Null	Clarity sought as to why setbacks would be reduced.	Accept	31.4.1
697.657	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 20.4 Subdivision heading, as follows: 20.4 Subdivision <u>Rules</u>	To provide clarity to the heading.	Accept	33.2.1
FS1387.635	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	33.2.1
697.658	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 20.4 Subdivision (1) and (2) as follows: (1) Rule 20.4.1 - General provides for subdivision density <u>within the Industrial Zone.</u> (2) Other subdivision provisions are contained in Rule	To provide clarity that the general subdivision rules must also comply with rules 20.4.2 - 20.4.6.	Accept	33.2.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			20.4.1 is also subject to compliance with the following rules: (a)... (e)...			
FS1387.636	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	33.2.1
697.659	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	<p>Add to Rule 20.4 Subdivision (2) clause (f), as follows: (f) Rule 20.4.6 - Subdivision of land containing a Significant Natural Area <u>Subdivision of land within the National Grid Corridor</u> And consequential renumbering</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Add new rule after Rule 20.4.6: <u>20.4.6 Subdivision - within the National Grid Corridor - RDI (a)</u></p> <p><u>The subdivision of land within the National Grid Corridor must comply with all of the following conditions: (i) All allotments intended to contain a sensitive land use must provide a building platform for the likely principal building(s) and any building(s) for a sensitive land use located outside of the National Grid Yard, other than where the allotments are for roads, access ways or infrastructure; and (ii) The layout of allotments and any enabling earthworks must ensure that physical access is maintained to any National Grid support structures located on the allotments, including any balance area. (b) Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters: (i) The subdivision layout and design in regard to how this may impact on the operation, maintenance, upgrading and development of the National Grid; (ii) The ability to provide a complying building platform outside of the National Grid Yard; (iii)</u></p>	Replicate the subdivision rule within the National Grid Corridor from Chapter 14 into Chapter 20 (where this is relevant to the Industrial Zone) for increased clarity and usability of the Plan.	Reject	32.2.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<u>The risk of electrical hazards affecting public or individual safety, and the risk of property damage;</u> <u>(iv) The nature and location of any vegetation to be planted in the vicinity of National Grid transmission lines. NCI Any subdivision of land within the National Grid Corridor that does not comply with one or more of the conditions of Rule 20.4.6 RDI.</u>			
FS1350.126	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 provisions into the respective chapters, Transpower supports and prefers a standalone set of provisions (for the reason it avoids duplication and provides a coherent set of rules which submitters can refer to, noting that the planning maps clearly identify land that is subject to the National Grid provisions). A standalone 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. If council wish 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 within the proposed plan, Transpower seeks the specific changes to provisions as sought in its original submission.	Accept	32.2.1
FS1387.637	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	Accept	32.2.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>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>		
697.660	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 20.4.1 (RDI) Subdivision - General, as follows: (a) Subdivision must comply with all of the following conditions: (i) proposed lots <u>The record of title to be subdivided must have a minimum net site area of 1000m2;</u> (ii) <u>all</u> proposed lots must have an average <u>net site</u> area of at least 2000m2; and (iii) <u>the number of rear lots created by the subdivision does not exceed</u> no more than 20% rear lots are created. (b) Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters: (i) the extent to which a range of future industrial activities can be accommodated; and (ii) amenity values.	Consistency with equivalent rules in other chapters and additional clarity of the rule.	Reject	33.3.1
697.661	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Add new Discretionary Activities Rule D1 to 20.4.1 Subdivision - General, as follows: <u>D1</u> Subdivision that does not comply with Rule 20.4.1 <u>RDI.</u>	Lacking a rule cascade upon noncompliance with the RDI rule.	Accept	33.3.1
FS1387.638	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</i>	Reject	33.3.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
697.662	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 20.4.2 Subdivision - Boundaries for Record of Title heading, as follows: 20.4.2 Subdivision - Existing buildings Boundaries for Records of Title	Boundaries for Records of Title is not the correct term to use for this rule heading. The change makes it clear that the rule is about existing buildings.	Reject	33.5.1
697.663	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 20.4.2 RDI(a) Subdivision - Boundaries for Records of Title, as follows: (a) Any boundary of a proposed lot must be located so that: (i) existing buildings comply with the permitted activity rules relating to setbacks (rule 20.3.4.1) and daylight admission (rule 20.3.3), except to the extent of any non-compliance that existed lawfully prior to the subdivision; and (ii) no contaminated land, heritage item, archaeological site, or wetland is divided between any proposed lot. (b) Council's discretion is restricted to: (i) Amenity values; (ii) effects on contaminated land; (iii) effects on any heritage item; (iv) effects on any wetland; (v) effects on any archaeological site; and (vi) (ii) the extent to which a range of future industrial activities can be accommodated.	The rule must relate to existing buildings, not contaminated land which is covered already under the NES. Heritage items, archaeological sites and wetlands are covered under separate rules.	Reject	33.5.1
697.664	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Add to Rule 20.4.2 Subdivision - Boundaries for Records of Title, as follows: DI Subdivision that does not comply with Rule 20.4.2 RDI.	DI is an omission and needs to be reinstated to enable a complete rule cascade.	Accept	33.5.1
697.665	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Add to Rule 20.4.3 Subdivision - Road Frontage, as follows: DI Subdivision that does not comply with Rule 20.4.3 RDI	The rule is incomplete without a rule cascade upon non-compliance with a condition of the restricted discretionary rule.	Reject	33.6.1
697.666	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 20.4.3 RDI(a) Subdivision - Road Frontage, as follows: (a) Any Every proposed lot with a road boundary, other than any access or utility allotment, right of way or access leg, must have a width along the road frontage boundary of at least 15m. (b) Rule 20.4.3 (a) does not apply	Proposed change provides clarity to the rule.	Reject	33.6.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			to any proposed rear lot or to a proposed access allotment. Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters: (i) traffic effects; safety and efficiency of vehicle access and road network; and (ii) amenity and streetscape.			
FS1193.10	Van Den Brink Group	Support	The submission is allowed.	The exclusion of access legs for rear sites from the frontage requirements.	Reject	33.6.1
FS1326.10	Holcim (New Zealand) Limited	Support	Support.	The exclusion of access legs for rear sites from the frontage requirements.	Reject	33.6.1
697.667	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 20.4.4 RDI Subdivision - Esplanade Reserves and Esplanade Strips, as follows: (a) Subdivision must create a <u>An esplanade reserve or esplanade strip 20m wide (or other width stated in Appendix 4 (Esplanade Priority Areas) is required to be created and vested in Council from every subdivision where the land being subdivided is</u> proposed lot: (i) less than 4ha and within 20m of any: A. mean high water springs; B. bank of any river whose bed has an average width of 3m or more; or C. a lake whose bed has an area of 8ha or more; or (ii) 4ha or more and <u>located</u> within 20m of <u>any:</u> A. mean high water springs; or B. a water body identified in Appendix 4 (Esplanade Priority Areas). (b) Council's discretion shall be <u>is</u> restricted to the following matters:	Consistency with equivalent rules in other chapters.	Accept in part	33.7.1
697.668	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 20.4.4(b) (vi) Subdivision - Esplanade Reserves and Esplanade Strips; AND Consequential amendment to Rule 20.4.4 RDI (b)(v) Subdivision - Esplanade Reserves and Esplanade Strips as follows: (v) Works required prior to vesting any reserve in the Council, including pest plant control, boundary fencing and the removal of structures and debris; and	This matter of discretion is not appropriate.	Accept in part	33.7.1
697.671	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 20.5.2 P5 Permitted Activities, as follows: A retail activity that is ancillary to any permitted activity.	The conditions for a retail activity are specified in (a) and (b) of the activity-specific conditions and are therefore not required.	Reject	34.2.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1264.20	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.	Accept	34.2.1
697.672	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 20.5.2 P6 One dwelling per lot for a caretaker or security personnel, as follows: Caretaker accommodation One dwelling per lot for a caretaker or security personnel	Definition amended to include one residential unit.	Reject	34.2.1
697.673	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 20.5.2 Permitted Activities Rule P8, as follows: Nil (a) contained in a building or outdoor enclosure	This condition is a duplication of the activity and not necessary.	Reject	34.2.1
697.674	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 20.5.3 D2 Discretionary Activities.	Non-compliance with an effects or building rule will be managed by those respective rules and there is no need for this rule.	Reject	34.2.1
697.675	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 20.5.6 P2(a)(i) Noise - General, as follows: (i) 65dB (LA10eq) at all times within any other site in the Industrial Zone; and	The LA10 standard for measuring noise is incorrect and should refer to LAeq.	Accept	34.3.1
697.676	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 20.5.7 P1 (a) (vii) Signs - General.	The District Plan cannot control signs within the road reserve.	Accept	34.3.1
697.677	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete from Rule 20.5.7 P1 (a) Signs - General conditions (ii) and (vii).	Council cannot support conditions (ii) and (vii) due to the impracticality of these rules.	Accept	34.3.1
FS1387.639	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	Reject	34.3.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>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>		
697.678	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Chapter 21 Industrial Zone Heavy heading, as follows: Chapter 21: Industrial Zone Heavy - <u>Rules</u>	To assist in clarifying that all of the provisions within the chapter are rules.	Accept	36.2
FS1387.640	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	36.2
697.679	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 21(2) Industrial Zone Heavy, as follows: The rules that apply to subdivision in the Industrial Zone Heavy are contained in Rule 21.4 and the relevant rules in 14 Infrastructure and Energy; and 15 Natural Hazards and Climate Change (Placeholder).	To clarify that the rules in Chapter 14: Infrastructure and Energy and Chapter 15: Natural Hazards and Climate Change apply to subdivision as well as to land use activities.	Reject	36.2
FS1387.641	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>	Accept	36.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>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>		
697.680	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 21.1.1 (1) Permitted Activities, as follows: (a) <u>Activity specific conditions</u> ; (b) Land Use - Effects rules in Rule 21.2 (unless the activity specific rule and/or activity-specific conditions identify a condition(s) that does not apply); and (c) Land Use - Building rules in Rule 21.3 (unless the activity rule and/or activity-specific conditions identify a condition(s) that does not apply).	Insert Activity specific conditions into the list, as this was omitted. The list of rules (a) - (c) should follow the order that they appear.	Accept	38.1
697.681	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete the words "Nil" from Rule 21.1.1 PI Industrial Activity; AND Amend Rule 21.1.1 PI Industrial Activity, as follows: <u>(a) where the industrial activity adjoins a Residential, Village, Reserve or Country Living Zone on the side or rear boundary of the site, a 3m wide landscaped strip must be provided running parallel with the side and/or rear boundary. (b) where the industrial site contains, or is adjacent to a river or a permanent or intermittent stream, an 8m wide landscaped strip must be provided, measured from the top edge of the closest bank and extending across the entire length of the watercourse.</u>	Currently rule 21.2.2 aims to ensure landscape planting is provided as a controlled activity where an industrial site adjoins a Residential, Village, Country Living, Reserve Zone or a river or stream. Having the criteria as a permitted activity is more likely to ensure planting is provided with the development.	Reject	53.1
FS1387.642	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</i>	Accept	53.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				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.		
FS1345.77	Genesis Energy Limited	Oppose	Reject submission point.	Genesis opposes these rules as they do not recognise or provide for industrial activities established prior to the other more sensitive zones. Should the industrial activity be developed secondary to the other sensitive uses (residential etc.) then it should be required to manage its amenity related effects. However, if a newer residential or other sensitive activity develops beside the industrial activity that industrial activity should not be required to address the potential reverse sensitivity effects. If a rule of this nature is proposed, then it needs to be drafted to ensure it only captures new industrial activities. Genesis is also concerned with the drafting of (b) in respect of the requirement for an 8-metre-wide landscape planting strip. This does not recognise existing activities beside waterbodies, and those which have critical infrastructure at a water body. For example, the Huntly Power Station is on the banks of the Waikato River and has a large cooling water intake and outfall - which cannot be planted. This rule needs to be drafted in a different manner to ensure there are no unintended consequences.	Accept in part	53.1
FS1264.28	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.	Accept	53.1
697.682	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 21.1.1 P4 (a) and (b) Office ancillary to an industrial activity, as follows: (a) Less than 100m2 gross floor area gfa; or (b) Does not exceed 30% of all buildings on the site.	Including the words "gross floor area" provides clarity.	Accept	38.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1264.21	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	38.1
FS1387.643	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	38.1
697.683	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 21.1.1 P5 (a) Food outlet, as follows: (b) Less than 200m2 gross floor area gfa.	Including the words "gross floor area" provide clarity.	Accept	38.1
FS1264.18	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	38.1
FS1387.644	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
697.684	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Add a new Restricted Activities Rule after Rule 21.1.1 "Caretaker accommodation", as follows: <u>21.1.1A Restricted Discretionary Activities RDI Caretaker accommodation (b) Council's discretion is restricted to the following the matters: (i) Purpose of the caretaker accommodation; (ii) Health and safety of the occupants; (iii) Noise; (iv) Amenity.</u> AND Make consequential amendment to Rule 21.1.3 NCI as follows: Any activity that is not listed as a permitted, restricted <u>discretionary</u> or discretionary activity.	Caretaker accommodation needs to be provided for as a Restricted Discretionary activity to enable activities that require a caretaker to live on site.	Accept in part	39.1
FS1387.645	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	39.1
697.685	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete the existing wording in Rule 21.1.2 Discretionary Activities DI and replace with the	This rule is not needed as it refers to Land Use Effects and Land Use Building rules which	Reject	40.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			following wording: <u>Any permitted activity that does not comply with one or more of the activity specific conditions in Rule 21.1.2</u>	are in subsequent parts of the chapter. Replacement wording provides Consistency with other chapters and additional clarity of the rule.		
FS1387.646	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	40.1
697.686	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 21.2.1 PI Servicing and hours of operation, as follows: Servicing and operation of an industrial activity adjoining any Residential, Village or Country Living Zone may must load or unload vehicles and/or receive customers or deliveries between 7.30am 6.00am and 6.30pm 8.00pm .	The word "must" is more definite than "may". Hours of operation need to reflect more realistic business hours, particularly where sites are close to Auckland.	Reject	52.3
FS1387.647	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	52.3
697.687	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 21.2.2 Landscape planting.	Planting adjoining sensitive zones should be a condition for a permitted activity to occur.	Reject	53.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				Where this is not complied with a Discretionary Activity consent would be required.		
697.688	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 21.2.3.1 P2 Noise - General, as follows: (a) Noise measured within any other site... (viii) In an Industrial Zone must not exceed: A. 75dB (LAeq) 7am to 10pm; and B. 55dB (LAeq) and 85dB (LAmax) 10pm to 7am the following day... (b) <u>Noise measured within any site in any other zone, other than the Industrial Zone and the Heavy Industrial Zone, must meet the permitted noise levels for that zone.</u> (c) <u>Noise levels must be measured in accordance with the requirements of NZS 6801:2008 "Acoustics - Measurement of Environmental Sound".</u> (d) <u>Noise levels must be assessed in accordance with the requirements of NZS 6802:2008 "Acoustics- Environmental noise".</u>	P3 and P4 need to be conditions of P2 as they are the standards which need to be met.	Accept in part	54.3
FS1291.27	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	HVL supports the proposed zone interface noise limits to ensure a reasonable level of noise between industrial and other activities.	Accept in part	54.3
FS1377.228	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	HVL supports the proposed zone interface noise limits to ensure a reasonable level of noise between industrial and other activities.	Accept in part	54.3
697.689	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 21.2.3.1 P3 Noise - General. AND Make consequential amendments to RDI (a) as follows: Noise that does not comply with Rule 21.2.3.1 P2, P3 or P4	P3 and P4 need to be conditions of P2 as they are the standards which need to be met.	Accept in part	54.3
697.690	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 21.2.3.1 P4 Noise - General; AND Make consequential amendments to RDI (a), as follows: Noise that does not comply with Rule 21.2.3.1 P2, P3 or P4	P3 and P4 need to be conditions of P2 as they are the standards which need to be met.	Accept in part	54.3
697.691	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 21.2.3.2 P3 and P4 Noise Huntly Power Station; AND Amend Rule 21.2.3.2 P2 Noise - Huntly Power	P3 and P4 need to be conditions of P2 as they are the standards which need to be met.	Accept in part	55.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			Station, as follows: (a) Noise measured at the notional boundary within any site in the Rural Zone must not exceed: (i) 55dB (LAeq) 7am to 10pm; and (ii) 45dB (LAeq) and 75dB (LAmax) 10pm to 7am the following day. (b) Noise measured within any other site in the Residential Zone must meet the permitted noise levels for that zone. (c) Noise levels must be measured in accordance with the requirements of NZS 6801:2008 "Acoustics Measurement of Environmental Sound". (d) Noise levels must be assessed in accordance with the requirements of NZS 6802:2008 "Acoustics Environmental Noise". AND Make consequential amendments as follows: RD1 (a) Noise that does not comply with Rule 21.2.3.1 P1 or P2,			
FS1345.78	Genesis Energy Limited	Oppose	Reject submission point.	Genesis supports the wording presented in its own submission.	Reject	55.1
697.692	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 21.2.3.3 P1 (a) Noise - Construction, as follows: (a) Construction noise must <u>not exceed</u> meet the limits in NZS 6803:1999 (Acoustics - Construction Noise).	Additional clarity that the rule. Construction noise should not exceed the limits, rather than meet the limits in the NZS.	Reject	56.1
697.693	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 21.2.4 P1 Glare and Artificial Light Spill, as follows: <u>Illumination from</u> Glare and artificial light spill must not exceed 10 lux measured horizontally and vertically within any <u>other-site zoned Residential, Village or Country Living Zone</u>	Consistency of wording with other zone chapters. It is more important to control light spill in the Residential, Village or Country Living zones than other zones.	Accept in part	57.2
697.694	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 21.2.5(1) Earthworks, as follows: (1) Rule 21.2.3.1 - Earthworks General, provides the permitted rules for earthworks activities for the Industrial Zone. <u>This rule does not apply in those areas specified in Rule 25.2.5.1A, 21.2.5.2 and 21.2.5.3.</u>	The wording of the rule does not make it clear that the rules in 21.2.5(2) apply instead of the general earthworks rule.	Accept in part	58.3
FS1350.97	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	Reject	58.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>submission point in response to Submission point 697.6 apply to the earthwork provisions listed. Transpower supports and prefers a standalone set of provisions (for the reason it avoids duplication and provides a coherent set of rules which submitters can refer to, noting that the planning maps clearly identify land that is subject to the National Grid provisions). A stand-alone set of provisions as provided in the notified plan is also consistent with the National Planning Standards. Irrespective that the proposed plan has not been drafted to align with the National Planning Standards, it would be counterproductive to amend the layout contrary to the intent of the Standards. Standard 7. District wide Matters Standard provides, as a mandatory direction, that 'provisions relating to energy, infrastructure and transport that are not specific to the Special purpose zones chapter or sections must be located in one or more chapters under the Energy, Infrastructure and Transport heading'. Clause 5.(c) makes specific reference to reverse sensitivity effects between infrastructure and other activities. It is not clear from the submission points as to the relationship between chapters 14, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24 and 25 and the National Grid provisions within 14.1.1 provides the zone provisions do not apply to infrastructure and energy activities. As such, any other network utility activities would appear to be subject to the National Grid provisions and this requires further clarification. If council wishes to pursue splitting the National Grid provisions into the respective chapters, supply of a revised full set of provisions would be beneficial to enable Transpower to fully assess the implications and workability of the requested changes. Notwithstanding the location of National Grid provisions relating to earthworks within the proposed plan, Transpower seeks the specific changes to earthwork provisions as sought in its original submission point 576.55. Note: It is not evident from the summary if there is a submission point applicable for Chapter 17. If so, this further submission covers that point.</p>		
697.696	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 21.2.5.1 PI Earthworks General, as	The volume threshold in (ii) and area	Accept in part	58.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			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 250 500m ³ and an area of more than 10,000m ² over any single consecutive 12 month period; (iii) not exceed an area of more than 1000 m ² 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 at least 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; and (ix) do not divert or change the nature of natural water flows, water bodies or established drainage paths.	threshold in (iii) have been entered in error. They need to be corrected to enable significantly larger volumes of earthworks as permitted activities within the heavy Industrial Zone. 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. The words "at least" provide clarity to the rule.		
697.697	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 21.5.1 P2 Earthworks General, as follows: (a) Earthworks for the purpose of creating a building platform for residential purposes within a site, using imported fill material. must meet the following condition: (i) be carried out in accordance with NZS 4431:1989 Code of Practice for Earth Fill for Residential Development.	Rule 21.2.5.1 P2 needs to be amended as The NZS 4431:1989 Code of Practice for Earth Fill for Residential Development does not apply to heavy industrial sites.	Accept	58.3
697.698	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 21.2.5.1 P3 Earthworks General, as follows: (a) Earthworks for purposes other than creating a building platform for residential purposes within a site, using imported fill material (excluding cleanfill) must meet all of the following conditions: (i) Must not exceed a total volume of 500m ³ ; (ii) Must not exceed a depth of 1m; (iii) the slope of the resulting filled area in stable	In respect to (a), building platforms in the industrial zone are not for residential purposes. In respect to (a)(i), (ii) and (iv), the words "must" and "at least" provide clarity to the rule.	Accept	58.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			ground to must not exceed a maximum slope of 1:2 (1 vertical to 2 horizontal); (iv) fill material is set back <u>at least</u> 1.5m from all boundaries; (v) areas exposed by filling are re-vegetated to achieve 80% ground cover within 6 months of the commencement of the earthworks; (vi) sediment resulting from the filling is retained on the site through implementation and maintenance of erosion and sediment controls; and (vii) de <u>must</u> not divert or change the nature of natural water flows, water bodies or established drainage paths.			
697.704	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 21.2.7.1 P2 Signs - General, as follows: (a) A sign must comply with all of the following conditions: (i) The sign height does not exceed 15m; (ii) An illuminated sign must: A. not have a light source that flashes or moves; and B. not contain moving parts or reflective materials; and C. be set back at least 15m from a state highway or the Waikato Expressway; (iii) Where the sign is attached to a building, it must: A. not extend more than 300mm from the building wall; and B. not exceed the height of the building; (iv) Where the sign is a freestanding sign, it must: A. not exceed an area of 3m ² for one sign per site, and 1m ² for any other freestanding sign on the site; and B. be set back at least 5m from the boundary of any site within any Residential, Village, Country Living Zone or Reserve Zone; (v) The sign is not attached to a heritage item listed in Schedule 30.1 (Heritage Items) except for the purpose of identification and interpretation; (vi) 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; (vii) The sign relates to: A. goods or services available on the site; or B. A property name sign.	The additional wording provides clarification.	Reject	59.3
FS1108.22	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)	Support	Null	Appropriate wording change.	Reject	59.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1139.21	Turangawaewae Trust Board	Support	Null	Appropriate wording change.	Reject	59.3
697.705	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 21.2.7.1 P3 Signs - General, as follows: (a) 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) the sign relates to the sale of the site on which it is located; (ii) There is no more than 3 signs per site agency; (iii) The sign is not illuminated; (iv) The sign does not contain any moving parts, fluorescent, flashing or revolving lights or reflective materials,	The additional wording provides clarification.	Accept in part	59.3
697.706	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 21.2.7.2 P1(a) Signs - Effects on traffic, as follows: (a) Any sign directed at road users must meet the following conditions:	The additional wording provides clarification.	Accept	60.1
697.707	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 21.2.7.2 P1(a)(vi) Signs - effects on traffic.	This rule is unnecessary and provides consistency across the zone chapters.	Accept	60.1
697.709	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 21.2.8 P1(a)(vi) Outdoor storage of goods or materials, as follows: (vi) be screened from any public road, public reserve and adjoining site in another zone, other than the Industrial Zone, by either of the following: C. a landscaped strip consisting of plant species that achieve a minimum height of 1.8m at maturity; or D. a close-boarded or solid fence or wall to a height of 1.8m. AND Add new condition as P1(a)(vii) Outdoor storage of goods or materials, as follows: (vii) complies with rule 21.3.3 (daylight admission)	The additional wording in (a)(vi) provides clarification. New (vii) provides cross referencing to the daylight admission rule which is also relevant.	Reject	61.2
FS1387.651	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.	Accept	61.2

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>		
FS1345.80	Genesis Energy Limited	Oppose	Reject submission point.	Genesis is concerned with any amendments to the outdoors storage of goods as there has been no provision made for coal stockpiles in the Heavy Industrial Zone.	Accept in part	61.2
697.710	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rules 21.2.8(a)(vi) A and B Outdoor storage of goods or materials, to ensure the practical application at an industrial site.	Council has concerns that these rules do not achieve good planning outcomes and further investigation is required in regards to their application and enforceability.	Reject	61.2
FS1264.29	Bootleg Brewery	Oppose	<i>Seek that either the submission point is disallowed OR The Matangi site is excluded/exempt from these rules, on the basis effects from the operation of the site on local community are addressed through a bespoke precinct zone, commercial agreement, or effects are negligible and there is no need to apply a restriction.</i>	<i>Bootleg supports a framework which provides for the permissive operation of a brewery with on and off premise, as well as promotes economic growth and regeneration of the site to realise its full potential. The rules unnecessarily restrict or result in additional cost to operators, which there is no significant adverse effect to be managed. The anticipated effects are either negligible or can be managed through commercial outcomes. On this basis, the proposed rules will have a negative effect on economic growth and regeneration of the site, which will benefit the local community.</i>	Accept	61.2
697.717	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 21.3.1 Height General heading, as follows: 21.3.1 Height - <u>Building</u> General	Alignment with other zone chapters.	Accept in part	62.2
697.718	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 21.3.1 PI(a) Building height - general, as follows: (a) The maximum height of any building may be up to <u>must not exceed</u> :	Words "and must not exceed" provide clarity to the rule.	Accept in part	62.2
697.719	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 21.3.3 PI(a)(i) Daylight Admission, as follows: (i) 45 degrees commencing at an elevation of 2.5m above ground level at any boundary of the Industrial Zone with any other Residential, Village, Reserve, or Country Living Zone;	Provides clarity that we are referring to these specific zones.	Reject	63.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
697.720	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 21.3.3 P1 (a)(ii) Daylight Admission, as follows: (ii) 37 degrees commencing at an elevation of 2.5m above ground level at any boundary of the Industrial Zone with any other zone between south-east or south-west of the building or stockpile <u>of goods or materials</u> .	Provides clarity that this rule includes stockpiles of goods and materials.	Reject	63.1
697.722	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 21.3.4.2 P4 Building setback - water bodies, as follows: A public amenity of up to 25m ² , or a pump shed (<u>public or private</u>), within any building setback identified in Rule 21.3.4.2 P1, P2 or P3.	The words "public or private" clarify that the pump shed is both private and public.	Reject	66.2
FS1387.653	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	66.2
697.723	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 21.3.4.2 P3 Building setback - water bodies.	Rule P3 is not needed, as the setbacks from waterbodies are adequately covered by the other rules.	Reject	66.2
FS1387.654	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	Accept	66.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>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>		
697.724	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 21.3.4.2 P3 Building setback-water bodies, as follows: P1 (a) Any building must be set back a minimum of 30 <u>27.5 m</u> from: (i) the margin of any: A. lake; B. wetland; and C. river bank, other than the Waikato River and Waipa River. P2 Any building must be set back at least 50 <u>32.5m</u> from the 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.	Reject	66.2
FS1387.655	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	66.2
FS1108.23	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)	Oppose	Null	Clarity sought as to why setbacks would be reduced.	Accept	66.2
FS1139.22	Turangawaewae Trust Board	Oppose	Null	Clarity sought as to why setbacks would be reduced.	Accept	66.2
697.725	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 21.3.4.2 P3 Building setback - water bodies.	This rule is not required. Consistency with equivalent rules in other chapters.	Reject	66.2
FS1387.656	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	Accept	66.2

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>		
697.726	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend the position of Rule 21.3.5 Building, structure or vegetation within battlefield viewshafts in the zone chapter so that it follows the height Rule 21.3.1 Height - General.	Consistency with other zone chapters.	Accept	67.1
697.727	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend heading for Rule 21.4 Subdivision, as follows: 21.4 Subdivision Rules	To provide clarity to the heading.	Accept	68.2
FS1387.657	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	68.2
697.728	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 21.4(1) and (2) Subdivision, as follows: (1) Rule 21.4.1 - General provides for subdivision density within the Heavy Industrial zone. (2) Other subdivision provisions are contained in Rule 21.4.1 is also subject to compliance with the following rules:	To provide clarity that the general subdivision rule must also comply with rules 21.4.2 - 21.4.6.	Accept	68.2
FS1387.658	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</i>	Reject	68.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
697.730	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 21.4.1 RD2 Subdivision - General. AND Amend Rule 21.4.1 RD1(a) Subdivision - General, as follows: (a) Subdivision must comply with all of the following conditions: (i) proposed lots The record of title to be subdivided must have a minimum net site area of 1000m ² ; (ii) <u>all</u> proposed lots must have an average net site area of at least 2000m ² ; and (iii) <u>the number of rear lots created by the subdivision does not exceed no</u> more than 20% rear lots are created. AND Add to Rule 21.4.1 RD1 new clause (b) to read as follows: (b) <u>Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters: (i) the extent to which a range of future activities can be accommodated; and (ii) amenity values.</u>	Additional wording provides clarity as to the intention of the subdivision rule.	Accept in part	69.1
FS1387.660	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept in part	69.1
697.731	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Add to Rule 21.4.1 Subdivision - General, as follows: <u>DI Any subdivision that does not comply</u>	DI is an omission and needs to be reinstated to form a complete rule cascade.	Reject	69.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			with Rule 21.4.1 RDI.			
FS1387.661	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	69.1
697.732	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend heading for Rule 21.4.2 Subdivision - Boundaries for Record of Title, as follows: 21.4.2 Subdivision - Existing buildings Boundaries for Records of Title	Boundaries for Records of Title is not the correct term to use for this rule heading. Change to focus the rule on existing buildings.	Reject	70.1
697.733	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 21.4.2 RDI Subdivision - Boundaries for Record of Title, as follows: (a) Any boundary of a proposed lot must be located so that: (i) Any existing building complies with the permitted activity rules relating to setbacks (rule 21.3.4.1) and daylight admission (21.3.3), except to the extent of any non-compliance that existed lawfully prior to the subdivision; and (ii) no contaminated land, archaeological site, or wetland is divided between any proposed lots. Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters: (i) Amenity values; (ii) effects on contaminated land; (iii) effects on any wetland; (iv) effects on any archaeological site; and (v) the extent to which a range of future activities can be accommodated.	The rule must relate to existing buildings, not contaminated land which is covered already under the NES. archaeological sites has been incorrectly referenced in this rule and should relate to Maaori sites or areas of Significance. Additionally wetlands are covered under separate rules (rule 21.4.5), which is not necessary in the industrial zone.	Reject	70.1
FS1323.28	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Support	That Rule 21.4.2-Boundaries for Records of Title is amended to include reference to Maaori sites and area of Significance.	HNZPT supports the intention of the submission to replace the reference to archaeological sites with Maaori sites and area of significance to create consistency in the Plan and would support	Reject	70.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>the amendment as sought.</i>		
697.734	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Add to Rule 21.4.2 Subdivision - Boundaries for Records of Title to insert new Discretionary Activities rule, as follows: D1 Subdivision that does not comply with Rule 21.4.2 RD1.	D1 is an omission and needs to be reinstated to form a complete rule cascade.	Reject	70.1
697.735	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 21.4.3 RD1 Subdivision - Road Frontage, as follows: (a) Any Every proposed lot with a road boundary, other than any access or utility allotment, right of way or access leg, must have a <u>width along the road frontage boundary</u> of at least 15m. (b) Rule RD1 (a) does not apply to a proposed rear lot or to a proposed access allotment. (c) Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters: (i) traffic effects <u>safety and efficiency of vehicle access and road network</u> ; and (ii) amenity and streetscape.	Proposed change provides clarity to the rule.	Reject	71.1
697.736	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Add to Rule 21.4.3 Subdivision - Road Frontage, as follows: <u>D1 Subdivision that does not comply with Rule 21.4.3 RD1.</u>	D1 is an omission and needs to be reinstated to complete the rule cascade.	Reject	71.1
697.737	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 21.4.4 RD1 Subdivision - Esplanade Reserves and Esplanade Strips, as follows: (a) Subdivision must create a <u>An esplanade reserve or esplanade strip 20m wide (or other width stated in Appendix 4 (Esplanade Priority Areas)) is required to be created and vested in Council from every subdivision where the land being subdivided is proposed to:</u> (i) less than 4ha and within 20m of any: A. mean high water springs; B. bank of any river whose bed has an average width of 3m or more; or C. a lake whose bed has an area of 8ha or more; or (ii) 4ha or more and <u>located</u> within 20m of <u>any</u> : A. mean high water springs; or B. a water body identified in Appendix 4 (Esplanade Priority Areas). (b) Council's discretion is shall be restricted to the following matters: (i) the type of esplanade provided - reserve or strip; (ii) width of the esplanade	Additional wording provides clarity to rule. Deletion of (vi) is because this matter is not related to an environmental effect.	Accept in part	72.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			reserve or strip; (iii) provision of legal access to the esplanade reserve or strip; (iv) matters provided for in an instrument creating an esplanade strip or access strip; (v) works required prior to vesting any reserve in the Council, including pest plant control, boundary fencing and the removal of structures and debris; and (vi) costs and benefits of acquiring the land.			
697.739	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Add new Rule 21.4(2)(e) Subdivision, as follows: <u>(e) 21.4.5A Subdivision of land containing Maaori sites of significance and Maaori areas of significance AND</u> Add new rule 21.4.5A (after deleted rule 21.4.5) "Subdivision of land containing Maaori sites of significance and Maaori areas of significance", as follows; <u>RDI (a) The boundaries of every proposed lot must not divide any of the following: (i) Maaori sites of significance as identified in Schedule 30.3 (Maori sites of significance); (ii) Maori areas of significance as identified in Schedule 30.4 (Maaori areas of significance). (b) Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters: (iv) effects on heritage values; (v) context and setting of the heritage item; and (vi) the extent to which the relationship of the heritage item with its setting is maintained. DI Subdivision that does not comply with Rule 21.4.5A RDI.</u>	This rule is required to accommodate the changes made to rule 21.4.2 which referenced "archaeological sites". To be consistent with other zone chapters, this rule needs to refer to Maaori sites of significance and Maaori areas of significance.	Reject	68.2, 70.1
FS1387.663	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	Reject	68.2, 70.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FS1323.27	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Support	That the amendment sought is retained subject to the amendments sought by HNZPT submission to similar rules.	HNZPT supports in part the inclusion of this new rule, however would want the wording of this rule to reflect the nature of the HNZPT amendments sought to similar rules in the WaiDC PDP to give better effect to s6 and s7 of the RMA.	Reject	68.2, 70.1
FS1139.23	Turangawaewae Trust Board	Support	Null	Appropriate wording change.	Reject	68.2, 70.1
FS1108.24	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)	Support	Null	Appropriate wording change.	Reject	68.2, 70.1
742.201	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Retain Rule 20.2.4 PI as notified. AND Retain Rule 20.4.2 RD1 as notified.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	24.1.2
742.202	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Retain Rule 20.2.7.1 PI Signs - General as notified. AND Retain Rule 20.2.7.1 RD1 Signs - General as notified.	The submitter supports Rule 20.2.7.1 PI as it allows the Transport Agency to erect signage as a permitted activity; The submitter supports the matters of discretion under Rule 20.2.7.1 RD1, particularly (b)(iii), b(iv) and b(v).	Accept	26.2.1
742.203	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 20.2.7.1 Signs- General, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Rule 20.2.7.1 P2(c) Signs - General, as follows: Where the sign is a freestanding sign, it must: (i) Not exceed an area of 3m ² for one sign per site and 1m ² for any other one additional freestanding sign on the site; and (iii) Be set back at least 15m from the boundary of a state highway. AND Request any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the submission.	The submitter supports Rule 20.2.7.1 P2, but seeks further permitted activity standards to ensure that adverse effects on the transport network are avoided.	Accept	26.2.1
FS1089.17	Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Limited and Mobil Oil NZ Limited for 'Oil Companies'	Oppose	Oppose submission point 742.203.	•The Oil Companies sought the retention of the Rule 17.2.1.7, 18.2.1.7, 20.2.1.7 and 21.2.7.1 (785.59, 85.61, 785.62 and 785.64) subject to minor amendments for prime signs at service stations. •The Oil Companies oppose the restriction of two freestanding signs per site and the 15m setback requirement as proposed by the submitter. •If a sign is visible from a State Highway, it does not necessarily mean the sign is	Reject	26.2.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>causing an adverse effect on the transport network. There would need to be a robust section 32 analysis to support a blanket setback of all signs from State Highways- irrespective of whether the sign and/or signs in question are visible, illuminated, digital and their dimensions. The cost of all such signs within 15m of a State Highway having to be sanctioned via resource consent will more likely than not outweigh the benefit. •Further, limiting the number of freestanding signs on a site is not considered appropriate. The proposed definition of 'sign' captures all signage including that signage required by law (e.g. HSNO) and directional signage to ensure the safe and efficient movement of people and vehicles on a given site, for example. •The submitter proposed to permit a total of two freestanding signs per site. This is not considered appropriate as many businesses will incorporate more than one sign on site. To use a service station example, consent will be required to provide directional signage to advise motorists which access way to enter and exit from, before consideration of installation of a prime sign, poster boards and various other freestanding signage often located on service station sites. •Therefore Oil Companies oppose the amendment to 20.2.7.1 as proposed by the submitter (742.203) and continue to seek the retention of the proposed rule as sought through the Oil Companies' primary submission.</p>		
742.204	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Neutral/Amend	<p>Retain Rule 20.2.7.2 PI Signs- Effects on traffic, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Rule 20.2.7.2 PI (iv) Signs - Effects on traffic as follows: Contain no more than 40 characters and no more than 6 <u>words, symbols or graphics</u>; AND Consequently amend other provisions as necessary to satisfy the relief sought. AND Request any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the submission.</p>	<p>The submitter supports the intent of Rule 20.2.7.2 PI but seeks an amendment to limit the maximum number of words permitted. This will ensure the signage erected does not cause unnecessary visual clutter, and that signs do not affect the efficient, safe and effective functioning of the transport network.</p>	Reject	26.2.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
742.205	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Retain Rule 20.2.7.2 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	26.2.1
742.206	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Retain Rule 20.3.4.1 Building setbacks as notified.	The submitter supports Rule 20.3.4.1 P1.	Accept	31.3.1
742.207	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 20.3.4.1 RDI Building setbacks, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Rule 20.3.4.1 RDI(b)(ii) Building setbacks as follows: Traffic and road safety <u>transport network safety and efficiency</u> AND Amend Rule 20.3.4.1 RDI(b) Building setback, to correct numbering errors. AND Request any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the submission.	The submitter supports the Council retaining discretion under Rule 20.3.4.1 RDI over road safety with minor amendment. It is further noted that there are numbering errors in the Rule which should be corrected.	Accept in part	31.3.1
742.208	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Retain Rule 20.4.3 RDI Subdivision - Road frontage as notified.	The submitter supports a minimum 15m width for lots with road frontages as it will avoid adverse effects on network safety and efficiency.	Accept	33.6.1
FS1134.80	Counties Power Limited	Support	Seek that the submission point be allowed.	A minimum road frontage of 15m will assist in avoiding adverse effects on network safety and efficiency as well as support existing infrastructure and allow for future infrastructure.	Accept	33.6.1
742.209	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Retain Rule 20.5.7 P2 Signs - General as, notified. AND Retain Rule 20.5.7 RDI Signs - General, as notified.	The submitter supports the permitted signage activity standards in Rule 20.5.7 P2 as they will ensure there are no adverse effects on State Highway 23. The submitter supports RDI as Council will retain discretion regarding traffic safety.	Accept in part	34.3.1
742.210	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Retain Rule 20.5.8 P1 Outdoor storage of goods or materials, as notified. AND Retain Rule 20.5.8 RDI Outdoor storage of goods or materials, as notified.	The submitter supports screening of outdoor storage of goods or materials from State Highway 23 to ensure that there are no adverse effects on the safety and efficiency of State Highway 23. The submitter supports RDI as Council will retain discretion regarding traffic safety.	Accept	34.3.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
742.211	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Retain Rule 20.5.5 PI Landscape planting as notified AND Retain Rule 20.5.5 RDI Landscape planting as notified.	The submitter supports Rule 20.5.5 PI as it will provide adequate screening from State Highway 23. The submitter supports RDI as Council will retain discretion regarding traffic safety.	Accept	34.3.1
742.212	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Retain Rule 20.5.13 PI Building setbacks, as notified; AND Retain Rule 20.5.13 RDI Building setbacks as notified.	The submitter supports all rules in this section.	Accept	34.3.1
742.213	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Retain Rule 20.5.14 PI as notified.	The submitter supports the proposed acoustic conditions in Rule 20.5.14 PI as it is considered that this will protect health and wellbeing and avoid reverse sensitivity effects.	Accept	34.2.1
742.214	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Retain Rule 21.2.4 PI Glare and Artificial Light Spill, as notified; AND Retain Rule 21.2.4 RDI Glare and Artificial Light Spill, as notified.	The submitter supports all rules in this section.	Accept in part	57.2
742.215	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Retain Rule 21.2.7.1 P1 Signs - General as notified AND Retain Rule RDI Signs - General as notified.	The submitter supports Rule 21.2.7.1 P1 as it allows the Transport Agency to erect signage as a permitted activity. The submitter supports the matters of discretion under RDI, particularly (b)(iii), (iv) and (v).	Accept	59.3
742.216	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 21.2.7.1 P2 Signs- General, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Rule 21.2.7.1 P2(a)(iv) Signs - General, as follows: Where the sign is a free standing sign, it must: A. Not exceed an area of 3m ² for one sign per site, and 1m ² for any other one additional free standing sign on the site; and B. Be set back at least 5m from the boundary of the Residential	The submitter supports the intent of Rule 21.2.7.1 P2 but considers amendments are required to ensure that adverse effects on the transport network are avoided.	Accept	59.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p>Zone; and C. Be set back at least 15m from the boundary of a state highway. AND Request any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the submission.</p>			
FS1089.18	Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Limited and Mobil Oil NZ Limited for 'Oil Companies'	Oppose	Oppose submission point 742.216.	<p>•The Oil Companies sought the retention of the Rule 17.2.1.7, 18.2.1.7, 20.2.1.7 and 21.2.7.1 (785.59, 85.61, 785.62 and 785.64) subject to minor amendments for prime signs at service stations. •The Oil Companies oppose the restriction of two freestanding signs per site and the 15m setback requirement as proposed by the submitter. •If a sign is visible from a State Highway, it does not necessarily mean the sign is causing an adverse effect on the transport network. There would need to be a robust section 32 analysis to support a blanket setback of all signs from State Highways- irrespective of whether the sign and/or signs in question are visible, illuminated, digital and their dimensions. The cost of all such signs within 15m of a State Highway having to be sanctioned via resource consent will more likely than not outweigh the benefit. •Further, limiting the number of freestanding signs on a site is not considered appropriate. The proposed definition of 'sign' captures all signage including that signage required by law (e.g. HSNO) and directional signage to ensure the safe and efficient movement of people and vehicles on a given site, for example. •The submitter proposed to permit a total of two freestanding signs per site. This is not considered appropriate as many businesses will incorporate more than one sign on site. To use a service station example, consent will be required to provide directional signage to advise motorists which access way to enter and exit from, before consideration of installation of a prime sign, poster boards and various other freestanding signage often located on service station sites. •Therefore Oil Companies oppose the amendment to 21.2.7.1 as proposed by the submitter (742.216) and continue to seek the retention of the proposed rule as sought through the Oil Companies' primary submission.</p>	Reject	59.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
742.217	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Not Stated	Retain Rule 21.2.7.2 P2 Signs- effects on traffic, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Rule 21.2.7.2 PI(a) (iv) Signs - effects on traffic as follows: Contain no more than 40 characters and no more than 6 words, symbols or graphics. AND Request any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the submission.	The submitter supports the intent of Rule 21.2.7.2 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	60.1
742.218	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Retain Rule 21.2.7.2 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	60.1
742.219	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 21.3.4.1 PI Building setbacks- all boundaries, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Rule 21.3.4.1 PI(a) Building setbacks - all boundaries as follows: (i) 5m from a road boundary, excluding a state highway; (ii) 20m from a state highway; and ... AND Request any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the submission.	The proposed setbacks are significantly less than what is permitted under the Operative District Plan. Given the maximum height of buildings allowed in this zone, the submitter seeks a significantly bigger setback from state highways.	Reject	65.1
742.220	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Retain Rule 21.3.4.1 RD1(b)(iii) Building setbacks all boundaries as notified.	The submitter supports Council retaining discretion regarding traffic and road safety.	Accept	65.1
742.221	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Retain Rule 21.4.3 RD1 Subdivision - Road frontage as notified.	The submitter supports a minimum 15m width for lots with road frontages as it will avoid adverse effects on network safety and efficiency.	Accept	71.1
FS1134.84	Counties Power Limited	Support	Seeks that the submission point be allowed.	A minimum road frontage of 15m will assist in avoiding adverse effects on network safety and efficiency as well as support existing infrastructure and allow for future infrastructure.	Accept	71.1
749.148	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 20.2.1 PI Servicing and hours of operation as follows: PI Servicing and operation	The submitter seeks that reference to dwelling should be included. The effects are	Reject	21.1.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			of an industrial activity adjoining any <u>residential activity and/or Residential, Village or Country Living Zone</u> may load... AND Amend the Proposed District Plan as consequential or additional relief as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission as necessary.	to dwellings and residential activity, not solely to zones. This is listed as a matter of discretion when servicing and operation of an industrial activity does not comply with Rule 20.2.1 P1.		
749.149	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 21.2.1 P1 Servicing and hours of operation as follows: Servicing and operation of an industrial activity adjoining any <u>residential activity and/or Residential, Village or Country Living Zone</u> may load or unload vehicles or receive customers or deliveries between 7.30am and 6.30pm. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan as consequential or additional relief as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission as necessary.	The submitter seeks that reference to dwelling should be included. The effects are to dwellings and residential activity, not solely to zones. This is listed as a matter of discretion when servicing and operation of an industrial activity does not comply with Rule 21.2.1 P1.	Reject	52.3
FS1110.39	Synlait Milk Limited	Oppose	<i>The submission seeks to limit loading activities in relation to any residential activity adjoining an industrial activity. The proposed wording could therefore apply to a house in a rural zone where it is located on a site adjoining a Heavy Industrial Zone. This may impose significant limitations on major food processing industries which have been lawfully established within industrial zones, with consequential effects on the efficiency of industrial activities.</i>	<i>The whole submission.</i>	Accept	52.3
FS1322.16	Synlait Milk	Oppose	<i>Disallow the whole submission point.</i>	<i>The submission seeks to limit loading activities in relation to any residential activity adjoining an industrial activity. The proposed wording could apply to a house in a rural zone adjoining a Heavy Industrial Zone imposing significant limitations on major food processing industries with consequential effects on the efficiency of industrial activities.</i>	Accept	52.3
923.153	Waikato District Health Board	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 20.2.3.1 P2, P3, P4 and D2- Noise General as follows: P2 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: (i) In the	The proposed noise limits are generally in accordance with guideline values and use current measurement and assessment standards, acoustical metrics, numerical values, assessment location and time-frames. However, the following issues have been	Reject	23.3.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p>Industrial Zone must not exceed: (i)(ii)A. 75 dB LAeq(15min) dB (LAeq), 7am to 10pm; and (ii)(iii)B. 55 dB LAeq(15min) dB (LAeq) and 85 dB (LAmax), 10pm to 7am the following day; (iii)(iv)85 dB LAfmax, 10pm to 7am the following day;</p> <p>(b)The permitted activity noise limits for the zone of any other site where sound is received. (i)In the Residential or Village Zone must not exceed: 55 dB (LAeq), 7am to 7pm; — 50 dB (LAeq), 7pm to 10pm; 45 dB (LAeq) and 75 dB (LAmax), 10pm to 7am the following day. P3 (a)Noise measured within any site in any zone other than the Industrial Zone and the Heavy Industrial Zone, must meet the permitted noise levels for that zone. P4 (a)Noise levels must be measured in accordance with the requirements of NZS 6801:2008 "Acoustics Measurement of Environmental Sound." (b)Noise levels must be assessed in accordance with the requirements of NZS 6802:2008 "Acoustic Environmental Noise." D21 (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 20.2.3.1 P1 or P2, P3 or P4.</p>	<p>identified: - Incorrect terminology has been used in conflict with the standards specified, - No provision has been made for sound sources outside the scope of NZS 6802, - The measurement and assessment standards are an integral part of the noise limits and cannot be a separate permitted activity standard, - There is an inconsistent approach for sound received in another zone. - It is often appropriate to impose no intrazonal noise limits on industrial zones, as otherwise noise limits can frustrate the fundamental purpose of the zone. Issues arising could be addressed under RMA s16.</p>		
923.154	Waikato District Health Board	Neutral/Amend	<p>Amend Rule 21.2.3.1 P2, P3, P4 and RD1- 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:</u> (a)Noise measured <u>the following noise limits at any point within any other site in the Heavy Industrial Zone must not exceed:</u> (i)A. 75 dB LAeq(15min) dB (LAeq) at any time; (b)The permitted activity noise limits for the zone of any other site where sound is received. (ii)In the Industrial Zone must not exceed: — 75 dB (LAeq), 7am to 10pm; — 55 dB (LAeq), and 85 dB (LAmax), 10pm to 7pm the following day. P3 Noise measured within any site in the Residential Zone must meet the permitted noise levels for that zone. P4 (a)Noise levels must be measured in accordance with the requirements of NZS 6801:2008 "Acoustics Measurement of Environmental Sound." Noise levels must be</p>	<p>The proposed noise limits are generally in accordance with guideline values and use current measurement and assessment standards, acoustical metrics, numerical values, assessment location and time-frames. However, the following issues have been identified: - Incorrect terminology has been used in conflict with the standards specified, - No provision has been made for sound sources outside the scope of NZS 6802, - The measurement and assessment standards are an integral part of the noise limits and cannot be a separate permitted activity standard, - There is an inconsistent approach for sound received in another zone. - It is often appropriate to impose no intrazonal noise limits in industrial zones, particularly heavy industrial zones, as otherwise noise limits can frustrate the</p>	Reject	54.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			assessed in accordance with the requirements of NZS 6802:2008 "Acoustic Environmental Noise." RD1 (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 21.2.3.1 P1, or P2, P3 and P4. b-) c.) Council's discretion...	fundamental purpose of the zone Issue arising could be addressed under RMA s16.		
FS1322.30	Synlait Milk	Oppose	Disallow the whole submission point.	The submission seeks to amend the measurement of noise, but it is unclear exactly where the point of measurement will be, being a notional boundary, a zone boundary or other.	Accept	54.3
FS1110.40	Synlait Milk Limited	Oppose	The submission seeks to amend the measurement of noise, but it is unclear exactly where the point of measurement will be, being a notional boundary, a zone boundary or other.	The whole submission point.	Accept	54.3
FS1377.298	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	HVL support the proposed zone interface noise limits to ensure a reasonable level of noise between industrial and other activities.	Reject	54.3
923.155	Waikato District Health Board	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 21.2.3.2 P2, P3, P4 and RD1- Noise-Huntly Power Station as follows: P2 <u>Sound measured in accordance with NZS 6801:2008 and assessed in accordance with NZS 6802:2008 must not exceed:</u> (a) Noise measured at the following noise limits at any point within a notional boundary within in the Rural Zone must not exceed: (i) 55dB LAeq(15min) dB (LAeq) 7am to 10pm; and (ii) 45dB LAeq(15min) dB (LAeq) and 75dB (LAmax), 10pm to 7am the following day; (iii) 75dB LAFmax, 10pm to 7am the following day; (b) <u>The permitted activity noise limits for the zone of any other site where sound is received, other than in the Rural Zone.</u> P3 (a) Noise measured within any site in the Residential Zone must meet the permitted noise levels for that zone. P4 (a) Noise levels must be measured in accordance with the requirements of NZS 6801:2008 "Acoustics Measurement of Environmental Sound." (b) Noise levels must be assessed in accordance with the requirements of NZS 6802:2008 "Acoustic Environmental Noise." RD1 (a) <u>Sound that is outside the scope of NZS 6802:2008 or a permitted activity standard; and</u> (b) <u>Sound Noise that does not comply with Rule 21.2.3.2 P1, or P2, P3 and P4. (b) (c) Council's discretion...</u>	The proposed noise limits are generally in accordance with guideline values and use current measurement and assessment standards, acoustical metrics, numerical values, assessment location and time-frames. However, the following issues have been identified: - Incorrect terminology has been used in conflict with the standards specified, - No provision has been made for sound sources outside the scope of NZS 6802, - The measurement and assessment standards are an integral part of the noise limits and cannot be a separate permitted activity standard, - There is an inconsistent approach for sound received in another zone. - A location has been specified "at" rather than "at any point within" a notional boundary.	Reject	55.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1345.56	Genesis Energy Limited	Oppose	Reject submission point.	Genesis supports the wording presented in its own submission.	Accept	55.1
986.110	Pam Butler on behalf of KiwiRail Holdings Limited (KiwiRail)	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 20.2.5.1 PI (a)(vii) Earthworks general as follows (or similar amendments to achieve the requested relief): (vii) Areas exposed by the earthworks are <u>stabilized to avoid runoff within 1 month of the cessation</u> re-vegetated to achieve 80% ground cover 6 months of the commencement of the earthworks AND Any consequential amendments to link and/or accommodate the requested changes.	KiwiRail also seeks that the rule relating to revegetation in certain zones be amended to include other available methods to stabilise the ground to prevent runoff, including building or hard cover development. As notified, these rules are ambiguous.	Accept in part	25.3.1
986.111	Pam Butler on behalf of KiwiRail Holdings Limited (KiwiRail)	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 21.2.5.1 PI (a)(vii) Earthworks general as follows (or similar amendments to achieve the requested relief): (vii) Areas exposed by the earthworks are <u>stabilized to avoid runoff within 1 month of the cessation</u> re-vegetated to achieve 80% ground cover 6 months of the commencement of the earthworks AND Any consequential amendments to link and/or accommodate the requested changes.	KiwiRail also seeks that the rule relating to revegetation in certain zones be amended to include other available methods to stabilise the ground to prevent runoff, including building or hard cover development. As notified, these rules are ambiguous.	Accept in part	58.3
986.119	Pam Butler on behalf of KiwiRail Holdings Limited (KiwiRail)	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 20.2.7.2 PI Signs – Effects on traffic as follows (or similar amendments to achieve the requested relief): (a) Any sign directed at road <u>land transport</u> users must: ... (iii) Not obstruct sight lines of drivers turning into or out of a site entrance and intersections <u>or at a level crossing</u> ; AND Any consequential amendments to link and/or accommodate the requested changes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Signs erected in the City should not have an adverse effect on the safe and efficient functioning of the land transport network, including railways, and the health and safety of road users. Traffic on the railway network will grow, and with more trains the issue of minimizing driver distraction is important to ensure the efficient running of the land transport network. 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. 	Accept	26.3.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
302.38	Jeremy Talbot for Barker & Associates Limited on behalf of EnviroWaste New Zealand Limited	Neutral/Amend	Retain the intent of Policy 4.6.7 Management of adverse effects within industrial zones insofar as it gives effect to the relief sought.	The submitter supports the intention of this objective to manage adverse effects on sensitive activities in other zones and ecosystems; however, the provisions are unnecessarily restrictive and could be modified as per the submitter's relief to achieve the same outcome.	Accept <i>in part</i>	14.2
923.118	Waikato District Health Board	Neutral/Amend	Amend Chapter 21: Heavy Industrial Zone to add a statement of purpose and anticipated outcomes of corresponding zone or subzone, and where appropriate make links to health and wellbeing considerations.	Currently there are no statements of purpose or descriptions for any of the zones or the intended outcomes to be achieved, leading to a reliance on objectives, policies and explanations within Section B of the Plan, which are based under generic heading topics with little zone based commentary. There is an opportunity to clarify the purpose of a zone and increase understanding of outcomes, and appropriate types of activities for the different environments. The amendments would assist with a clear understanding of the purpose and character of the various zones.	Reject	36.2
697.695	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 21.2.5(2) Earthworks, as follows: There are specific standards for earthworks within rules: <i>(a) Rule 21.2.5.1A Earthworks - within the National Grid Yard</i> <i>(a b) Rule 21.2.5.2 Earthworks – Significant Natural Areas;</i> <i>(b c) Rule 21.2.5.3 – Landscape and Natural Character Areas.</i> AND Add new rule after Rule 21.2.5.1 as follows: <i>21.2.5.1A Earthworks - within the National Grid Yard</i> <i>PI</i> <i>(a) The following earthworks within the National Grid Yard:</i> <i>(i) Earthworks undertaken as part of domestic cultivation; or repair, sealing or resealing of a road,</i>	Replicate the earthworks rule within the National Grid from Chapter 14 into Chapter 21 (where this is relevant to Industrial Zone Heavy) for increased clarity and usability of the Plan.	Reject	52.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p><u>footpath or driveway:</u></p> <p><u>(ii) Vertical holes not exceeding 500mm in diameter that are more than 1.5m from the outer edge of the pole support structure or stay wire.</u></p> <p><u>(iii) Earthworks for which a dispensation has been granted by Transpower under New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safe Distances 34:2001 ISSN 0114-0663.</u></p> <p><u>P2</u></p> <p><u>(a) Earthworks activities within the National Grid Yard near National Grid support poles or any stay wires must comply with the following conditions:</u></p> <p><u>(i) Do not exceed a depth of 300mm within 2.2m of the pole or stay wire; and</u></p> <p><u>(ii) Do not exceed a depth of 750mm between 2.2m and 5m of the pole or stay wire.</u></p> <p><u>P3</u></p> <p><u>(a) Earthworks within the National Grid Yard near National Grid support towers (including any tubular steel tower that replaces a steel lattice tower) must comply with all of the following conditions:</u></p> <p><u>(i) Do not exceed 300m depth within 6m of the outer edge of the visible foundation of the tower;</u></p> <p><u>(ii) Do not exceed 3m between 6m and 12m of the outer edge of the visible foundation of the tower;</u></p> <p><u>(iii) Do not compromise the stability of a National Grid support structure;</u></p> <p><u>(iv) Do not result in the loss of access to any National Grid support structure; and</u></p> <p><u>(v) Must be less than the minimum ground to conductor clearance distances in Table 4 of the New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safe Distances 34:2001 ISSN 0114-0663.</u></p> <p><u>RD1</u></p> <p><u>(a) Earthworks within the National Grid Yard that do not comply with one or more of the conditions of Rules 21.2.5.1A P1, P2 or P3.</u></p> <p><u>(b) Discretion is restricted to:</u></p> <p><u>(i) Impacts on the operation, maintenance, upgrading and development of the National Grid;</u></p>			

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p><i>(ii) The risk to the structural integrity of the affected National Grid support structure(s);</i></p> <p><i>(iii) Any impact on the ability of the National Grid owner (Transpower) to access the National Grid; (iv) The risk of electrical hazards affecting public or individual safety, and the risk of property damage.</i></p>			
697.716	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	<p>Add new clause (3) into Rule 21.3.4 Land Use - Building, as follows:</p> <p><i>(3) Rule 21.3.4.3 provides the permitted setbacks for buildings and structures within the National Grid Yard</i></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Add the following rule into Chapter 21, after Rule 21.3.4.2 Building setback-waterbodies, as follows:</p> <p><u>21.3.4.3 Buildings and structures within the National Grid Yard P1</u></p> <p><i>(a) Within the National Grid yard, building alterations and additions to an existing building or structure must comply with the following conditions:</i></p> <p><i>(i) Not involve an increase in the building height or footprint;</i></p> <p><i>(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.</i></p> <p><u>P2</u></p> <p><i>(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.</i></p> <p><u>P3 Within the National Grid yard, new buildings and structures that are not for a sensitive land use must comply with the following conditions:</u></p> <p><i>(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</i></p> <p><i>(ii) Locate a minimum 12m from the outer visible foundation of any National Grid tower and locate a minimum 12m from any pole and associated stay wire, unless it is:</i></p>	Replicate the rule regarding buildings and structure within the National Grid from Chapter 14 into Chapter 21 (where this is relevant to the Industrial Zone Heavy) for increased clarity and usability of the Plan.	Reject	52.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p><u>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.</u></p> <p><u>NC1</u></p> <p><u>Any building alterations or additions within the National Grid Yard that does not comply with Rule 21.3.4.3 P1.</u></p> <p><u>NC2</u></p> <p><u>Any new buildings or structures within the National Grid Yard that does not comply with Rule 21.3.4.3 P2 or P3.</u></p>			
FS1350.113	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Oppose	<p><i>Disallow in terms of sought relocation of National Grid provisions. Notwithstanding the location of the provisions, Transpower seeks that all amendments sought in its original submission be included.</i></p>	<p><i>Related to the original submission by Waikato District Council seeking relocation/replicating of the National Grid provisions into the respective chapters, Transpower supports and prefers a standalone set of provisions (for the reason it avoids duplication and provides a coherent set of rules which submitters can refer to, noting that the planning maps clearly identify land that is subject to the National Grid provisions). A stand-alone set of provisions as provided in the notified plan is also consistent with the National Planning Standards. Irrespective that the proposed plan has not been drafted to align with the National Planning Standards, it would be counterproductive to amend the layout contrary to the intent of the Standards. Standard 7. District wide Matters Standard provides, as a mandatory direction, that 'provisions relating to energy, infrastructure and transport that are not specific to the Special purpose zones chapter or sections must be located in one or more chapters under the Energy, Infrastructure and Transport heading'. Clause 5.(c) makes specific reference to reverse sensitivity effects between infrastructure and other activities. It is not clear from the submission points as to the relationship between chapters 14, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24 and 25 and the National Grid provisions within 14.1.1 provides the zone provisions do not apply to infrastructure and energy activities. As such, any other network utility activities would appear to be subject to the National Grid provisions and this requires further clarification. If council wishes to pursue splitting the National Grid provisions into the</i></p>	Accept	52.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				respective chapters, a revised full set of provisions would be beneficial to enable Transpower to fully assess the implications and workability of the requested changes. Notwithstanding the location of National Grid provisions within the proposed plan, Transpower seeks the specific changes to provisions as sought in its original submission.		
FS1387.652	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	52.3
923.117	Waikato District Health Board	Neutral/Amend	Amend Chapter 20: Industrial Zone to add a statement of purpose and anticipated outcomes of corresponding zone or subzone, and where appropriate make links to health and wellbeing considerations.	Currently there are no statements of purpose or descriptions for any of the zones or the intended outcomes to be achieved, leading to a reliance on objectives, policies and explanations within Section B of the Plan, which are based under generic heading topics with little zone based commentary. There is an opportunity to clarify the purpose of a zone and increase understanding of outcomes, and appropriate types of activities for the different environments. The amendments would assist with a clear understanding of the purpose and character of the various zones.	Reject	36.2
FS1385.76	Mercury Energy Limited for Mercury B	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	Accept	36.2

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>		
302.34	EnviroWaste New Zealand Ltd	Support	Retain Rule 4.6.3 Maintain a sufficient supply of industrial land insofar as it gives effect to the relief sought.	The submitter supports the intention of the policy to enable a sufficient supply of Industrial Zoned land.	Accept in part	
FS1353.5	Tuakau Proteins Ltd	Support			Accept in part	