

## Appendix I: H9 – Business Zones - Table of submission and further submission points

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
4.1	Peter Humphreys	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.3.6 Dwelling, which requires that a dwelling in the Business Zone not be located at ground level.	The submitter considers that this rule could affect their wish to build a granny flat type of accommodation on their property at 14 Herschel Street, Ngaruawahia to accommodate their disabled daughter or other family member.	Reject	63
FS1386.3	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	63
FS1078.1	Hugh Green Limited	Support	Consistent with relief sought by HGL (392.2 and .7)	The submission is allowed	Reject	63
81.8	Waikato Regional Council	Support	Retain Rule 19.1.2 RDI Restricted Discretionary Activities.	Rule 19.1.2 RDI already incorporates detail for low impact design principles and is supported. Submitter supports the application of low impact design principles as outlined in Waikato Regional Council's Waikato Stormwater Management Guideline. There is an opportunity for this item to be included as a matter of discretion across all zones in the district.	Accept	106
82.1	Don and Angela Needham for 320 Limited trading as Kids Time Kindergarten and Kids Time Early Learning Centre	Support	No specific decision sought, but submission states support for Rule 17.1.2 Permitted Activities.	No reason provided.	Accept	47
FS1386.67	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood	Reject	47

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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>		
82.2	<b>Don and Angela Needham for 320 Limited trading as Kids Time Kindergarten and Kids Time Early Learning Centre</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.1.2 Permitted Activities to include education facilities as a complying activity OR Amend the zoning of the property at 94 Great South Road, Ngaruawahia from Business Town Centre Zone to Business Zone.	Under the Proposed District Plan, an Educational facility is no longer a complying activity. The submitter understands that existing use rights apply under the Resource Management Act. The submitter plans to hopefully demolish the existing premises and rebuild a new purpose built premises sometime within the next few years. The submitter is happy to comply with the building requirements of the business town centre zone if necessary. Kids Time Kindergarten is licensed for 50 children and provides services to up to 75 different local children at a time (represented by about 60 different families). The submitter believes this provides an essential service to Ngaruawahia and that a new purpose built facility on the existing site would be an asset to the area.	Reject	75
FS1386.68	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	<p>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is</p>	Accept	75

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>appropriate.</i>		
<b>296.4</b>	<b>Richard Falconer for Terra Consultants (CNI) Ltd</b>	Support	Retain the provisions of Chapter 17 - Business Zone as notified.	No reasons provided.	Accept	45
<i>FSI 386.305</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</i>	<i>45</i>
<b>326.5</b>	<b>Charlie Young for Raglan Chamber of Commerce</b>	Neutral/Amend	Add "Relocatable Home Park" to Rule 17.1.2 Permitted Activities, to include 'Relocatable Home Park' AND Add a definition to Chapter 13 Definitions that describes a "Relocatable home park".	Building much smaller, building on trailers and with the intent that houses could be moved if the owner wanted to relocate is a mechanism for providing affordable housing that is not currently addressed by the District Plan. Land remains one of the most expensive components, a future option is that land ownership be retained by the developer and only the dwellings would be owned by purchaser(s). Developments could be created to provide suitable flat site, power, potable water and waste amenities to the site ready for connection. Some shared facilities of communal gardens and recreation areas could be a pre-requisite for such developments. Rule change necessary to create activity as permitted and provide good planning objectives so such developments are of a good standard, enhance town and building amenities and provide affordable options for those desiring smaller homes in village environment. Housing developments have a focus on providing good quality homes which meet the needs of individual communities at a cost that enables those at all income levels to afford a decent place to live are supported in the consent and development processes. Clearly	Reject	47

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				housing affordability throughout District needs to be supported. Lack of affordable housing is having a severe impact on businesses trying to retain staff in communities. Other NZ District Councils have recognized housing crisis and have activated affordable housing policies and initiatives.		
FS1386.382	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	47
367.3	Liam McGrath for Mercer Residents and Ratepayers Committee	Oppose	Add policies for small towns, i.e. Mercer and Meremere to Section 4.5 Business and Business Town Centre Zones.	All small towns contribute to wider community, especially those close to main arterials and visible to the public. Small towns need policies to help keep their character and prevent loss of identity.	Reject	8
FS1386.546	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	8
378.7	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Retain Objective 9.4.2 Adverse effects of land use, to the extent that recognition is given to health and well-being of	Fire and Emergency New Zealand supports the objective to the extent that recognition is given	Accept	102

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p>communities and they are protected from adverse effects of land use and development.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend Objective 9.4.2(a) Adverse effects of land use, as follows: (a) The health, safety and well-being of people, communities and the environment are protected from the adverse effects of land use and development within the Business Zone Tamahere.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend the Proposed District Plan to make further or consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>	to the health and well-being of communities and are protected from the adverse effects of land use and development. However, Fire and Emergency New Zealand recommends the wording better reflect section 5 of the RMA, which also refers to the safety of the community.		
FS1388.19	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	102
FS1035.112	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	102
384.1	Te Kauwhata Community Committee	Neutral/Amend	Amend Appendix 10.5 Character Statements for Te Kauwhata Town Centre 2017, as per but not limited to the suggestions in the document attached to the submission. Some points for consideration are, but not limited to: Ensure that there are fluid connections to walkways/cycleways and also to include those trails etc that are envisaged in the future; Public transport options; Smaller/modern retail features with more options/opportunities eg: rental/lease opportunities for small business in Te Kauwhata to have a physical presence and to be able to contribute more fully to the local economy; Consideration of any effect (positive or negative) of mixed zoning options ie: Residential and Retail; Enhanced/improved cosmetic features whilst retaining the heritage features of the main street eg: better/brighter/modern appearance/features of the retail	The town character statement should more accurately reflect the village community of Te Kauwhata as it is today, in order to better guide the future direction, yet maintaining links to the past.	Reject	121

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			sector, town centre feature(s)/plantings, improved parking, more park bench setting, usage of the currently vacant land in town; Work with Mana Whenua regarding the development and promotion of cultural features in Te Kawhata ie: Cultural Repatriation.			
<b>386.9</b>	<b>Pokeno Village Holdings Limited</b>	Not Stated	Amend the Proposed Waikato District Plan's approach to management of the Pokeno Town Centre (including Policy 4.5.18 Pokeno Town Centre and associated implementation methods) to reflect the need for the Pokeno Town Centre to service the surrounding community.	While the land surrounding Pokeno has undergone significant change from rural to urban over the last decade, the town centre has hardly changed at all, meaning Pokeno residents need to travel to other urban areas such as Pukekohe for basic services. Policy 4.5.18 and associated implementation methods do not recognize the ongoing urbanisation of the Pokeno Structure Plan area and are thus inconsistent with Part 2 of the RMA, particularly with regards to enabling people to provide for the social and economic wellbeing.	Reject	25
<b>392.2</b>	<b>Hugh Green Limited</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend the activity-specific conditions for Rule 17.1.2 P4 Permitted activities, as follows: <del>Located above ground floor level nil.</del> AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to provide alternative, additional or consequential amendments/relief as necessary to achieve consistency with the other submission points and to satisfy submitter's concerns or such alternative relief to satisfy the concerns of the submitter.	Imposition of controls around Activities at Ground Floor Level for buildings facing the front Main Road are accepted, however for all sites within the Business Zone the rule is unduly restrictive.	Reject	47
<i>FS1388.99</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>Accept</i>	<i>47</i>
<b>392.3</b>	<b>Hugh Green Limited</b>	Neutral/Amend	Add "Retail activity" to Rule 17.1.2 Permitted activities, as a	To be consistent with approach taken in Rule	Reject	47

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			separate activity to the wider-defined "Commercial activity" (already a permitted activity). AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to provide alternative, additional or consequential amendments/relief as necessary to achieve consistency with the other submission points and to satisfy submitter's concerns or such alternative relief to satisfy the concerns of the submitter.	18.1.2 (for the Business Town Centre) and avoid confusion.		
FS1388.100	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	47
392.4	Hugh Green Limited	Oppose	Delete Rule 17.1.3 RDI condition (a) (iii) Restricted Discretionary Activities. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to provide alternative, additional or consequential amendments/relief as necessary to achieve consistency with the other submission points and to satisfy submitter's concerns or such alternative relief to satisfy the concerns of the submitter.	Imposition of controls around Activities at Ground floor level for buildings facing the front Main Road are accepted however for all sites within the Business Zone the rule is unduly restrictive.	Reject	48
FS1388.101	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	Accept	48

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
<b>392.5</b>	<b>Hugh Green Limited</b>	Oppose	Delete Rule 17.1.5 NCI Non-Complying Activities. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to provide alternative, additional or consequential amendments/relief as necessary to achieve consistency with the other submission points and to satisfy submitter's concerns or such alternative relief to satisfy the concerns of the submitter.	This requirement is unduly restrictive for the Business Zone.	Reject	50
<i>FS1388.102</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>Accept</i>	<i>50</i>
<b>392.6</b>	<b>Hugh Green Limited</b>	Oppose	Delete Rule 17.1.5 NC2 Non-Complying Activities. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to provide alternative, additional or consequential amendments/relief as necessary to achieve consistency with the other submission points and to satisfy submitter's concerns or such alternative relief to satisfy the concerns of the submitter.	This requirement is unduly restrictive for the Business Zone.	Reject	50
<i>FS1388.103</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</i>	<i>Accept</i>	<i>50</i>

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
392.7	Hugh Green Limited	Oppose	Delete Rule 17.3.6 PI Condition (a)(i) Dwelling. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to provide alternative, additional or consequential amendments/relief as necessary to achieve consistency with the other submission points and to satisfy submitter's concerns or such alternative relief to satisfy the concerns of the submitter.	Restrictions are accepted for buildings that front Main Road, however the imposition of this control for all sites within the Business Zone is considered unduly restrictive. Restrictions on residential activities in the Business Zone should be removed.	Reject	63
FS1388.104	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	63
392.8	Hugh Green Limited	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 17.3.6 NCI Dwelling AND Amend Rule 17.3.6 DI Dwelling, to apply to buildings not complying with Rule 17.3.6 PI. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to provide alternative, additional or consequential amendments/relief as necessary to achieve consistency with the other submission points and to satisfy submitter's concerns or such alternative relief to satisfy the concerns of the submitter.	Restrictions on residential activities in the Business Zone should be removed. Dwellings not complying with Rule 17.3.6 PI subject instead to Rule 17.3.6 DI.	Accept	63
FS1388.105	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</i>	Reject	63

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
<b>392.9</b>	<b>Hugh Green Limited</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend the specific conditions for Rule 18.1.2 P2 Permitted activities, as follows: Located above floor ground floor level <u>if the site is subject to a verandah line identified on the planning maps.</u> AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to provide alternative, additional or consequential amendments/relief as necessary to achieve consistency with the other submission points and to satisfy submitter's concerns or such alternative relief to satisfy the concerns of the submitter.	Restrictions are accepted for buildings that front Main Road, however the imposition of this control for all sites within the Business Town Centre Zone is considered unduly restrictive. Restrictions on residential activities in the Business Town Centre Zone should only apply to sites that are subject to a verandah line identified on the planning maps.	Reject	75
<i>FS1388.106</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>Accept</i>	<i>75</i>
<b>403.1</b>	<b>Doug Nicholson</b>	Neutral/Amend	No specific decision sought, but submitter seeks that Rule 18.2.1 be amended.	No reasons provided.	Reject	79
<b>403.2</b>	<b>Doug Nicholson</b>	Oppose	Amend Rule 18.2.4.1 Earthworks - General, to suit 10 Baird Avenue, Te Kauwhata.	No one has visited the site to the knowledge of the submitter. No consideration as to what the land looks like and what runs through it, such as the council easement for wastewater being an open drain right through the middle of the property to a small lake, which then drains to the wetlands via a large open culvert. Any planned development would have to do earthworks outside these rules to achieve the District Plan vision.	Reject	82

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
403.3	Doug Nicholson	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.2.8 PI (iii) Outdoor Storage, so activities on 10 Baird Ave, Te Kauwhata are a discretionary activity.	10 Baird Avenue is in a gully from adjacent zones and properties. This rule is unlikely to be achieved, and would need compromise of sorts at consent stage.	Reject	84
403.4	Doug Nicholson	Oppose	Amend Rule 18.3.1.1 PI Height - Building General, from 10m to 15m.	10m does not lend itself to current successful/optimum shopping precincts developments, which consist of anchor tenants, such as The Warehouse Ltd. It is necessary for a 15m peak for buildings (perhaps not on street frontage) which are these anchor tenants. Example: <a href="http://www.colliers.co.nz/209211/">http://www.colliers.co.nz/209211/</a>	Reject	85
403.5	Doug Nicholson	Oppose	Amend Rule 18.1.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities and review the rules in consultation with 10 Baird Avenue, Te Kauwhata.	There are rules which contradict each other. The new rules do not lend themselves to current trends in developments the Town Centre is looking for. 10 Baird Avenue is the submitters' residential home, and they would not be able to do anything that they regard as 'lifestyle block' ownership improvements (such as a barn for a tractor). The Plan restricts development to business with residential only allowed above ground floor, but cannot be done unless the indicative road is made into a permanent road. This may not happen for a long time, as the submitter does not own the road, only have right of use. The only choice under these new rules would be to sell now to someone who is happy as it is, or wants to land bank, or sit 'in limbo' waiting for someone to come and want to buy the block plus the neighbours block to develop into shops etc., which could be 7-20 years away. The rules devalue the land.	Reject	76
FS1388.144	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	Accept	76

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
<b>403.7</b>	<b>Doug Nicholson</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.1.2 P8 Permitted Activities, to allow offices at the rear of tenancies on the ground floor OR Amend Rule 18.1.2 P8 Permitted Activities, to have no restrictions on offices.	A typical shop or retail development does not have a second floor and offices are generally at the rear of the tenancy on the ground floor. Some businesses require offices to be on the ground floor and at the street front Campbell Tyson, as an example, is on the ground floor and on a main street frontage.	Reject Accept	75
FS1078.7	Hugh Green Limited	Support	Consistent with relief sought by HGL (392.12)	The submission is allowed	Reject Accept	75
FS1388.145	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 Reject	75
<b>403.8</b>	<b>Doug Nicholson</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.1.2 P2 Permitted Activities, to allow for existing ground floor dwellings and new ground floor dwellings as permitted activities as per the existing mixed use area rules, for the duration of the existing legal owners.	The home is on the ground floor, and the submitter may want to build another home on the site should the existing home become uninhabitable for whatever reason. The Proposed District Plan removes their existing rights or use they had when they purchased. The Proposed District Plan should allow current landowners to use existing zone rules until sale.	Reject	75
FS1388.146	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	Accept	75

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>		
FS1078.8	Hugh Green Limited	Support	Consistent with relief sought by HGL (392.9)	The submission is allowed	Reject	75
403.9	Doug Nicholson	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.1.5 Non-Complying Activities, to allow for rules under mixed-use area policy currently in place AND Amend Rule 18.1.5 Non-Complying Activities, to enable development on an indicative road.	10 Baird Avenue is on an indicative road (not owned by submitter). NC1, NC2 and NC4 do not allow the submitter to do anything unless neighbours land turns into permanent road, which may never happen. The submitter does not want to develop the land themselves, just to be able to build lifestyle improvements while they are there, until they sell to a developer, if one is interested in next 10 years or more. This rule effectively devalues the land from the current rules.	Reject	78
FS1388.147	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	78
411.2	Kelvin Norgrove	Neutral/Amend	Amend the planning maps for Pokeno, by extending the verandah annotation to corner sites (including the property at 26 Market Street) that are within the Town Centre Business Zone at the western end (Market Square).	Extending the map annotation for verandahs in this location would be consistent with the approach for other road intersections to the east. A stronger built form, pedestrian shelter and amenity are required at the western entrance to the main street to achieve the design guidelines for the Pokeno Town Centre.	Reject	124
414.5	Chris Rayner	Neutral/Amend	Amend the Proposed District Plan by lifting noise limits within the town centre of Raglan to enable more live music	Socialising and getting out to events, with music and dancing is an important part of a happy	Reject	79

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			and events.	healthy community. The submitter would like to see Council help those who want to create events as music is a big part of why people come to Raglan. The submitter believes the noise limits in the the town centre should be raised and the restrictions around temporary events should be reduced.		
FS1276.33	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Oppose	WED seeks that the whole of the submission be disallowed.	Lifting noise limits within the town centre of Raglan will worsen living conditions for many residents. Noise events should be held with acoustically insulated buildings.	Accept	79
FS1276.170	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Oppose	WED seeks that the whole of the submission be disallowed.	Lifting noise limits within the town centre of Raglan will worsen living conditions for many residents. Noisy event should be held within acoustically insulated buildings.	Accept	79
435.8	Jade Hyslop	Oppose	Add rules to Chapter 18 Business Town Centre, to provide for protection of defined views from public places to harbour, coast and natural backdrops which include at least the following defined views: (a) From SH23 (north of Maungatawhiri Road) to Kaitoke Creek. (b) All existing views of the bar from Main Road, Bow Street and Norrie Avenue. (c) All existing views of Karioi from Raglan CBD. (d) From Wainui Road to the coast between the Bryant Reserve and the Bible Crusade Camp. (e) From SH23 summit to Karioi. (f) AroAro salt marsh from Wallis Street. AND Amend the Planning maps for any consequential relief required to give effect to this submission point.	Rules in each zone chapter are needed to apply Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes Objective 3.3.3a.) And in Raglan to apply Business and Business Town Centre Zone Policy 4.5.14a.iii.)- Raglan Town Centre. Views are an inherent part of retaining Raglan's seaside character. Raglan's community plan, 'Raglan Naturally,' contains 6 references to views. RMA s5 states purpose of RMA which includes reference to social, economic and cultural wellbeings, of which Raglan Naturally sets out that the Raglan community clearly expressed such wellbeings include protection of views. At the last plan revision, Council accepted views were important but change needed to occur via a variation which has not happened and thus needs to be a part of the plan. Excluding an important part of Raglan Naturally is to deny the value of public participation. Plan protects views of navigation beacons. Other authorities' district plans show protection of other views is possible, e.g. Auckland and Hastings	Reject	74
FS1258.47	Meridian Energy Limited	Oppose	Disallow	The submission point does not provide sufficient detail to determine the precise spatial extent of the view protection areas and does not define what 'protection' means in terms of rules and policy framework. It is not possible to determine what the potential effect would be for structures, including infrastructure installations. In the absence of this detail, Meridian opposes the submission point.	Accept	74

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
496.6	Andrea Millar for The Department of Corrections	Support	Retain Rule 17.1.2 P3 Permitted Activities.	The submission is seeking community correction activities be a subset of community activities. This would result in community correction activities being permitted in the Business Zone. This activity is compatible and appropriate exemplified by the existing facilities that are located in the Business Zone within Huntly, Ngaruawahia and Raglan. Such facilities are appropriately suited to these areas on the basis that they are easily accessible to the communities they serve. Locating community corrections facilities in Business Zones mean that they have good accessibility to other social government agencies, such as the courts, Police and Work and Income. It would provide for community corrections activities therefore it is supported.	Accept	47
FS1388.493	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	47
496.7	Andrea Millar for The Department of Corrections	Support	Retain Rule 18.1.2 P6 Permitted Activities.	The submission is seeking community correction activities be a subset of community activities. This would result in community correction activities being permitted in the Business Town Centre Zone. This activity is compatible and appropriate in this zone. Such facilities are appropriately suited to these areas on the basis that they are easily accessible to the communities they serve. Locating community corrections facilities in Business Zones mean that they have good accessibility to other social government agencies, such as the courts, Police and Work and Income. It would provide for	Accept	75

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				community corrections activities therefore it is supported.		
FS1388.494	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	75
553.7	Malibu Hamilton	Neutral/Amend	Add a new clause (iv) to Policy 4.5.38(a)(iv) Artificial outdoor lighting, as follows: <u>(iv) Artificial outdoor lighting is installed and operated so that light spill does not contribute to pollution of the night sky or similar wording.</u>	Light pollution can cause adverse impacts to wildlife and migratory birds and disrupt their normal patterns of behaviour. Villages and towns contribute to wider adverse impacts. All exterior lighting should have shields to force lighting towards the ground. There are no policies dealing with adverse effects of night sky pollution. LED lights need to be coated with phosphor that converts the blue light to yellow to avoid adverse effects of blue light.	Reject	42
553.8	Malibu Hamilton	Support	Retain Rule 18.3.1.1 Building height, restricting the maximum building height limit to 10m in the Whaingaroa Township.	Supports the 10m max height limit. New development should be carefully designed to fit the existing main street height, scale and form and align with the corresponding immediate surroundings. Maintaining the existing character of the historic buildings is crucial.	Accept	85
FS1388.786	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	Reject	85

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
567.4	Ngati Tamaoho Trust	Neutral/Amend	Amend Objective 4.5.12(c) - Business Town Centre - Character, as follows: Development of town centres is designed in a functional, and attractive and environmentally sustainable manner serving the needs of the community.	No reasons provided.	Reject	19
588.1	Peter Buchan for Woolworths NZ Ltd	Not Stated	Delete Policy 4.5.29 New Buildings - Business Zone. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential or alternative relief to give effect to the specific amendments sought.	The content of these repetitive policies is more appropriately addressed in standards and assessment criteria.	Accept	36
FS1388.970	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	36
588.2	Peter Buchan for Woolworths NZ Ltd	Not Stated	Amend Policy 4.5.31 Reverse sensitivity as follows: (a) Reverse sensitivity is managed by ensuring residential activities and development within Business and Business Town Centre Zones is managed by ensuring residential activities and development are acoustically insulated to mitigate adverse effects of noise. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential or alternative relief to give effect to the specific amendments sought.	No reasons provided.	Accept	38
FS1388.971	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</i>	Reject	38

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
588.3	Peter Buchan for Woolworths NZ Ltd	Not Stated	Delete Policy 4.5.33 Reverse sensitivity. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential or alternative relief to give effect to the specific amendments sought.	No reason provided.	Accept	38
FS1388.972	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
588.4	Peter Buchan for Woolworths NZ Ltd	Not Stated	Retain Policy 4.5.32 Adjoining site amenity as notified.	No reason provided.	Accept	39
588.5	Peter Buchan for Woolworths NZ Ltd	Not Stated	Delete Policy 4.5.42 Adjoining site amenity. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential or alternative relief to give effect to the specific amendments sought.	No reason provided.	Accept	44
FS1388.973	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	Reject	44

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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>		
588.6	Peter Buchan for Woolworths NZ Ltd	Not Stated	Amend Policy 4.5.36 Signage as follows: (a) In the Business Town Centre and Business Zone provide 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 signs that are of benefit to community well-being; and iii. Establishment of signage to support the commercial function and vibrancy of the zones with controls on the site, location, appearance and number of signs to ensure they do not detract from the visual amenity of the surrounding environment, <u>including avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse effects arising from illumination, light spill, flashing or reflection</u> ; iv. <u>Control of 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</u> ; v. <u>the placement of signs that do not obstruct the free movement of: A. Pedestrians along the footpath; B. Vehicle use of the road carriageway.</u> AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential or alternative relief to give effect to the specific amendments sought.	Assessment of signage in commercial zones needs to consider the importance of corporate branding for consistency and cohesion and ensure that consideration sites along the urban design aspirations for the centres in the district. Businesses need to be instantly recognisable for customers and not "watered down" to achieve a character	Reject	40
588.7	Peter Buchan for Woolworths NZ Ltd	Not Stated	Delete Policy 4.5.37 Managing the adverse effects of signs. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential or alternative relief to give effect to the specific amendments sought.	This policy is a copy and achieves the outcomes sought within other policies.	Reject	41
589.3	Z Energy Ltd	Oppose	Amend Rule 18.3.5 D1 Verandahs from a Discretionary activity to a Restricted Discretionary activity and include	This rule captures a "new building or the alteration of an existing building" and will be	Accept	89

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p>relevant matters of discretion: <del>D-IRD1</del> Any verandah that does not comply with Rule 18.3.5 PI. <u>Discretion is restricted to: (i) The effects on the amenity of the streetscape; (ii) The character and layout of the building; (iii) The nature, design and location of the verandah; and (iv) The functional requirements of the activities that the buildings are intended to accommodate.</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend the Proposed District Plan, including consequential amendments, to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>	<p>triggered irrespective of the extent or location of the alteration or new building. Non-compliance with the overlay rule triggers a full discretionary activity and this is inappropriate. It is possible to restrict the matters relevant and required to be considered and therefore should be considered a restricted discretionary activity. It needs to be recognised that there are some commercial activities that have a different form and function to that enshrined in the proposed approach, but which are still appropriately located in the business environment. The Z Pokeno truckstop is an established business that provides a function and facility to the public. The design requirements of a service station will not meet the verandah overlay standard. It is important that the operating requirements of such activities are accommodated.</p>		
589.4	Z Energy Ltd	Oppose	<p>Amend Policy 4.5.29 New Buildings: Business Zone, as follows: (a) New buildings within the Business Zone are consistent with the Waikato District Council Urban Design Guidelines Town Centres (Appendix 3.3), and in particular: (i) Responds to the specific site characteristics and wider street; (ii) Promotes architectural form, building features and placement; (iii) Provides landscape and open space design that responds to the characteristics and qualities of the area; (iv) Minimises visual and visual amenity impacts of accessways and parking facilities; and (v) Accommodates pedestrian access and safety. <u>Except that where an activity has a specific functional or operational design or layout requirement, to consider (i) - (v) in the context of the following: (i) the investment in existing activities; (ii) the nature of the existing environment; (iii) the degree to which new buildings have been designed to address the street and the street edge, to the degree practicable, and otherwise to mitigate the visual impact of blank walls, including through design features or landscaping; and (iv) the degree to which visibility of and for pedestrians is maintained and pedestrian movements along the footpath can be prioritised.</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend the Proposed District Plan, including consequential amendments, to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>	<p>Does not make satisfactory provision for the continued use and redevelopment of existing commercial use and redevelopment of existing commercial sites. There is a need to recognise that there are business activities which have a different form and function, but which are appropriately located in a business environment. Service stations are activities that provide important functions for the public and the design requirements of service stations mean that many of the requirements within the Proposed District Plan will not be able to be met. It is important that their operating requirements are accommodated, To do otherwise would be inefficient and ineffective and will generate greater costs than benefits.</p>	Reject	36

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FSI 388.993	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	36
603.5	Helen Clotworthy on behalf of Pokeno Community Committee	Support	Retain the character statement for the Business Town Centre Zone/Pokeno Town Centre.	No reasons provided.	Accept	25
FSI 175.4	Pokeno Community Committee	Support	The Pokeno Main St Design Guide has to be adhered to.	The Pokeno Main St Design Guide has to be understood by Council planners to ensure the development of our Main St and developing CBD is in the design principals	Accept	25
633.1	Alan Henderson for Van Den Brink Group	Oppose	Delete Policy 4.5.42(a)(ii) Adjoining site amenity to reduce height adjoining residential or reserve zoned land. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	Policy 4.5.42 Adjoining site amenity is a duplicate of Policy 4.5.31 Reverse sensitivity. The policy is not supported by the rules, and is inconsistent with the relief sought elsewhere in the submission.	Accept	44
FSI 387.26	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	44
679.3	Greenways Orchards Limited	Oppose	Delete Policy 4.5.11(a)(ii) Residential upper floors: Business	There may be circumstances where ground floor	Reject	18

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			Town Centre Zone and Business Zone relating to avoiding residential activity at ground level.	residences are appropriate, especially when dealing with zone or heritage interfaces, or motel accommodation.		
FS1387.151	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	18
FS1078.31	Hugh Green Limited	Support	Generally consistent with relief sought by HGL	The submission is allowed	Reject	44
679.5	Greenways Orchards Limited	Oppose	Delete Rule 17.1.5 NCI Non-Complying Activities AND Add ground floor residential activity to Rule 17.1.4 Discretionary Activities.	A non-complying activity status for this type of multi-unit development is too restrictive and does not provide for innovation in design or development concepts which may promote good outcomes for the Business Zone. Residential activities are appropriate and a non-complying activity status does not enable this type of development. Residential development at ground floor level may an appropriate design response given the characteristics of the site and surrounding area, such as where buildings adjoin a Residential Zone.	Reject	50
FS1387.153	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	Accept	50

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FS1078.33	Hugh Green Limited	Support	Generally consistent with relief sought by HGL	The submission is allowed if the alternative relief by HGL (392.2, .6 and .7) is disallowed	Reject	50
FS1078.32	Hugh Green Limited	Support	Generally consistent with relief sought by HGL	The submission is allowed if the alternative relief by HGL (392.4 and .5) is disallowed	Reject	50
<b>679.6</b>	<b>Greenways Orchards Limited</b>	Oppose	Delete Rule 17.1.5 NC2 Non-Complying Activities AND Add ground floor residential activity to Rule 17.1.4 Discretionary Activities.	A non-complying activity status for this type of residential activity is too restrictive and does not provide for innovation in design or development concepts which may promote good outcomes for the Business Zone. Residential activities are appropriate and a non-complying activity status does not enable this type of development. Residential development at ground floor level may an appropriate design response given the characteristics of the site and surrounding area, such as where buildings adjoin a Residential Zone.	Reject	50
FS1387.154	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
FS1078.40	Hugh Green Limited	Support	Generally consistent with relief sought by HGL	The submission is allowed if the alternative relief by HGL (392.2, .6 and .7) is disallowed	Reject	50
<b>749.6</b>	<b>Housing New Zealand Corporation</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 4.5.3 Commercial purpose: Business Town Centre Zone as follows: (a)The role of the business town centres in Raglan, Huntly, Ngaruawahia, Te Kauwhata, Pokeno and Tuakau is strengthened by ensuring that: (i)They are recognised and maintained as the primary retail, administration, commercial service and civic centre for each town; and (ii)The scale of commercial activities supports their continued viability as the primary retail, administration and commercial service centre for each	The submitter supports the intent of the objectives and policies of the Business Town Centre Zone; however, there is no recognition in the policies that support residential activity to occur in the zone. The Business Town Centre Zone enables residential on upper floors, and therefore the policies of the zone should recognise that residential development will occur in the centres.	Reject	10

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			town; and (iii) Enhances their vitality and amenity while providing for a range of commercial, residential and community activities and facilities.; and (iv) Opportunities for higher intensity residential development are provided to support a compact, urban form. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan as consequential or additional relief as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission as necessary.			
FS1387.992	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
FS1078.46	Hugh Green Limited	Support	Generally consistent with relief sought by HGL	The submission is allowed	Reject	10
749.7	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 4.5.11 Residential upper floors: Business Town Centre Zone and Business Zone as follows: 4.5.11 Policy - Residential upper floors: in the Business Town Centre Zone and Business Zone a) Maintain the commercial viability of the Business Town Centre Zone and Business Zone while: i. Providing for mixed use developments, ensuring residential activities are located in appropriate locations and in some cases above ground floor; and ii. Avoiding residential activity located at ground level where it undermines commercial retail frontage and activity AND Add a new policy to Section 4.5 to address residential upper floors in the Business Zone as follows: 4.5.11A Policy - Residential upper floors in the Business Zone a) Maintain the commercial viability of the Business Zone while: (i) Providing for mixed use developments, ensuring residential activities are located above ground floor; and (ii) Minimising residential activity located at ground level. AND	The submitter supports the intent of the policy, however disagrees that residential activity should be limited to upper floors in a Business Town Centre Zone. In some cases and locations, where appropriate, mixed use development could be provided at ground level in a Business Town Centre Zone. Residential on upper floors in a Business Zone can remain as it is appropriate.	Reject Accept	18

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			Amend the Proposed District Plan as consequential or additional relief as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission as necessary.			
FS1371.30	Lakeside Development Limited	Support	Lakeside Development Limited seek that the submission made in relation supporting residential development on the ground floor where considered to appropriate within the context of the area and managed through appropriate urban design responses be allowed.	Will encourage design innovation in providing a variety of housing typologies within areas marked for intensification. Will promote the sustainable management of resources and will achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991. Will enable the well-being of the community. Will meet the reasonably foreseeable need of future generations. Will enable the efficient use and development of the district's assets. Will represent the most appropriate means of exercising the Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means.	Reject Accept	18
FS1387.993	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 Reject	18
749.8	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Support	Retain Objective 4.5.12 Business Town Centre - Character, as notified.	The submitter supports this objective.	Accept	19
FS1387.994	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate	Reject	19

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
<b>749.9</b>	<b>Housing New Zealand Corporation</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 4.5.13 (a) (v) Town centre built form as follows: (v) maintains a low-rise built form that supports and small scale pedestrian focussed retail activities; AND Amend the Proposed District Plan as consequential or additional relief as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission as necessary.	The submitter supports this policy with minor amendments to remove the words "low rise" and "small scale" from Policy 4.5.13(a)(v).	Reject	20
<b>780.3</b>	<b>John Lawson (Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Incorporation on behalf of Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Incorporated Society</b>	Oppose	Add rules to Chapter 18 Business Town Centre Zone to provide for protection of defined views from public places to the harbour, coast and natural backdrops and to include at least the following defined views:- (a) from SH23 (north of Maungatawhiri Rd) to Kaitoke Creek (b) all existing views of the bar from Main Road, Bow St and Norrie Avenue (c) all existing views of Karioi from Raglan CBD (d) from Wainui Rd to the coast between the Bryant Reserve and the Bible Crusade Camp (e) from SH23 summit to Karioi (f) AroAro salt marsh from Wallis St. AND Amend the planning maps for any consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Rules in each zone are required to give effect to Policies 3.3.3 (a) and 4.5.14 (a) (iii). Views are a part of Raglan's character. Raglan Naturally makes various references to 'view'. The original submission notes these references in detail. RMA (Section 5) includes "well being" which was included in Raglan Naturally and this clearly includes protection of views. Raglan Naturally needs to be considered as a part of the district plan review. Other district plans protect views (Auckland and Hastings).	Reject	74
FS1387.1189	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Accept	74
FS1258.49	Meridian Energy Limited	Oppose	Disallow	<i>The submission point does not provide sufficient detail to determine the precise spatial extent of the view protection areas and does not define what 'protection' means in terms of rules and policy</i>	Accept	74

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>framework. It is not possible to determine what the potential effect would be for structures, including infrastructure installations. In the absence of this detail, Meridian opposes the submission point.</i>		
FS1269.64	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Oppose	Oppose in part.	Housing New Zealand opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission.	Accept	74
FS1142.17	Greig Metcalfe	Oppose	Development in the Raglan Town Centre should not be constrained by protection of view shafts. Existing bulk and location provisions ensure buildings have an appropriate scale..		Accept	74
<b>780.7</b>	<b>John Lawson (Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Incorpora on behalf of Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Incorporated Society</b>	Oppose	Add provisions to Chapter 17 - Business Zone, to restrict further holiday accommodation in Raglan's residential and business areas. AND Add provisions for an area of high density development near the cement silos, of similar height to them and to the density and design of a traditional European fishing village, available for low cost purchase and rental by permanent residents for leases of no less than a year.	Raglan is very short of permanent accommodation and the Plan makes no provision for affordable properties protected from use for holiday occupation.	Reject	48
FS1387.1193	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	48
<b>780.8</b>	<b>John Lawson (Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Incorpora on behalf of Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Incorporated Society</b>	Oppose	Add provisions to Chapter 18 - Business Town Centre Zone, to restrict further holiday accommodation in Raglan's residential and business areas. AND Add provisions for an area of high density development near the cement silos, of similar height to them and to the density and design of a traditional European fishing village, available for low cost purchase and rental by permanent residents for leases of no less than a year.	Raglan is very short of permanent accommodation and the Plan makes no provision for affordable properties protected from use for holiday occupation.	Reject	74
FS1387.1194	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood	Accept	74

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FS1142.18	Greig Metcalfe	Oppose	There is demand for holiday accommodation in Raglan and the Town Centre Zone is an appropriate location.		Accept	74
788.7	Susan Hall	Neutral/Amend	Add a new set of rules to Chapter 18 Business Town Centre Zone to provide for the protection of defined views from public places in Raglan to the harbour, coast and natural backdrops in the chapters on rural, residential, and business town centre zones, to include at least the following defined views: (a) From SH23 (north of Maungatawhiri Road) to Kaitoke Creek; (b) All existing views of the bar from Main Road, Bow Street, and Norrie Avenue; (c) All existing views of Karioi from Raglan CBD; (d) From Wainui Road to the coast between the Bryant Reserve and the Bible Crusade Camp; (e) From SH23 summit to Karioi; and (f) AroAro salt marsh from Wallis Street. AND Amend the planning maps to identify defined views.	Views are an inherent part of retention of Raglan's seaside Character. The Raglan Naturally community plan contains six references to views as follows: "Relaxed lifestyles, a tranquil harbour, safe swimming beaches, black sand, internationally renowned surf ad spectacular coastal views are characteristic - the Waikato District's only seaside resort." "What We Don't Want - Buildings blocking views of harbour, coast and mountain." "Priorities for Action - The retention of access to, and views of the harbour, coast, and mountain from within Raglan." "What We Don't Want - Loss of access to or views of the harbour from parked cars, large trees or buildings." "Safeguard coastal views from Wainui Reserve." "Safeguarding the Environment - Maintain the coastal and harbour views, e.g. do not allow the planting of big trees, or the building of high fences or large buildings that destroy existing views." Section 5 of the RMA sets out the purpose (including District Plans) "protection of natural and physical resources in a way, or at a rate, which enables people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural wellbeing." Raglan Naturally sets out how the Raglan community has expressed its views on their well-	Reject	74

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				beings. These very clearly include protection of views. At the last Plan revision, the Council accepted views as important, but said any change would need to occur through a variation to the District Plan. That has not happened, so it should be a part of this plan. To exclude such an important part of Raglan Naturally in the district plan review is to deny the value of public participation in which over 10% of Raglan's population took part. The plan protects views of the navigation beacons and district plans of other authorities, such as Auckland and Hastings show that protection of other views is possible. A policy should protect views, e.g. Auckland's protection of volcanic view shafts. Each chapter needs to apply Policy 3.3.3.		
FS1258.51	Meridian Energy Limited	Oppose	Disallow	The submission point does not provide sufficient detail to determine the precise spatial extent of the view protection areas and does not define what 'protection' means in terms of rules and policy framework. It is not possible to determine what the potential effect would be for structures, including infrastructure installations. In the absence of this detail, Meridian opposes the submission point.	Accept	74
FS1276.156	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Support	WED seeks that the whole submission point be allowed.	This supports WED's submission that views should be protected by the Plan.	Reject	74
798.6	Ngati Te Ata	Not Stated	Amend Objective 4.5.12 (c) Business Town Centre - Character as follows: (c) Development of town centres is designed in a functional, and attractive and environmentally sustainable manner... AND Add the following to all town centre objectives: ...In a functional, attractive and environmentally sustainable manner.	No reasons provided.	Reject	19
FS1108.35	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)	Support	Null	General agreement with the submission.	Reject	19
823.8	NZTE Operations Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.3.1.2 - Height - Buildings, structures and vegetation within an airport obstacle limitation surface, as follows: P1 Any building, structure, tree or other vegetation must not protrude through the airport obstacle limitation surfaces as shown on the planning maps. D1 Any building, structure, tree or other vegetation that does not comply with Rule 17.3.1.2 P1. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan for any consequential	The OLS (as notified) is necessary to ensure compliance with Civil Aviation Circular AC139-7 Aerodrome Standards and Requirements for Code 1 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	Accept	59

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			relief required to give effect to this submission.	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 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.		
FS1253.9	Waikato Regional Airport Ltd	Support	Seek that the part of this submission be allowed, subject to the changes set out in response to submission point 697.201.	The inclusion of trees and other vegetation in the rule makes it clearer to the reader what applies to this rule.	Accept	59
FS1178.8	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 its 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 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 to have to apply for Resource consents to build and do not think we should have to. All for their business venture.	Reject	59
825.3	John Lawson	Oppose	Add rules to Chapter 18 Business Town Centre Zone to provide for protection of defined views from public places to the harbour, coast and natural backdrops and to include	Rules in each zone are required to give effect to Policies 3.3.3 (a) and 4.5.14 (a) (iii). Views are a part of Raglan's character. Raglan Naturally	Reject	74

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			at least the following defined views:- (a) from SH23 (north of Maungatawhiri Rd) to Kaitoke Creek (b) all existing views of the bar from Main Road, Bow St and Norrie Avenue (c) all existing views of Karioi from Raglan CBD (d) from Wainui Rd to the coast between the Bryant Reserve and the Bible Crusade Camp (e) from SH23 summit to Karioi (f) AroAro salt marsh from Wallis St. AND Amend the planning maps for any consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	makes various references to 'view'. The original submission notes these references in detail. RMA (Section 5) includes "well being" which was included in Raglan Naturally and this clearly includes protection of views. Raglan Naturally needs to be considered as a part of the district plan review. Other district plans protect views (Auckland and Hastings).		
FS1387.1312	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	74
FS1258.54	Meridian Energy Limited	Oppose	Disallow	The submission point does not provide sufficient detail to determine the precise spatial extent of the view protection areas and does not define what 'protection' means in terms of rules and policy framework. It is not possible to determine what the potential effect would be for structures, including infrastructure installations. In the absence of this detail, Meridian opposes the submission point.	Accept	74
FS1142.19	Greig Metcalfe	Oppose	Development in the Raglan Town Centre Should not be constrained by protection of view shafts. Existing bulk and location provisions ensure buildings have an appropriate scale.		Accept	74
825.7	John Lawson	Oppose	Add provisions to Chapter 17 - Business Zone, to restrict further holiday accommodation in Raglan's residential and business areas. AND Add provisions for an area of high density development near the cement silos, of similar height to them and to the density and design of a traditional European fishing village, available for low cost purchase and rental by permanent residents for leases of no less than a year.	Raglan is very short of permanent accommodation and the Plan makes no provision for affordable properties protected from use for holiday occupation.	Reject	48

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1387.1316	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	48
825.8	John Lawson	Oppose	Add provisions to Chapter 18 - Business Town Centre Zone, to restrict further holiday accommodation in Raglan's residential and business areas. AND Add provisions for an area of high density development near the cement silos, of similar height to them and to the density and design of a traditional European fishing village, available for low cost purchase and rental by permanent residents for leases of no less than a year.	Raglan is very short of permanent accommodation and the Plan makes no provision for affordable properties protected from use for holiday occupation.	Reject	74
FS1387.1317	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	74
FS1142.20	Greig Metcalfé	Oppose	There is demand for holiday accommodation in Raglan and the Town Centre Zone is an appropriate location.		Accept	74
838.6	Madsen Lawrie Consultants	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.3.6(a)(i) Dwelling to clarify that this rule is	A dwelling at ground level should be permitted,	Reject	63

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			relevant to multi-story developments with road frontage only in the Business Zone.	provided the dwelling does not have road frontage.		
FS1387.1369	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	63
FS1078.51	Hugh Green Limited	Support	Generally consistent with relief sought by HGL	The submission is allowed if the alternative relief by HGL (392.2, .6 and .7) is disallowed	Reject	63
871.9	Brendon John & Denise Louise Strong	Oppose	Amend Rule 17.3.1.1 PI height - Building General, as follows: The maximum height of any building must not exceed 10.15m.	The building height should be increased from 10m to 15m to allow for 4 storeys. This will ensure development and re-development (especially for smaller sites) is economically viable for developers and allow for a range of uses making residential development viable on upper floors.	Reject	59
965.3	Sandra Ellmers for Sandra EllmersFamily Trust	Oppose	Add a new activity to Rule 17.1.2 Permitted Activities for "multi-unit development".	Raglan has a shortage of quality tourism accommodation. Many Waikato and Auckland residents own baches or homes in Raglan that are only used occasionally, mainly on weekends, in the summer months. These properties are under-utilised and as many are on large blocks on land the grounds and properties need on-going maintenance which can be time consuming and expensive. Therefore, there is a need for construction of smaller, higher density, low maintenance units and apartments as an option for "weekenders." This would free up many properties in established residential areas. It is appropriate that multi-unit development be incorporated and encouraged within Business Zones, rather than Residential areas. When a property has multiple residents, it can create on-	Reject	47

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				going noise problems. If numerous multi-unit apartments are located within Residential areas the level of people movement and noise could ruin the enjoyment of life for the other residents. It is often difficult in Residential areas to accommodate adequate visitor parking for multi-unit developments as residential streets can become clogged up with visitor parking.		
FS1276.165	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Oppose	WED seeks that the whole submission point be disallowed.	The amount of holiday accommodation has increased a lot in the last decade and no controls are proposed to ensure 'quality.'	Accept	47
FS1387.1603	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	47
965.4	Sandra Ellmers for Sandra EllmersFamily Trust	Oppose	Amend Rule 17.1.3 RD1 (a) (vii) Restricted Discretionary Activities, as follows: Residential Unit Minimum Area Minimum Dimension Studio Unit or 1 bedroom 106m <sup>2</sup> 21.5m 2 or more bedroom 158m <sup>2</sup> 21.5m	Not all above ground apartments/units or apartment owners require or want balconies or exterior living court areas. There should be an option when designing and constructing multi-level apartments to include (or not include) upper level balconies. Apartment managers do not encourage and often do not permit socialisation by groups of people on balconies as it can cause noise nuisance for other residents. A reasonable sized ground level communal outdoor area may be more practical than numerous individual 'living court' areas. The market is the best judge of what is required to upper level living court areas should be an option, not compulsory.	Reject	48
FS1387.1604	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	Accept	48

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
965.5	Sandra Ellmers for Sandra EllmersFamily Trust	Oppose	Amend Rule 17.2.3 PI (a) (i) Onsite parking areas - Landscaping, as follows: (i) The car parking area must be separated from the road by a 4.51m wide planting strip, with the exception of vehicle access points;	The wider the planting strip is, the more it is likely to be neglected. It is not practical to plant trees as they grow too high and when mature the roots can cause uplift in the paved areas and the tree branches drop and shed over the car park area. It is therefore more practical to plant either a suitable hedging variety or a row of low growing shrubs. Maintenance of planted areas requires constant upkeep to keep weed free and looking attractive. It is very apparent that carparks district wide are often left in a very untidy state with weeds growing and rubbish being thrown into the landscape strip. A 1m landscape strip is more than adequate to achieve an attractive landscape and provide separation between the road and carparks is easier to maintain and keep tidy in carpark areas.	Reject	53
FS1276.29	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Oppose	WED seeks that the whole of the submission be disallowed.	The issues raised indicate the need for larger, rather than smaller strips.	Accept	53
965.6	Sandra Ellmers for Sandra EllmersFamily Trust	Oppose	Amend Rule 17.3.4.1 (a) (i) Building setbacks - Zone boundaries, as follows: (a) (i) 7.54m from rear and side boundaries adjoining the: A. Residential Zone; B. Village Zone; C. Country Living Zone; or D. Reserve Zone; and...	There are adequate rules in place within the current Building Code and District Plan to protect adjacent residential properties from excessive noise levels and disturbance from Business areas. Many Business zoned lots are small and if located adjacent to a Residential Zone the 7.5m setback requirement for side and rear boundaries would render much of the site unusable. A 4m separation would allow a wide driveway or storage area between the Business and Residential zones and still enable compliance. When purchasing a residential dwelling, the potential buyer has an option of not purchasing a dwelling adjacent to a business area if they are genuinely concerned about any possible impact.	Accept	61

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
965.7	Sandra Ellmers for Sandra EllmersFamily Trust	Oppose	Delete Rule 17.3.7 PI (a) (iii) Living Court.	Not all above ground apartments/units or apartment owners require or want balconies or exterior living court areas. Apartment managers do not encourage or permit socialisation by groups of people on balconies as it can cause noise nuisance for other residents. There should be an option when designing and constructing multi-level apartments to include (or not include) upper level balconies. A reasonable sized ground level communal outdoor area may be more practical than numerous individual living court areas. The market is the best judge of what is required so upper level living court areas should be an option, not compulsory.	Reject	64
FS1387.1605	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Accept	64
965.8	Sandra Ellmers for Sandra EllmersFamily Trust	Oppose	Amend Rule 17.4.1.1- RDI (a) (iii) Subdivision- Multi-unit development, as follows: Unit of Apartment Minimum Unit Area Studio unit or 1 bedroom unit <del>60</del> 50m <sup>2</sup> 2 bedroom unit <del>80</del> 70m <sup>2</sup> 3 bedroom unit <del>100</del> 80m <sup>2</sup>	There appears to be very little recognition in the Proposed District Plan that units and dwellings worldwide are downsizing. There must be options within a District Plan to provide for smaller homes and units people can afford and there is not. Often units only have one permanent occupant, regardless of the size of the unit. 100m <sup>2</sup> is a very large unit and larger than many standard homes, therefore it seems excessive and outside the standard so it should be reduced to be more in line with what people want and can afford. If people require larger units they can purchase them but the option	Reject	66

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				should be there to purchase units of various sizes.		
FS1387.1606	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
198.20	Katherine Wilson for Property Council New Zealand	Support	Retain Policy 4.5.24 New buildings: Business Town Centre Zone.	The submitter has long supported the development of infrastructure, buildings and designs that support quality urban design. Quality urban design is important in contributing to the overall design of the community and landscape. Urban design principles are important to ensure that buildings are functional and sustainable.	Accept	31
FS1386.216	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	31
297.16	Dave Glossop for Counties Manukau Police	Neutral/Amend	Add to Policy 4.5.41 Earthworks a new line as follows: Manage the earthworks site to ensure that resources at the site are safe and to minimise the risk of victimisation	Development sites are crime attractors Vehicles, tools and diesel have previously been targeted by criminals The inclusion of this wording ensures that there in an obligation	Reject	43

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				through council policy to consider safety at development sites This should result in reduced victimisations, making people safe and feel safe.		
FS1269.14	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Oppose	Oppose in part.	Housing New Zealand opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission.	Accept	43
297.24	Dave Glossop for Counties Manukau Police	Neutral/Amend	Retain Policy 4.5.38 Artificial outdoor lighting, except for the amendments sought below AND Add to Policy 4.5.38(a) Artificial outdoor lighting a new line as follows: (iv) artificial outdoor lighting conforms to national guidelines for CPTED	To ensure that there is an obligation to consider security and CPTED, reducing victimisation, making people safe and feel safe.	Accept	42
FS1269.19	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Oppose	Oppose in part.	Housing New Zealand opposes the proposed amendment; to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission.	Reject	42
297.27	Dave Glossop for Counties Manukau Police	Support	Retain Policy 4.5.37 Managing the adverse effects of signs as notified.	The intention of this policy is in line with the Police Prevention First Model (taking every opportunity to prevent harm) and the Safer Journeys Strategy (reducing and preventing road related trauma) and the target to reduce road deaths every year by 5 percent.	Accept	41
297.29	Dave Glossop for Counties Manukau Police	Neutral/Amend	Amend Objective 4.5.12(c) Business Town Centre - Character as follows: Development of town centres is designed in a functional and attractive manner serving the needs of the community and conforms to the national guidelines for CPTED.	To ensure that there is an obligation to consider CPTED, reducing victimisation, making people safe and feel safe.	Reject	19
FS1269.20	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Oppose	Oppose in part.	Housing New Zealand opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission.	Accept	19
297.30	Dave Glossop for Counties Manukau Police	Support	Retain Policy 4.5.13(a)(i) Town centre built form as notified.	To ensure that there is an obligation to consider safety, reducing victimisation, making people safe and feel safe.	Accept	20
297.31	Dave Glossop for Counties Manukau Police	Support	Retain Policy 4.5.18(a)(i) Pokeno Town Centre as notified.	To ensure that there is an obligation to consider access and CPTED, reducing victimisation, making people safe and feel safe To ensure that there is an obligation to consider access by emergency services and other service vehicles This is of specific concern and has been problematic in some new developments under the authority of Auckland Council.	Accept	25

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
297.53	Dave Glossop for Counties Manukau Police	Neutral/Amend	Amend Appendix 3.3 Town Centre Guidelines to prominently include the national guidelines for CPTED to provide further useful information, and not just listed as a reference.	To ensure that there is an obligation to consider CPTED, reducing victimisation, making people safe and feel safe.	Reject	118
FS1386.320	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	118
FS1269.23	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Oppose	Oppose in part.	Housing New Zealand opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission.	Accept	118
297.60	Dave Glossop for Counties Manukau Police	Neutral/Amend	Add to Policy 4.5.18(a) Pokeno Town Centre a new point as follows: <u>(a)(v) ensuring adequate accessibility for emergency services and other service vehicles. (Including adequate turning circles and road widths when roads are in use and taking into consideration parked vehicles at the road side)</u>	To ensure that there is an obligation to consider access and CPTED, reducing victimisation, making people safe and feel safe To ensure that there is an obligation to consider access by emergency services and other service vehicles This is of specific concern and has been problematic in some new developments under the authority of Auckland Council.	Reject	25
FS1114.4	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Null	FENZ supports the addition of this policy provision as it supports FENZ's requirements of adequate accessibility to both the source of a fire and a firefighting water supply for the efficient operation of FENZ. The requirements for firefighting access are set out in the Code of Practice and further detailed in FENZ's 'Emergency Vehicle Access Guidelines' (May 2015).	Reject	25
297.61	Dave Glossop for Counties Manukau Police	Neutral/Amend	Add to Policy 4.5.18(a) Pokeno Town Centre a new point as follows: <u>(a) (vi) by conforming to the National Guidelines for Crime Prevention through Environmental Design in New Zealand.</u>	To ensure that there is an obligation to consider access and CPTED, reducing victimisation, making people safe and feel safe To ensure that there is an obligation to consider access by emergency services and other service vehicles This is of specific concern and has been problematic in some new developments	Reject	25

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				under the authority of Auckland Council.		
310.12	<b>Fiona McNabb for Whaingaroa Raglan Affordable Housing Project</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.1.2 Permitted Activities, by including "Relocatable Home Park" as a permitted activity in the Business Zone. AND Add a definition to Chapter 13 Definitions for "Relocatable Home Park."	Building much smaller, on trailers and with intent houses could be moved if desired is a mechanism for providing affordable housing that is not currently addressed by the District Plan. Future option is that land be retained by the developer and only dwellings would be owned by the purchaser(s). Developments created to provide suitable flat size, power, potable water and waste amenities to the site ready for connection. Shared facilities of communal gardens and recreation areas could be a pre-requisite for such developments. Rule change necessary to create the above as a permitted activity and provide good planning objectives so that such developments would be built of good standard, enhance town and building amenities and provide affordable options for those wanting smaller homes in a village environment.	Reject	47
FS1386.368	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	47
FS1276.21	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Support	WED seeks that the whole of the submission point be allowed subject to adding 'subject to appropriate safeguards to amenities and the environment.'	Affordable housing is needed, but large scale building has not so far created affordable housing and can destroy other amenities.	Reject	47
378.31	<b>Fire and Emergency New Zealand</b>	Oppose	Add a new activity to Rule 17.1.2 Permitted Activities, as follows: <u>(x) Emergency services training and management activities.</u> AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make further or	Fire and Emergency New Zealand opposes the range of activities listed in Rule 17.1.2 as permitted activities as there is no provision explicitly made for emergency services training and management activities. The rules should	Accept	47

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.	be expanded to provide for emergency services training and management activities in order to better achieve the sustainable management purpose of the At and better enable Fire and Emergency New Zealand to achieve its statutory function by facilitating firefighting and emergency response.		
FS1388.34	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	47
FS1035.137	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	47
378.57	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Add a new objective to Section 4.5 Business and Business Town Centre Zones, as follows: <u>Objective 4.5.x To recognise and provide for non-commercial activities that contribute to the health, safety and wellbeing of the community while managing their potential adverse effects to ensure that the activities complement the amenity values of the District's Business Zone areas.</u> AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make further or consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.	Amendments sought will better achieve the purpose of the RMA by providing for the health and safety of people and communities.	Accept	7
FS1210.5	Ara Poutama Aotearoa (Department of Corrections)	Support	The Department seeks that the whole of submission point 378.57 be allowed.	The Department is responsible for managing community correction sites within business zones, which contribute to the health, safety and wellbeing of the community, and are activities that complement the amenity values of the District's business zones.	Accept	7
FS1035.164	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	7
FS1388.46	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	Reject	7

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
<b>378.58</b>	<b>Fire and Emergency New Zealand</b>	Neutral/Amend	Retain Policy 4.5.4 Commercial purpose: Business Zone, except for the amendments sought below AND Add a new clause (iv) to Policy 4.5.4 Commercial purpose: Business Zone as follows: <u>(iv) Enabling non-commercial activities such as emergency service facilities that provide for the health, safety and well-being of the community and that service or support an 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 Policy 4.5.4 in part, however 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-commercial activities in the Business 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.	Reject	12
FSI388.47	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	12
FSI035.165	Pareoranga Te Kata	Support	Obtain statement of performance expectation (SPE) to allow submission to be accepted.	Fire safety and fire prevention to undertake training activities for fire fighters within the region.	Reject	12
<b>378.74</b>	<b>Fire and Emergency New Zealand</b>	Support	Retain Policy 4.5.3 Commercial purpose: Business Town Centre Zone.	Fire and Emergency New Zealand supports Policy 4.5.3 as the provision anticipates non-	Accept	11

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				commercial activities in the Business Town Centre Zone providing for a range of activities, including community activities and facilities.		
FS1035.181	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	11
FS1388.56	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	11
<b>378.82</b>	<b>Fire and Emergency New Zealand</b>	Neutral/Amend	Add a new activity to Rule 17.1.3, to include the following as a Restricted Discretionary Activity: <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 Rule 17.1.3 as no provision is made for emergency service facilities. As no provision is made under this rule, emergency service facilities would instead default to non-complying activities under Rule 17.1.5. The default non-complying activity status is overly restrictive and inappropriate. Fire and Emergency New Zealand consider that emergency service facilities should be included as a restricted discretionary activity to provide for emergency services in the Business Zone for the following reasons: Fire stations must be strategically located within and throughout communities to maximise their coverage and response times so that they can efficiently and effectively provide for the health and safety of people and communities by being able to respond to emergency call outs in a timely way, thus avoiding /mitigating the potential for adverse effects associated with fire hazard and other emergencies; The actual or potential effects of fire stations are minor and can be adequately predicted and subsequently managed by conditions of consent and subsequent matters	Accept	48

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				for control; A Restricted Discretionary activity status better implements the Objectives and Policies of the Proposed District Plan. A Restricted Discretionary activity status better achieves the purpose of the RMA and better enables Fire and Emergency New Zealand to meet its statutory obligations.		
FS1388.58	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	48
FS1035.189	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	48
378.83	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Retain Rule 17.2.1.1 Noise - General, as notified.	Fire and Emergency New Zealand supports Rule 17.2.1.1 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.	Accept	51
FS1035.190	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	51
378.85	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.3.1 Height as follows: 17.3.1 Height - Building The maximum height of any building must not exceed 10m, <u>except hose drying towers up to 15m associated with emergency service facilities.</u> AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make further or consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.	Fire and Emergency New Zealand supports the height standards of 17.3.1, but seeks the inclusion of a specific exemption for hose drying towers in order to appropriately provide for the operational requirements of Fire and Emergency New Zealand. Fire stations are single storied buildings of approximately 8-9m in height and are typically able to achieve the height standards in a District Plan. Some fire stations also include a hose drying tower of between 12-15m in height. Fire and Emergency New Zealand considers that the inclusion of an exemption for associated structures better provides for the health and	Accept	59

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				safety of the community by enabling the efficient functioning of Fire and Emergency New Zealand.		
FS1035.192	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	59
<b>378.86</b>	<b>Fire and Emergency New Zealand</b>	Support	Retain Rule 17.3.4.2 Building setbacks - Waterbodies.	Fire and Emergency New Zealand supports the building setback in 17.3.4.2 and considers that the Standard 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 surrounding environment.	Accept	61
FS1388.60	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	61
FS1035.193	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	61
<b>378.87</b>	<b>Fire and Emergency New Zealand</b>	Support	Retain Rule 17.4.1 - General subdivision.	Fire and Emergency New Zealand supports Rule 17.4.1 as subdivision of land in the Business Zone is a Restricted Discretionary activity and requires that proposed lots must be connected to public-reticulated water supply. Subdivision that does not comply is a Discretionary Activity.	Accept	65
FS1388.61	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	Reject	65

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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>		
FS1035.194	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	65
<b>378.88</b>	<b>Fire and Emergency New Zealand</b>	Support	Retain Rule 17.4.1.1 Subdivision - Multi-unit development as notified.	Fire and Emergency New Zealand supports Rule 17.4.1.1 as any subdivision of land in the Business Zone in the form of multi-unit development is a Restricted Discretionary activity and requires that multi-unit developments are able to be connected to water reticulation. Subdivision that does not comply is a Discretionary Activity.	Accept	66
FS1035.195	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
FS1388.62	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	66
<b>378.89</b>	<b>Fire and Emergency New Zealand</b>	Oppose	Add a new activity to Rule 18.1.2 Permitted Activities as a permitted activity, as follows: <u>(x) Emergency services training and management activities.</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 18.1.2 as permitted activities to the extent that no provision is explicitly made for emergency services training and management activities. The rules should be expanded to provide for emergency services training and management activities 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.	Accept	75
FS1388.63	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</i>	Reject	75

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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>		
FS1035.196	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	75
378.90	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Oppose	<p>Add a new activity to Rule 18.1.3 to include the following as a Restricted Discretionary activity: <del>(x)</del> <u>Emergency service facilities.</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend the Proposed District Plan to make further or consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>	<p>Fire and Emergency New Zealand opposes Rule 18.1.3 as no provision is made for emergency service facilities. As no provisions is not made under this rule, emergency service facilities would instead default to non-complying activities under Rule 18.1.5. The default non-complying activity status is overly restrictive and inappropriate. Fire and Emergency New Zealand therefore seeks the inclusion of emergency service facilities as a restricted discretionary activity to provide for emergency services in the Business Town Centre Zone for the following reasons: Fire stations must be strategically located within and throughout communities to maximise their coverage and response times so that they can efficiently and effectively provide for the health and safety of people and communities by being able to respond to emergency call outs in a timely way, thus avoiding or mitigating the potential for adverse effects associated with fire hazard and other emergencies; The actual or potential effects of fire stations are minor and can be adequately predicted and subsequently managed by conditions of consents and subsequent matter for control; Restricted Discretionary activity status better implement the Objectives and Policies of the Proposed District Plan; Restricted Discretionary activity status better achieves the purpose of the RMA and better</p>	Reject	76

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				enables Fire and Emergency New Zealand to meet its statutory obligations.		
FS1035.197	Pareoranga Te Kata	Support	Obtain statement of performance expectation (SPE) to allow submission to be accepted.	Fire safety and fire prevention to undertake training activities for fire fighters within the region.	Reject	76
<b>378.91</b>	<b>Fire and Emergency New Zealand</b>	Support	Retain Rule 18.2.1.1 Noise - General.	Fire and Emergency New Zealand supports Rule 18.2.1.1 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.	Accept	79
FS1035.198	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	79
<b>378.93</b>	<b>Fire and Emergency New Zealand</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.3.1.1 Height - Building general, as follows: 18.3.1.1 Height - Building General The maximum height of any building must not exceed 10m, <u>except hose drying towers up to 15m associated with emergency service facilities.</u> AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make further or consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.	Fire and Emergency New Zealand supports the height standard of 18.3.1, but an inclusion of a specific exemption for hose drying towers in order to appropriately provide for the operational requirements of Fire and Emergency New Zealand. Fire stations are single storied buildings of approximately 8-9m in height and are typically able to achieve the height standards in a District Plan. Some fire stations also include a hose drying tower of between 12-15m in height. Fire and Emergency New Zealand considers 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	85
FS1035.200	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	85
<b>378.94</b>	<b>Fire and Emergency New Zealand</b>	Support	Retain Rule 18.3.7 Building setbacks - Waterbodies.	Fire and Emergency New Zealand supports the building setback in Rule 18.3.7 and considers that the Standard 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 surrounding environment.	Reject	90
FS1388.65	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	Accept	90

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FS1035.201	Pareoranga Te Kata	Support	Obtain statement of performance expectation (SPE) to allow submission to be accepted.	Fire safety and fire prevention to undertake training activities for fire fighters within the region.	Reject	90
378.95	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Retain Rule 18.4.1 Subdivision - General.	Fire and Emergency New Zealand supports Rule 18.4.1 as subdivision of land in the Business Town Centre Zone is a Restricted Discretionary activity and requires that proposed lots shall be connected to public-reticulated water supply. Subdivision that does not comply is a Discretionary Activity.	Accept	95
FS1388.66	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	95
FS1035.202	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	95
378.96	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Retain Rule 18.4.2 Subdivision - Multi-unit subdivision.	Fire and Emergency New Zealand supports Rule 18.4.2 as any subdivision of land in the Business Town Centre Zone in the form of multi-unit development is a Restricted Discretionary activity and requires that multi-unit developments be connected to water reticulation. Subdivision that does not comply is a Discretionary Activity.	Accept	96
FS1388.67	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	Reject	96

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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>		
FS1035.203	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	96
378.97	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Oppose	Add a new activity to Rule 19.1.1 Permitted Activities as a permitted activity, as follows: <u>(x) Emergency services training and management activities.</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 19.1.1 as no provision is explicitly made for emergency services training and management activities. The rules should be expanded to provide for emergency services and training and management activities 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.	Accept	105
FS1035.204	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	105
378.98	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Add a new activity to Rule 19.1.2 Restricted Discretionary Activities, as follows: <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 Rule 19.1.2 as no provision is made for emergency service facilities. As the provision is not made under the rule, emergency service facilities would instead default to non-complying status under Rule 19.1.4. The default non-complying activity status is overly restrictive and inappropriate. The inclusion of emergency service facilities as a restricted discretionary activity to provide for emergency services in the Tamahere Business Zone for the following reasons: Fire stations must be strategically located within and throughout communities to maximise their coverage and response times so that they can efficiently and effectively provide for the health and safety of people and communities by being able respond to emergency call outs in a timely way, thus avoiding or mitigating the potential for adverse	Reject	106

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				effects associated with fire hazard and other emergencies; The actual or potential effects of fire stations are minor and can be adequately predicted and subsequently managed by conditions of consent and subsequent matters for control; Restricted Discretionary activity status better implement the Objectives and Policies of the Proposed District Plan. Restricted Discretionary activity status better achieves the purpose of the RMA and better enables Fire and Emergency New Zealand to meet its statutory obligations.		
FS1035.205	Pareoranga Te Kata	Support	Obtain statement of performance expectation (SPE) to allow submission to be accepted.	Fire safety and fire prevention to undertake training activities for fire fighters within the region.	Reject	106
378.99	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Retain Rule 19.2.1.1 Noise - General.	Fire and Emergency New Zealand supports Rule 19.2.1.1 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	108
FS1035.206	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	108
386.13	Pokeno Village Holdings Limited	Not Stated	Amend Policy 4.5.18 (a) (iv) F Pokeno Town Centre as follows: <del>Ensuring</del> Encourage built form is consistent with Waikato District Council Pokeno Town Centre Architectural Form, Materials and Signage Design Guide, and in particular section 6 (Architectural Style, Materials and Appearance). AND Amend the matters of discretion in Rule 18.1.3 RD2 (a)(ii) Restricted Discretionary Activities as follows: <del>Consistency</del> The extent to which the building is consistent with the relevant Town Centre Character Statement contained within Appendix 10.1-10.6 (Town Centre Character Statements).	The use of the word "ensuring" is inappropriate in this context, as it implies that a rule may follow in the Town Centre Zone provision which requires compliance with the 'Pokeno Town Centre Architectural Form, Materials and Signage Design Guide.' Such an amendment recognises there is no rule requirement in the Proposed District Plan which would ensure such consistency or compliance. The matter of discretion is requested to be consistent with the wording of the amendments sought to Policy 4.5.18.	Reject	25
392.10	Hugh Green Limited	Oppose	Delete Rule 18.3.3 NCI Gross leasable floor area. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to provide alternative, additional or consequential amendments/relief as necessary to achieve consistency with the other submission points and to satisfy submitter's concerns or such alternative	No reasons provided	Reject	87

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			relief to satisfy the concerns of the submitter.			
392.11	Hugh Green Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.3.8 (a)(i) Dwelling, as follows: The dwelling must not be located at ground floor <u>if the site is subject to a verandah line identified on the planning maps.</u> AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to provide alternative, additional or consequential amendments/relief as necessary to achieve consistency with the other submission points and to satisfy submitter's concerns or such alternative relief to satisfy the concerns of the submitter.	Restrictions are accepted for buildings that front Main Road, however the imposition of this control for all sites within the Business Town Centre Zone is considered unduly restrictive. Restrictions on residential activities in the Business Town Centre Zone should only apply to sites that are subject to a verandah line identified on the planning maps.	Reject	92
FS1388.107	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	92
392.12	Hugh Green Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend the specific condition for Rule 18.1.2 P8 as follows: Located above ground floor level <u>if the site is subject to a verandah line identified on the planning maps.</u> AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to provide alternative, additional or consequential amendments/relief as necessary to achieve consistency with the other submission points and to satisfy submitter's concerns or such alternative relief to satisfy the concerns of the submitter.	Restrictions are accepted for buildings that front Main Road, however the imposition of this control for all sites within the Business Town Centre Zone is considered unduly restrictive. Restrictions the ground floor in the Business Town Centre Zone should only apply to sites that are subject to a verandah line identified on the planning maps.	Reject Accept	75
FS1388.108	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</i>	Accept Reject	75

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>		
392.13	Hugh Green Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.1.3 RD1 condition (b), as follows: The multi-unit development must be located above the ground floor level <u>if the site is subject to a verandah line identified on the planning maps.</u> AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to provide alternative, additional or consequential amendments/relief as necessary to achieve consistency with the other submission points and to satisfy submitter's concerns or such alternative relief to satisfy the concerns of the submitter.	Restrictions are accepted for buildings that front Main Road, however the imposition of this control for all sites within the Business Town Centre Zone is considered unduly restrictive. Restrictions on residential activities in the Business Town Centre Zone should only apply to sites that are subject to a verandah line identified on the planning maps.	Reject	76
FS1388.109	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	76
392.14	Hugh Green Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.1.5 NC2 Non-Complying Activities, as follows: Residential activity on the ground floor <u>if the site is subject to a verandah line identified on the planning maps.</u> AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to provide alternative, additional or consequential amendments/relief as necessary to achieve consistency with the other submission points and to satisfy submitter's concerns or such alternative relief to satisfy the concerns of the submitter.	Restrictions are accepted for buildings that front Main Road, however the imposition of this control for all sites within the Business Town Centre Zone is considered unduly restrictive. Restrictions on residential activities in the Business Town Centre Zone should only apply to sites that are subject to a verandah line identified on the planning maps.	Reject	78
FS1388.110	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</i>	Accept	78

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
392.15	Hugh Green Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.1.5 NC3 Non-Complying Activities, as follows: A multi-unit development located on the ground floor if the site is subject to a verandah line identified on the planning maps. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to provide alternative, additional or consequential amendments/relief as necessary to achieve consistency with the other submission points and to satisfy submitter's concerns or such alternative relief to satisfy the concerns of the submitter.	Restrictions are accepted for buildings that front Main Road, however the imposition of this control for all sites within the Business Town Centre Zone is considered unduly restrictive. Restrictions on activities in the Business Town Centre Zone should only apply to sites that are subject to a verandah line identified on the planning maps.	Reject	78
FS1388.111	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	78
392.16	Hugh Green Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.3.3 DI Gross leasable floor area, to remove the reference to "and no greater than 500m2." AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to provide alternative, additional or consequential amendments/relief as necessary to achieve consistency with the other submission points and to satisfy submitter's concerns or such alternative relief to satisfy the concerns of the submitter.	No reasons provided.	Reject	87

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
403.10	Doug Nicholson	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.3.3 D1 Gross leasable floor area, as follows (or similar): Any individual tenancy with a gross leasable floor area over 350m2 and no greater than 500m2-1000m2, and no greater than 5000m2 for no more than two tenancies	Anchor tenants are key to shopping or business area developments. With small tenancy restrictions, no anchor tenant will be allowed so developments will not get off the ground due to no interest for other smaller tenants. Retailers and business need to be around anchor tenants for many reasons. A developer will not spend money if there is no tenancy interest, or ongoing success in a development. Examples of typical shopping development of size suitable for Te Kauwhata: <a href="http://www.colliers.co.nz/209211/">http://www.colliers.co.nz/209211/</a>	Reject	87
FS1078.9	Hugh Green Limited	Support	Generally consistent with relief sought by HGL	The submission is allowed if the alternative relief by HGL (392.16) is disallowed	Reject	87
403.11	Doug Nicholson	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.3.4 Display windows and building facades, to reflect Business Zone rule for 10 Baird Avenue, Te Kauwhata.	This rule will restrict optimum developments at 10 Baird Ave, Te Kauwhata.	Reject	88
FS1078.10	Hugh Green Limited	Support	Generally consistent with relief sought by HGL	The submission is allowed, although the rule should still apply to sites subject to a verandah line identified on the planning maps.	Reject	88
403.12	Doug Nicholson	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.3.7 P1 (a)(i)A Building setbacks - Waterbodies, to define what qualifies as a lake.	It is unclear to the submitter whether the water at 10 Baird Avenue is a lake or if the site is a flood zone area. It is noted that the site includes a flood line limit and no identified waterbodies.	Reject	90
FS1388.148	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	90
403.13	Doug Nicholson	Oppose	Amend Rule 18.3.8 Dwelling, to allow for current owners at 10 Baird Ave, Te Kauwhata to have the same rules as mixed policy area rules in place currently.	10 Baird Ave, Te Kauwhata is the submitter's residential home, and they would not be able to do anything they regard as 'lifestyle block' ownership improvements (such as a barn for a tractor), or a replacement home on the land.	Reject	92

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				The Proposed District Plan restricts development to business with residential only allowed above ground floor, but cannot be done unless indicative road is made into a permanent road. This may not happen for a long time, as they do not own the road, only have right of use. The only choice under these new rules would be to sell now to someone who is happy as it is, or wants to land bank, or sit 'in limbo' waiting for someone to come and want to buy the block. The neighbours block is to develop into shops etc., which could be 7-20 years away. The rules devalue the land.		
FS1388.149	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	92
FS1078.11	Hugh Green Limited	Support	Generally consistent with relief sought by HGL	The submission is allowed if the alternative relief by HGL (392.9, .11 and .14) is disallowed	Reject	92
405.62	Counties Power Limited	Neutral/Amend	Add a matter of discretion to Rule 17.4.1 RD1(b) General Subdivision 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	65
FS1211.50	First Gas Limited on behalf of First Gas	Support	Allow	First Gas supports the intention of the proposed amendment to Rule 17.4.1 RD1(b) which seeks to ensure subdivision within the Business Zone does not impact adversely on existing infrastructure and in particular. While First Gas supports the intent of submission point 405.62, ultimately First Gas seeks and additional rule which would make subdivision of a site containing a gas transmission pipeline a restricted discretionary activity as outlined in the original submission.	Accept	65

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
405.63	Counties Power Limited	Neutral/Amend	Add a matter of discretion to Rule 18.4.1 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	95
435.18	Jade Hyslop	Neutral/Amend	Add to Chapter 17 Business Zone rules to the effect that: Construction of commercial building within sight of SH23 at Raglan is a permitted activity if it will be screened from SH23 by planting with indigenous species that will achieve an average height of 3m after 5 years, mature to over 9m in the residential zone and 12m in the business zone and be of sufficient density to visually screen the activity from SH23. Any activity that does not comply with a condition for a permitted activity is a discretionary activity.	Zone extensions have increase the extent of urban development along the main approach to Raglan, that could be mitigated by screening further development.	Reject	58
435.19	Jade Hyslop	Oppose	Add to Rule 17.3.5 Horotiu Acoustic Area, so that these rules apply to Raglan Business Zones.	The SH23 Business Zone is next to the Lorenzen Bay Residential Zone.	Accept	62
553.19	Malibu Hamilton	Support	Retain Rule 18.4.5 Subdivision – Title boundaries – Maaori Sites and Areas of significance to Maaori.	The New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010 in Policy (d) recognises Tangata whenua needs for papakāinga, marae. The Waikato Regional Policy Statement, 2016 also has Policy 6.4 Marae and papakāinga provisions. The Future Proof Strategy Planning for Growth November 2017 has Priority 15 that seeks developments of papakāinga housing that meets the needs and aspirations in the sub-region. RMA sections 6(e), 7(a), and 8 set out legal obligations when managing the natural and physical resources of the region to Tangata whenua.	Accept	99
559.47	Sherry Reynolds on behalf of Heritage New Zealand Lower Northern Office	Support	Retain Policy 4.5.14 (a)(v)G. Raglan Town Centre.	The submitter supports Policy 4.5.14 (a)(v)G. as this policy gives effect to Part 2 s6 Matters of National Importance, in particular s6(e).	Accept	21
559.48	Sherry Reynolds on behalf of Heritage New Zealand Lower Northern Office	Support	Retain Policy 4.5.16 (a)(v)A. Ngauruwaahia Town Centre.	The submitter supports Policy 4.5.16 (a)(v)A. as this policy gives effect to Part 2 s6 Matters of National Importance, in particular s6(e).	Accept	23
FS1388.804	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	Reject	23

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
559.49	Sherry Reynolds on behalf of Heritage New Zealand Lower Northern Office	Support	Retain Policy 4.5.17(a) Te Kauwhata Town Centre.	The submitter supports Policy 4.5.17(a) as this policy gives effect to Part 2 s6 Matters of National Importance, in particular s6(e).	Accept	24
FS1388.805	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	24
559.50	Sherry Reynolds on behalf of Heritage New Zealand Lower Northern Office	Support	Retain Policy 4.5.18 (a)(iv)D. Pokeno Town Centre.	The submitter supports Policy 4.5.18 (a)(iv)D. as this policy gives effect to Part 2 s6 Matters of National Importance, in particular s6(e).	Accept	25
559.51	Sherry Reynolds on behalf of Heritage New Zealand Lower Northern Office	Support	Retain Policy 4.5.19 (a)(iv)E. Tuakau Town Centre.	The submitter supports Policy 4.5.19 (a)(iv)E. as this policy gives effect to Part 2 s6 Matters of National Importance, in particular s6(e).	Accept	26
559.52	Sherry Reynolds on behalf of Heritage New Zealand Lower Northern Office	Neutral/Amend	Retain Policy 4.5.41 Earthworks, except for the amendments sought below. AND Add a new clause 'b' to Policy 4.5.41 Earthworks as follows: (a)... (b) Earthworks are designed and undertaken in a manner that they do not adversely affect historic	The submitter supports Policy 4.5.41 Earthworks in part as this policy does not reflect the need to provide for the protection of historic and cultural values at the time of earthworks. The policy needs to be amended to reflect the need to give effect to s6 of the Resource	Accept	43

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			heritage and cultural values.	Management Act.		
559.81	Sherry Reynolds on behalf of Heritage New Zealand Lower Northern Office	Oppose	<p>Amend Rule 17.2.7.1 P2 Signs - general to exclude any type of signage on Heritage Items and Maaori Sites of Significance.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend Rule 17.2.7.1 RD1 Signs - general to include signage on Heritage items and Maaori Sites of Significance.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Add an advice note under this new rule to advise of the other heritage building related rules within the Chapter.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Provide for any consequential amendments as required.</p>	<p>The submitter cannot support the P2 Signs General where the zone rules that relate to signage, including on heritage items or Maori sites of significance are permitted activities with 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)).</p>	Reject	56
559.82	Sherry Reynolds on behalf of Heritage New Zealand Lower Northern Office	Oppose	<p>Amend Rule 18.2.7.1 P2 Signs - general to exclude any type of signage on Heritage Items and Maaori Sites of Significance.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend Rule 18.2.7.1 RD1 Signs - general to include signage on Heritage items and Maaori Sites of Significance.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Add an advice note under this new rule to advise of the other heritage building related rules within the Chapter.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Provide for any consequential amendments as required.</p>	<p>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</p>	Reject	83

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				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).		
<b>567.20</b>	<b>Ngati Tamaoho Trust</b>	Neutral/Amend	No specific decision sought, but submission questions if it is an intended omission that there is no mention of sustainable development in Appendix 10: Town Centre Character Statements - 10.4 - Pokeno Town Centre.	No reasons provided.	Reject	120
<b>567.21</b>	<b>Ngati Tamaoho Trust</b>	Neutral/Amend	No specific decision sought, but submission questions if it is an intended omission that there is no consideration for road contaminants being treated through vegetated swales or rain gardens in Appendix 10: Town Centre Character Statements - 10.4 - Pokeno Town Centre.	No reasons provided.	Reject	120
<b>567.22</b>	<b>Ngati Tamaoho Trust</b>	Neutral/Amend	No specific decision sought, but submission questions if it is an intended omission that there is no discussion of enhancement of streams in Appendix 10: Town Centre Character Statements - 10.4 - Pokeno Town Centre.	No reasons provided.	Reject	120
<b>567.23</b>	<b>Ngati Tamaoho Trust</b>	Neutral/Amend	No specific decision sought, but submission questions if it is an intended omission that there is no mention of sustainable development in Appendix 10: Town Centre Character Statements - 10.6 - Tuakau Town Centre.	No reasons provided.	Reject	122
<b>567.24</b>	<b>Ngati Tamaoho Trust</b>	Neutral/Amend	No specific decision sought, but submission questions if it is an intended omission that there is no consideration for road contaminants being treated through vegetated swales or rain gardens in Appendix 10: Town Centre Character Statements - 10.6 - Tuakau Town Centre.	Does not feel that the proposed district plan covers environmental future effects.	Reject	122
<b>567.25</b>	<b>Ngati Tamaoho Trust</b>	Neutral/Amend	No specific decision sought, but submission questions if it is an intended omission that there is no discussion of enhancement of streams in Appendix 10: Town Centre Character Statements - 10.6 - Tuakau Town Centre.	No reasons provided.	Reject	122
<b>567.28</b>	<b>Ngati Tamaoho Trust</b>	Not Stated	Add the following policy to all town centres: In a functional, attractive and environmentally sustainable	No reasons provided.	Reject	10

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			manner.			
567.29	Ngati Tamaoho Trust	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, but submission questions if it is an intended omission that there is no discussion of enhancement of streams in Appendix 10.4 Town Centre Character Statements for Pokeno Team Centre.	No reasons provided.	Reject	120
567.30	Ngati Tamaoho Trust	Neutral/Amend	Add the following clause to all Town Centre Objectives: Natural waterbodies are maintained or enhanced within integrated development for all towns AND Promote park edge development for all open spaces especially adjacent to waterbodies.	No reasons provided.	Reject	6
578.84	Ports of Auckland Limited	Not Stated	Add matters of discretion to Rule 17.1.3 RDI Restricted Discretionary Activities, to provide for the avoidance of reverse sensitivity and protection of lawfully established industrial activities from reverse sensitive effects. The matters of discretion will read: (a) Council's discretion is limited to the following matters: (i) The extent to which the development is consistent with Town Centre Guidelines contained in Appendix 3.3; ... (ix) Geotechnical suitability for building. (x) <u>Avoidance of reverse sensitivity effects on industrial activities;</u> (xi) <u>Protection of noise sensitive activities from the effects of noise generated by industrial activities.</u> AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make alternative or consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.	Generally supportive of the subdivision requirements set out but note that consideration of reverse sensitivity effects, particularly in regards to the Horotiu Industrial Park has not been included as a matter of discretion.	Reject Accept	48
FS1388.871	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	Accept Reject	48

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FS1322.23	Synlait Milk	Support	Allow the whole submission point.	The submission is consistent with Synlait's concerns that additional standards and assessment matters are required to ensure reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established industrial activities are avoided. Such effects can have significant adverse effects on the efficiency of industrial activities with consequential effects for community wellbeing.	Reject Accept	48
FS1110.37	Synlait Milk Limited	Support	The submission is consistent with Synlait's concerns that additional standards and assessment matters are required to ensure reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established industrial activities are avoided. Such effects can have significant adverse effects on the efficiency of industrial activities with consequential effects for community wellbeing.	The whole submission point.	Reject Accept	48
578.85	Ports of Auckland Limited	Not Stated	Amend Rule 17.3.5 PI Horotiu Acoustic Area, as follows: Construction, addition to or alteration of a building for a noise-sensitive activity within the Horotiu Acoustic Area shall be designed and constructed to achieve the internal design sound level specified in Appendix I (Acoustic Insulation) - Table 811. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make alternative or consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.	Minor correction sought.	Accept	62
578.86	Ports of Auckland Limited	Not Stated	Add a new permitted activity rule in Rule 17.3.5 Horotiu Acoustic Area, as follows: P2 Activities sensitive to noise <u>must be subject to a restrictive no-complaint covenant in favour of Ports of Auckland Limited. For the purposes of this rule a 'restrictive non-complaint covenant' is defined as a restrictive covenant registered on the Title to the property or a binding agreement to covenant, in favour of the Horotiu Industrial Park, by the landowner (and binding any successors in title) not to complain as to effects generated by the lawful operation of industrial activities from the Park. The restrictive no-complaint covenant is limited to the effects that could be lawfully generated by industrial activities at the time the agreement to covenant is entered into. This does not require the covenantor to forego any right to lodge submissions in respect of resource consent applications or plan changes in relation to industrial activities (although an individual restrictive non-complaint may do so).</u> AND	The Proposed plan enables the intensification of activities that are sensitive to noise within close proximity to the Horotiu Industrial Park. The RPS provides clear direction that the Proposed Plan should minimise potential reverse sensitivity effects that have the potential to occur on the Horotiu Industrial Park by the intensification that will be enabled within the area. The Proposed District Plan should provide clear direction on where and how sensitive activities should be enabled within the vicinity of the Horotiu Industrial Park to avoid and mitigate potential reverse sensitivity effects. Considers it is appropriate to require new buildings and the alteration of existing buildings within the Horotiu area to be subject to 'no complaints' covenants in favour of Ports of Auckland Ltd, and be subject to minimum acoustic insulation requirements which can be achieved through	Reject	62

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			Amend Rule 17.3.5 RD1 Horotiu Acoustic Area, as follows: (a) Construction, addition to or alteration of a building that does not comply with Rule <del>17.3.4.3 P1</del> <u>17.3.5</u> . (b)... AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make alternative or consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.	amendments to the Noise Control Boundary. This overlay should be applied to the entirety of the Horotiu residential area. Such measures will provide for the ongoing lawful operation and establishment of industrial activities.		
<b>588.13</b>	<b>Peter Buchan for Woolworths NZ Ltd</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.1.2 P2 Commercial activities Activity Specific Condition as follows: <del>Not Subject to Control</del> <u>17.3[x] regarding Gross floor area</u> AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential or alternative relief to give effect to the specific amendments sought.	Seek amendment to achieve the differentiated roles for Business Zone as per the objectives and policies	Accept	47
FSI388.974	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	47
FSI193.22	Van Den Brink Group	Oppose	The submission is disallowed.	If allowed the amendment would unduly restrict development options for VDB.	Reject	47
FSI078.12	Hugh Green Limited	Oppose	The amendment unduly restricts development options for HGL (on the basis that 392.1 is allowed)	The submission is disallowed	Reject	47
<b>588.14</b>	<b>Peter Buchan for Woolworths NZ Ltd</b>	Neutral/Amend	Add a new rule within Section 17.1 Land Use - Activities as follows: <u>17.3[x] Gross floor area P1 Any individual tenancy must have a gross floor area of greater than 500m2 RD1 (a) Any individual tenancy with a gross floor area less than 500m2 (b) The Council's discretion shall be limited to the following matters: i. Design and location of the building ii. Effects on vitality and amenity of nearby Business Town Centre zones and centres.</u> AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential	Insert a gross floor area limitation on small-scale retail activities to achieve the differentiated roles for Business and Business Town Centre zones as per the objectives and policies.	Accept	47

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			or alternative relief to give effect to the specific amendments sought.			
FS1193.26	Van Den Brink Group	Oppose	The submission is disallowed.	If allowed the amendment would unduly restrict development options for VDB.	Reject	47
FS1078.13	Hugh Green Limited	Oppose	The amendment unduly restricts development options for HGL (on the basis that 392.1 is allowed)	The submission is disallowed	Reject	47
FS1388.975	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	47
588.15	Peter Buchan for Woolworths NZ Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.2.3D1 On-site parking areas - Landscaping from a discretionary activity to a restricted discretionary activity as follows: <u>RDI (a) On-site parking areas that do not comply with Rule 17.2.3 P1. (b) The Council's discretion shall be limited to the following matters: i. Design and location of the parking area ii. Effects on streetscape amenity.</u> AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential or alternative relief to give effect to the specific amendments sought.	Adopt restricted discretionary activity status where activities infringe the various standards. Incorporate appropriate assessment criteria alongside the retention of a restricted discretionary activity status.	Accept	53
588.16	Peter Buchan for Woolworths NZ Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.2.7.1 Signs - General to read: P2 (a) A sign must comply with all of the following conditions: ... (v) where the sign is a freestanding sign, it must: A. Not exceed an area of <u>203m2</u> for one sign <del>face and 1m2 for any other free standing sign on the site</del> ; B. <u>Must not exceed one sign per site</u> ; and C. Be set back at least 5m from the boundary of the Residential Zone. ... RDI ... (xi) <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	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 appropriate assessed via a restricted	Reject	56

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 consequential or alternative relief to give effect to the specific amendments sought.	discretionary activity assessment.		
FS1089.14	Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Limited and Mobil Oil NZ Limited for 'Oil Companies'	Oppose	Oppose submission point 588.16.	The Oil Companies sought the retention of the Rule 17.2.7.1 (785.59) on the basis the proposed rules permit the maximum height limit of 10m- providing for a prime sign as a standard and integral feature of a service station. The proposed definition of 'sign' captures all signage and directional signage to ensure the safe and efficient movement of people and vehicles on a given site. The submitter (588.16) proposed to permit only one freestanding sign per site, for example. 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 direction 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, the Oil Companies oppose the amendment to Rule 17.2.1.7 P2 as proposed by the submitter (588.16) and continue to seek the retention of the proposed rule as sought through the Oil Companies' primary submission (785.59).	Accept	56
588.17	Peter Buchan for Woolworths NZ Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.3.4.1 Building setbacks - Zone boundaries as follows: P1 (a) A building must be set back at least: i. 7.53m from rear and side boundaries adjoining any: A. Residential Zone B... RDI (a) Any building that does not comply with Rule 17.3.4.1 P1. (b) <u>The Council's discretion shall be limited to the following matters: i. Height, design and location of the building relative to the boundary ii. Privacy on other site iii. Effects on amenity values of adjacent property.</u> AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential or alternative relief to give effect to the specific amendments sought.	A 3m side and rear yard is a more appropriate separation distance than the 7.5m as notified, when considering how best to manage the interface with sensitive activities yet retain an efficient use of a business zoned site. 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.	Accept	61
588.18	Peter Buchan for Woolworths NZ Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.1.2 Permitted Activities to read: P4 Retail activity <del>Nil-Subject to Control 18.3.3 regarding Gross floor area</del> P4A Supermarket Nil (for the avoidance of doubt, this activity is not subject to Control 18.3.3 regarding Gross floor area)	Ensure an appropriate permitted activity status for supermarkets as set out in the assessment contained in the submission. In comparison, the Proposed District Plan as notified ascribes a non-complying activity status for supermarkets in	Reject	75

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential or alternative relief to give effect to the specific amendments sought.	the Business Town Centre zone, while the Operative District Plan allows for any activity in the zone as permitted, provided similar urban design controls are met.		
FS1388.976	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	75
588.19	Peter Buchan for Woolworths NZ Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.1.3 RD2 Restricted Discretionary Activity as follows: (a) The construction of any new building <u>that meets all of the following conditions: ... (a) The Council's discretion shall be limited to the following matters: (i)... (iii) For the purpose of assessing supermarkets against the above criteria, regard shall be had to the following operational and functional requirements: a) store visibility that is easily identifiable when viewed from the street and surrounding area b) the provision of appropriate customer parking, which is clearly visible; accessible to motorists approaching the store from the local roading network and to customers on site; and functionally well connected to the store entrance c) where large building formats are required, there is provision for solid facades to facilitate internal shelving and fresh produce display. d) adequate and accessible servicing areas that are preferably separated from customer vehicle traffic and pedestrian movements.</u> AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential or alternative relief to give effect to the specific amendments sought.	A restricted discretionary activity status remains appropriate, rather than defaulting to a more onerous discretionary status remains appropriate. Restricted discretionary activity status can be accompanied by suitably limited criteria that still ensure an appropriate assessment of effects is undertaken, whilst providing certainty to applicants where activities are anticipated.	Reject	76
FS1388.977	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	Accept	76

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
588.20	Peter Buchan for Woolworths NZ Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.2.7.1 Signs - General as follows: P2 (a) A sign must comply with all of the following conditions: ... (v) Where the sign is a freestanding sign, it must: A. Not exceed an area of <del>320</del> 1m <sup>2</sup> for one sign face, and <del>1m<sup>2</sup> for any other freestanding sign on the site</del> ; B. <u>Must not exceed one sign per site</u> ; and C. Be set back at least 5m from the boundary of the Residential Zone. .... RD1 (a) A sign that does not comply with Rules 18.2.7.1 P2 or P3. (b) The Council's discretion shall be limited to the following matters: ... (xi) <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 appropriate assessed via a restricted discretionary activity assessment.	Reject	83
FS1323.80	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	<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>	Accept	83
588.21	Peter Buchan for Woolworths NZ Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.3.3 Gross leasable floor area as follows: 18.3.3 Gross leasable floor area PI Any individual tenancy must have a gross leasable floor area of no more than <del>500</del> 350m <sup>2</sup> RD1 Any individual tenancy with a gross leasable floor area over <del>500</del> 350m <sup>2</sup> and no greater than 500m <sup>2</sup> NC1 <u>Any individual tenancy with a gross leasable floor area over 500m<sup>2</sup> The Council's discretion shall be limited to the following matters: (i) The matters listed in 18.1.3 RD2(b) (ii) Extent to which operational and functional requirements dictate the necessity for a floor area over 500m<sup>2</sup>.</u> AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential or alternative relief to give effect to the specific	Considers that the urban form component is already addressed by the restricted discretionary activity consent status for new buildings and the urban design controls. There is no need to go beyond restricted discretionary status for activities that exceed 500m <sup>2</sup> as an appropriately comprehensive assessment can still be made so long as the specific matters listed cover the recognised and relatable effects.	Reject	87

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			amendments sought.			
FS1078.14	Hugh Green Limited	Support	Consistent with relief sought by HGL (392.10 and .16)	The submission is allowed	Reject	87
588.22	Peter Buchan for Woolworths NZ Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 18.3.4 PI Display windows and building facades as notified AND Amend Rule 18.3.4 DI Display windows and building facades to be a restricted discretionary rather than a discretionary activity, as follows: <u>RD1 (a) A building that does not comply with Rule 18.3.4 PI (b) The Council's discretion shall be limited to the following matters: i. Design and location of the building having regard to the operational and functional requirements of the activity to be accommodated ii. Extent to which the activity achieves the intent of the control by other means, to enable passive surveillance and promote pedestrian safety Effects on amenity values and town centre character.</u> AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential or alternative relief to give effect to the specific amendments sought.	Propose a set of appropriate restricted matters of discretion to address potential effects of this infringement.	Reject	88
FS1078.26	Hugh Green Limited	Support	Generally consistent with relief sought by HGL	The submission is allowed, although the rule should still apply to sites subject to a verandah line identified on the planning maps.	Reject	88
FS1078.15	Hugh Green Limited	Support	Generally consistent with relief sought by HGL	The submission is allowed, although the rule should only apply to sites subject to a verandah line identified on the planning maps.	Reject	88
588.23	Peter Buchan for Woolworths NZ Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 18.3.5 PI Verandahs as notified AND Amend Rule 18.3.5 DI Verandahs, to be a restricted discretionary activity rather than a discretionary activity as follows: <u>RD1 (a) A building that does not comply with Rule 18.3.5 PI. (b) The Council's discretion shall be limited to the following matters: i. Design and location of the building having regard to the operational and functional requirements of the activity to be accommodated ii. Extent to which the activity achieves the intent of the control by other means, to encourage continuous pedestrian shelter and maintain pedestrian amenity iii. Effects on amenity values and town centre character.</u> AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential or alternative relief to give effect to the specific amendments sought.	Propose a set of appropriate restricted matters of discretion to address potential effects of this infringement.	Accept	89
588.24	Peter Buchan for Woolworths	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.3.6 Building setbacks - zone boundaries, as	Propose a set of appropriate restricted matters	Accept	90

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
	NZ Ltd		<p>follows: PI (a) A building must be set back a minimum of: i. 7.53m from rear and side boundaries adjoining any: A. Residential Zone ... RD1 (a) A building that does not comply with Rule 18.3.6 PI (b) <u>The Council's discretion shall be limited to the following matters: i. Height design and location of the building relative to the boundary ii. Privacy on other site iii. Effects on amenity values of adjacent property.</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential or alternative relief to give effect to the specific amendments sought.</p>	<p>of discretion to address potential effects of this infringement, 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.</p>		
588.28	Peter Buchan for Woolworths NZ Ltd	Neutral/Amend	<p>Add a new definition of "Supermarket" in Chapter 13 Definition as follows: <u>An individual retail outlet having a store footprint over 1,000m<sup>2</sup> GFA that sells, primarily by way of self-service, a comprehensive range of: a) domestic supplies, fresh food, groceries, such as fresh meat and produce; chilled , frozen, packaged, canned and bottled foodstuffs and beverages; and general housekeeping and personal goods, including (but not limited to) cooking, cleaning and washing products; kitchenwares; toilet paper, diapers and other paper tissue products; pharmaceuticals, health and personal hygiene products and other toiletries; cigarettes, magazines and newspapers, greeting cards and stationery, batteries, flashlights, light bulbs and related products; and b) non-domestic supplies and comparison goods comprising not more than 20 per cent of all products offered for sale as measured by retail floor space, including (but not limited to) clothing and footwear; furniture; electrical appliances; office supplies; barbeque and heating fuels; audio visual products. Note Retail floor space means that area of the premises to which the public has access for the purpose of shopping, together with any area: a) taken up for the purpose of display of goods; and b) any counter areas used by or occupied exclusively by staff members whilst actively engaged in serving the public. This area does not include floor space used for: storerooms back of house including delivery areas trolley storage areas entrance lobbies behind counter areas, and checkouts</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential or alternative relief to give effect to the specific amendments sought.</p>	<p>Supermarkets are distinct from general retail activity. The Proposed District Plan provides for supermarkets as a distinct category within the Transport chapter. Seeks inclusion of a suitable definition of a Supermarket.</p>	Reject	123

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1388.979	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	123
588.29	Peter Buchan for Woolworths NZ Ltd	Support	Retain Policy 4.5.2 Commercial function and purpose, so long as the amendments sought regarding the importance and appropriate nature of supermarkets within town centres are accepted.	Support the policy, so long as the amendments sought regarding the importance of supermarkets as appropriate town centre activities are recognised.	Accept	10
FS1388.980	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
588.30	Peter Buchan for Woolworths NZ Ltd	Support	Retain Policy 4.5.3 Commercial purpose: Business Town Centre Zone in respect of the Proposed District Plan is intended purpose for the Business Town Centre Zone, so long as the amendments sought elsewhere in this submission are incorporated into the Proposed Waikato District Plan.	The policy is supported in respect of the Proposed Waikato District Plan's intended purpose for the Business Town Centre Zone, with amendments sought.	Accept	11
588.31	Peter Buchan for Woolworths NZ Ltd	Support	Retain Policy 4.5.4 Commercial Purpose: Business Zone in respect of the Proposed District Plan's intended purpose	Support the policy provided they do not preclude the ability for supermarkets to be	Accept	12

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			for the Business Zone, provided the ability for supermarkets to be accommodated within the Business Town Centre Zone are not precluded.	accommodated within the Business Town Centre Zone		
FS1388.981	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	12
588.33	Peter Buchan for Woolworths NZ Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 4.5.10 Policy - Retail: Business Town Centre Zone and Business Zone as follows: (a) Locate small scale retail activities and key commercial activities, including supermarkets within the Business Town Centre Zone and discourage other large scale retail activities from establishing within the Business Town Centre Zone. (b) Locate other large scale retail and commercial activities to within the Business Zone. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential or alternative relief to give effect to the specific amendments sought.	Supports the overarching centres focus of the Proposed Waikato District Plan. Understand the intention to achieve high intensity yet fine grained town centres across the District, recognising the unique character of each settlement, however a failing in this approach is the absence of provision for supermarkets within the Business Town Centre. Supermarkets are recognised as retail anchors for centres and commercial development and act as a catalyst for investment by others. The scale and function of supermarkets unique operational and functional requirements can be managed through consideration of design, bulk and location. It is important to recognise that urban design aspirations should not be used to veto the operational and functional requirements of commercial activities in commercial zones. Supports the current approach in the Proposed District Plan that does not preclude consideration of 'out-of-centre' supermarkets where it can be demonstrated that the activity will not have adverse effects in terms of vitality and amenity of centres, nor traffic effects. Seek a number of amendments to the centre specific objectives and policies in Chapter 4.5 to ensure that the sensible outcome sought by	Reject	17

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				Objective 4.5.12 is not overlooked in favour of prescriptive urban design controls.		
FS1388.982	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
FS1078.16	Hugh Green Limited	Support	Generally consistent with relief sought by HGL	The submission is allowed	Reject	17
588.34	Peter Buchan for Woolworths NZ Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 4.5.13 Policy - Town centre built form as follows: (a) The scale and form of new development in the Business Town Centre Zone is to: (i) Provide for a safe, accessible, compact and attractive town centre environment; (ii) Facilitate the integration of retail shopping, administration and commercial services, residential, civic and community activities, <u>recognising that the operational and functional requirements of these activities need to be taken into account when assessing built form</u> ; (iii) Reflect the role and character of the business town centre; (iv) Increase the prominence of buildings on street corners; (v) Maintain a low rise built form and small scale, pedestrian focused retail activities, <u>with the exception of supermarkets</u> ; and (vi) Manage adverse effects on the surrounding environment, particularly at the interface with residential areas. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential or alternative relief to give effect to the specific amendments sought.	Supports the overarching centres focus of the Proposed Waikato District Plan. Understand the intention to achieve high intensity yet fine grained town centres across the District, recognising the unique character of each settlement, however a failing in the approach is the absence of provision for supermarkets within the Business Town Centre. Supermarkets are recognised as retail anchors for centres and commercial development and act as a catalyst for investment by others. The scale and function of supermarkets unique operational and functional requirements can be managed through consideration of design, bulk and location. It is important to recognise that urban design aspirations should not be used to veto for the operational and functional requirements of commercial activities in commercial zones. Seek a number of amendments to the centre specific objectives and policies in Chapter 4.5 to ensure that the sensible outcome sought by Objective 4.5.12 is not overlooked in favour of prescriptive urban design controls.	Reject	20
588.35	Peter Buchan for Woolworths NZ Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 4.5.14 Policy - Raglan Town Centre as follows: (a) Development maintains and enhances the role	Supports the overarching centres focus of the Proposed Waikato District Plan. Understand	Reject	21

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			of the Raglan Town Centre by: (i) Maintaining wide footpaths and high quality public space, prioritising and providing for pedestrian movement and safety; (ii) Maintaining a pedestrian focus by discouraging vehicle access across footpaths; (iii) Maintaining built form framing views towards Raglan Harbour; (iv) Providing for a building scale appropriate to the town centre; (v) Protecting and enhancing the character of the existing buildings centre through new built form being consistent with the outcomes of the Town Centre Character Statement for Raglan Town Centre (Appendix 10.1), in particular by: A. Promoting traditional roof forms (hipped or gable ends) and symmetry through window design and placement; B. Providing continuous post-supported verandahs sheltering footpaths; C. Promoting recessed shop fronts; D. Providing parking, loading and storage where rear access to buildings exists; E. Promoting active street frontages by developing up to the street boundaries; F. Reinforcing the street corners by ensuring the design is two storey and is transparent on both sides of the street corner; G. Encouraging the preservation and promotion of cultural features. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential or alternative relief to give effect to the specific amendments sought.	the intention to achieve high intensity yet fine grained town centres across the District, recognizing the unique character of each settlement, however a failing is the absence of provision for supermarkets within the Business Town Centre. Supermarkets are recognised as retail anchors for centres and commercial development and act as a catalyst for investment by others. The scale and function of supermarkets unique operational and functional requirements can be managed through consideration of design, bulk and location. It is important to recognise that urban design aspirations should not be used to veto for the operational and functional requirements of commercial activities in commercial zones. Seek a number of amendments to the centre specific objectives and policies in Chapter 4.5 to ensure that the sensible outcome sought by Objective 4.5.12 is not overlooked in favour of prescriptive urban design controls. The detail in this policy is more appropriately covered by standards as assessment criteria.		
FS1323.35	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	That the amendments sought are declined.	HNZPT is concerned that the proposed deletions will have adverse effects on the historical and cultural heritage values of the Town Centre.	Accept	21
588.36	Peter Buchan for Woolworths NZ Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 4.5.15 Policy - Huntly Town Centre as follows: (a) Development maintains and enhances the role of the Huntly Town Centre by: (i) Maintaining wide footpaths and high quality public space, prioritising and providing for pedestrian movement and safety; (ii) Maintaining a pedestrian focus by discouraging vehicle access across footpaths; (iii) Providing for a building scale appropriate to the town centre; (iv) Protecting and enhancing the character of the existing buildings centre through new built form being consistent with the outcomes of the Town Centre Character Statement for Huntly Town Centre (Appendix 10.3), in particular by: A. Providing transparent facades and window displays at ground level; B. Providing continuous suspended verandas sheltering footpaths; C. Symmetrical window detailing; and D. Promoting active street frontages by developing up to the street boundary.	Supports the overarching centres focus of the Proposed Waikato District Plan. Understand the intention to achieve high intensity yet fine grained town centres across the District, recognising the unique character of each settlement, however a failing in the approach is the absence of provision for supermarkets within the Business Town Centre. Supermarkets are recognised as retail anchors for centres and commercial development and act as a catalyst for investment by others. The scale and function of supermarkets unique operational and functional requirements can be managed through consideration of design, bulk and location. It is important to recognise that urban design aspirations should not be used to veto the operational and functional requirements of	Reject	22

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential or alternative relief to give effect to the specific amendments sought.	commercial activities in commercial zones. Seek a number of amendments to the centre specific objectives and policies in Chapter 4.5 to ensure that the sensible outcome sought by Objective 4.5.12 is not overlooked in favour of prescriptive urban design controls. The detail in this policy is more appropriately covered by standards or assessment criteria.		
FS1388.983	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	22
588.37	Peter Buchan for Woolworths NZ Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 4.5.16 Policy - Ngaaruwaahia Town Centre as follows: (a) Development maintains and enhances the role of the Ngaaruwaahia Town Centre by: (i) Maintaining wide footpaths, prioritising and providing for pedestrian movement and safety; (ii) <del>Maintaining a pedestrian focus by discouraging vehicle access across footpaths;</del> (iii) Promoting improved pedestrian and cycle linkages with Te Awa River ride, Ngaaruwaahia swimming pool and town centre; (iv) Providing for an appropriate building scale and narrow frontages; (v) Protecting and enhancing the character of <del>the existing buildings centre</del> through new built form being consistent with the outcomes of the Town Centre Character Statement for Ngaaruwaahia Town Centre (Appendix 10.2), in particular by: <del>A. Recognising and promoting Ngaaruwaahia's cultural and heritage value set within the setting of the Waikato River and Hakarimata Range. B. Encouraging the preservation and promotion of Maaori heritage; C. Providing transparent facades and window displays at ground level; D. Providing continuous suspended verandahs sheltering footpaths; E. Providing parking, loading and storage where rear access to buildings exists; and F. Promoting active street frontages by</del>	Supports the overarching centres focus of the Proposed Waikato District Plan. Understand the intention to achieve high intensity yet fine grained town centres across the District, recognising the unique character of each settlement, however a failing in this approach is the absence of provision for supermarkets within the Business Town Centre. Supermarkets are recognised as retail anchors for centres and commercial development and act as a catalyst for investment by others. The scale and function of supermarkets unique operational and functional requirements can be managed through consideration of design, bulk and location. It is important to recognise that urban design aspirations should not be used to veto for the operational and functional requirements of commercial activities in commercial zones. Seek a number of amendments to the centre specific objectives and policies in Chapter 4.5 to ensure that the sensible outcome sought by Objective 4.5.12 is not overlooked in favour of	Reject	23

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			developing up to the street boundary. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential or alternative relief to give effect to the specific amendments sought.	prescriptive urban design controls. The detail in this policy is more appropriately covered by standards or assessment criteria.		
FS1388.984	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	23
FS1323.36	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	That the amendments sought are declined.	HNZPT is concerned that the proposed deletions will have adverse effects on the historical and cultural heritage values of the Town Centre.	Accept	23
588.38	Peter Buchan for Woolworths NZ Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 4.5.17 Policy - Te Kauwhata Town Centre as follows: (a) Development maintains and enhances the role of the Te Kauwhata Town Centre by: (i) Maintaining wide footpaths, prioritising and providing for pedestrian movement and safety; (ii) <del>Maintaining a pedestrian focus by discouraging vehicle access across footpaths;</del> (iii) Providing for an appropriate building scale <del>with narrow frontages;</del> and (iv) Protecting and enhancing the character of <del>the existing buildings centres</del> through new built form being consistent with the outcomes of the Town Centre Character Statement for Te Kauwhata Town Centre (Appendix 10.5), in particular by: <del>A. Providing transparent facades and window displays at ground level; B. Providing continuous suspended verandahs sheltering footpaths; C. Symmetrical window detailing; D. Promoting flat or low pitched roofs; E. Providing parking, loading and storage where rear access to buildings exists; F. Promoting mixed use and residential activities on upper floors; G. Recognising the connections between the town centre and Whangamarino Wetland; H. Encouraging the preservation and promotion of cultural features; and I. Promoting active street frontages by developing up to the street boundary.</del>	Supports the overarching centres focus of the Proposed Waikato District Plan. Understand the intention to achieve high intensity yet fine grained town centres across the District, recognising the unique character of each settlement, however a failing in this approach is the absence of provision for supermarkets within the Business Town Centre. Supermarkets are recognised as retail anchors for centres and commercial development and act as a catalyst for investment by others. The scale and function of supermarkets unique operational and functional requirements can be managed through consideration of design, bulk and location. It is important to recognise that urban design aspirations should not be used to veto for the operational and functional requirements of commercial activities in commercial zones. Seek a number of amendments to the centre specific objectives and policies in Chapter 4.5 to ensure that the sensible outcome sought by Objective 4.5.12 is not overlooked in favour of	Reject	24

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential or alternative relief to give effect to the specific amendments sought.	prescriptive urban design controls. The detail in this policy is more appropriately covered by standards or assessment criteria.		
FS1078.17	Hugh Green Limited	Support	Generally consistent with relief sought by HGL	The submission is allowed	Reject	24
FS1388.985	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	24
FS1323.37	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	That the amendments sought are declined.	HNZPT is concerned that the proposed deletions will have adverse effects on the historical and cultural heritage values of the Town Centre.	Accept	24
588.39	Peter Buchan for Woolworths NZ Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 4.5.18 Pokeno Town Centre as follows: (a) Development maintains and enhances the role of the Pokeno Town Centre by: i. Maintaining wide footpaths, prioritising and providing for pedestrian movement and safety; ii. Maintaining a pedestrian focus by discouraging vehicle access across footpaths; iii. Providing for an appropriate building scale with narrow frontages; and iv-Protecting and enhance the character of the existing centre buildings through new built form being consistent with the outcomes of the Town Centre Character Statement for Pokeno Town Centre (Appendix 10.4) in particular by: A. Promoting transparent facades and window displays at ground level; B. Providing continuous suspended verandahs sheltering footpaths; C. Providing parking, loading and storage where rear access to buildings exists; D. Encouraging the preservation and promotion of cultural features; E. Promoting active street frontages by developing up to the street boundary; F. Ensuring built form is consistent with Waikato District Council Pokeno Town Centre Architectural Form, Materials and Signage Design Guide, and in particular section 6 (Architectural	Supports the overarching centres focus of the Proposed Waikato District Plan. Understand the intention to achieve high intensity yet fine grained town centres across the District, recognising the unique character of each settlement, however a failing in this approach is the absence of provision for supermarkets within the Business Town Centre. Supermarkets are recognised as retail anchors for centres and commercial development and act as a catalyst for investment by others. The scale and function of supermarkets unique operational and functional requirements can be managed through consideration of design, bulk and location. It is important to recognise that urban design aspirations should not be used to veto for the operational and functional requirements of commercial activities in commercial zones. Seek a number of amendments to the centre specific objectives and policies in Chapter 4.5 to ensure that the sensible outcome sought by	Reject	25

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			Style, Material and Appearance) AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential or alternative relief to give effect to the specific amendments sought.	Objective 4.5.12 is not overlooked in favour of prescriptive urban design controls. The detail in this policy is more appropriately covered by standards or assessment criteria.		
FS1323.38	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	That the amendments sought are declined.	HNZPT is concerned that the proposed deletions will have adverse effects on the historical and cultural heritage values of the Town Centre.	Accept	25
FS1281.31	Pokeno Village Holdings Limited	Support	Support.	PVHL supports this submission and are of the view that a supermarket should be provided for in the Pokeno Town Centre.	Reject	25
<b>588.40</b>	<b>Peter Buchan for Woolworths NZ Ltd</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 4.5.19 Tuakau Town Centre as follows: (a) Development maintains and enhanced the role of the Tuakau Town Centre by; i. Maintaining wide open streets, with wide pedestrian footpaths; ii. <del>Maintaining a pedestrian focus by discouraging vehicle access across footpaths;</del> iii. Providing for an appropriate building scale with narrow frontages; and iv Protecting and enhancing the character of the existing centre buildings through new built form being consistent with the outcomes of the Town Centre Character Statement for Tuakau Town Centre (Appendix 10.6), in particular by: A. <del>Providing parking, loading and storage where rear access to buildings exists;</del> B. <del>Promoting mixed use and residential activities on upper floors;</del> C. <del>Providing transparent facades and window displays at ground level;</del> D. <del>Providing continuous suspended verandahs sheltering footpaths;</del> E. <del>Encouraging the preservation and promotion of cultural features;</del> F. <del>Promoting active street frontages by developing up to the street boundary.</del> AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential or alternative relief to give effect to the specific amendments sought.	Supports the overarching centres focus of the Proposed Waikato District Plan. Understand the intention to achieve high intensity yet fine grained town centres across the District, recognising the unique character of each settlement, however a failing in this approach is the absence of provision for supermarkets within the Business Town Centre. Supermarkets are recognised as retail anchors for centres and commercial development and act as a catalyst for investment by others. The scale and function of supermarkets unique operational and functional requirements can be managed through consideration of design, bulk and location. It is important to recognise that urban design aspirations should not be used to veto for the operational and functional requirements of commercial activities in commercial zones. Seek a number of amendments to the centre specific objectives and policies in Chapter 4.5 to ensure that the sensible outcome sought by Objective 4.5.12 is not overlooked in favour of prescriptive urban design controls. The detail in this policy is more appropriately covered by standards or assessment criteria.	Reject	26
FS1323.39	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	That the amendments sought are declined.	HNZPT is concerned that the proposed deletions will have adverse effects on the historical and cultural heritage values of the Town Centre.	Accept	26
<b>588.41</b>	<b>Peter Buchan for Woolworths NZ Ltd</b>	Not Stated	Delete Policy 4.5.20 Pedestrian frontages: active street frontages - Business Town Centre Zone. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential	The content of these repetitive policies is more appropriately addressed in standards and assessment criteria.	Reject	27

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			or alternative relief to give effect to the specific amendments sought.			
FS1078.21	Hugh Green Limited	Support	Generally consistent with relief sought by HGL	The submission is allowed, although the policy should only apply to sites subject to a verandah line identified on the planning maps.	Reject	27
FS1078.18	Hugh Green Limited	Support	Generally consistent with relief sought by HGL	The submission is allowed	Reject	27
588.42	Peter Buchan for Woolworths NZ Ltd	Not Stated	Delete Policy 4.5.21 Corner Buildings - Business Town Centre Zone. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential or alternative relief to give effect to the specific amendments sought.	The content of these repetitive policies is more appropriately addressed in standards and assessment criteria.	Reject	28
588.43	Peter Buchan for Woolworths NZ Ltd	Not Stated	Delete Policy 4.5.22 Landscaping - Business Town Centre Zone. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential or alternative relief to give effect to the specific amendments sought.	The content of these repetitive policies is more appropriately addressed in standards and assessment criteria.	Reject	29
FS1388.986	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	29
588.44	Peter Buchan for Woolworths NZ Ltd	Not Stated	Delete Policy 4.5.23 Height - Business Town Centre Zone. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential or alternative relief to give effect to the specific amendments sought.	The content of these repetitive policies is more appropriately addressed in standards and assessment criteria.	Reject	30
FS1369.17	Ngati Tamaoho Trust	Oppose	Null	Oppose the requested deletion of "encouraging the preservation and promotion of cultural features" from all villages and town centres.	Accept	30
588.45	Peter Buchan for Woolworths	Not Stated	Delete Policy 4.5.24 New Buildings - Business Town	The content of these repetitive policies is more	Reject	31

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
	<b>NZ Ltd</b>		Centre zone. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential or alternative relief to give effect to the specific amendments sought.	appropriately addressed in standards and assessment criteria.		
FS1388.987	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
<b>588.46</b>	<b>Peter Buchan for Woolworths NZ Ltd</b>	Not Stated	Delete Objective 4.5.25 Character - Business Zone. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential or alternative relief to give effect to the specific amendments sought.	The content of this repetitive objective is more appropriately addressed in standards and assessment criteria.	Reject	32
FS1388.988	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	32
<b>588.47</b>	<b>Peter Buchan for Woolworths NZ Ltd</b>	Not Stated	Delete Policy 4.5.26 Landscaping of onsite parking areas - Business Zone. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential	The content of these repetitive policies is more appropriately addressed in standards and assessment criteria.	Reject	33

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			or alternative relief to give effect to the specific amendments sought.			
<b>588.48</b>	<b>Peter Buchan for Woolworths NZ Ltd</b>	Not Stated	Delete Policy 4.5.27 Front setback - Business Zone. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential or alternative relief to give effect to the specific amendments sought.	The content of these repetitive policies is more appropriately addressed in standards and assessment criteria.	Awaiting recommendation	
<b>588.49</b>	<b>Peter Buchan for Woolworths NZ Ltd</b>	Not Stated	Delete Policy 4.5.28 Height - Business Zone. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential or alternative relief to give effect to the specific amendments sought.	The content of these repetitive policies is more appropriately addressed in standards and assessment criteria.	Reject	35
<b>588.50</b>	<b>Peter Buchan for Woolworths NZ Ltd</b>	Support	Retain Policy 4.5.8 Role and function of the Business Zone, subject to an amendment to discourage small-scale retail activities within this zone is controlled with a limit on gross floor area. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential or alternative relief to give effect to the specific amendments sought.	The policy is supported regarding the role and function of the Business Zone, noting the above suggested amendment that this intention to discourage small-scale retail activities within the zone is carried through into the rules with a limit on gross floor area.	Accept	15
<b>588.51</b>	<b>Peter Buchan for Woolworths NZ Ltd</b>	Support	Retain Policy 4.5.9 Employment opportunities: Business Town Centre Zone and Business Zone.	Support this policy in that it recognises the importance of both the Business Town Centre and Business Zones to encourage and increase employment opportunities. Supermarkets will achieve this	Accept	16
<i>FS1388.989</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</i>	<i>Reject</i>	<i>16</i>

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
588.52	Peter Buchan for Woolworths NZ Ltd	Not Stated	Retain Objective 4.5.12 Business Town Centre - Character, insofar as it ensures development is designed in a functional manner.	To ensure development is designed in a functional and attractive manner is appropriate within the commercial environment.	Accept	19
588.53	Peter Buchan for Woolworths NZ Ltd	Support	Retain the approach where a restricted discretionary activity status is ascribed to an activity that infringes certain standards e.g. Rule 18.2.2 Servicing and hours of operation and Rule 18.2.8 Outdoor storage.	The submitter suggests that where activities infringe identified standards, a restricted discretionary activity status remains appropriate, rather than defaulting to a more onerous discretionary, where discretion is unfettered in assessment,	Accept	4
588.54	Peter Buchan for Woolworths NZ Ltd	Support	Amend the Proposed District Plan to clarify that where buildings (which already require restricted discretionary activity consent) infringe standards, the activity status does not default to discretionary but remains restricted discretionary and a suitably limited set of criteria is applied. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential or alternative relief to give effect to the specific amendments sought.	Restricted discretionary activity status can be accompanied by suitably limited criteria that still ensure an appropriate assessment of effects is undertaken, whilst providing a level of certainty to applicants that where activities of effects is undertaken, whilst providing a level of certainty to applicants that where activities are anticipated, such assessments will be rational and streamlined.	Accept	4
FS1385.21	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury B	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 perspective. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Reject	4
602.14	Greig Metcalfe	Oppose	Amend Rule 18.1.2 P2 Permitted Activities, as follows: Located above ground floor level exclusive of any entrance lobby, stairwell, lift, vehicle access, parking, manoeuvring or service court. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	Ancillary residential activities on the ground floor are inevitable and should not require resource consent as a non-complying activity.	Accept	75

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1388.1029	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	75
FS1078.22	Hugh Green Limited	Support	Generally consistent with relief sought by HGL	The submission is allowed, in addition to the relief sought by HGL (392.9)	Accept	75
602.15	Greig Metcalfe	Oppose	Amend Rule 18.1.3 RD1 (b) Restricted Discretionary Activities, as follows: (b) The multi-unit development must be located above the ground floor level <u>exclusive of any entrance lobby, stairwell, lift, vehicle access, parking, manoeuvring or service court.</u> AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	Ancillary residential activities on the ground floor are inevitable and should not require resource consent to a non-complying activity.	Accept	76
FS1388.1030	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	76
FS1078.23	Hugh Green Limited	Support	Generally consistent with relief sought by HGL	The submission is allowed, in addition to the relief sought by HGL (392.13)	Accept	76
602.16	Greig Metcalfe	Oppose	Amend Rule 18.1.3 RD1 (e) Restricted Discretionary Activities, by adding text to RD1 (e), as follows: (e) A	Standards are required for service courts to provide clarity.	Accept	76

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			communal service court is provided comprising: <u>A. a minimum area of 20m<sup>2</sup>; and B. a minimum dimension of 3m; Or alternatively a private service court is provided for each residential unit comprising: A. a minimum area of 10m<sup>2</sup>; and B. a minimum dimension of 2.5m.</u>			
FS1388.1031	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	76
602.17	Greig Metcalfe	Oppose	Amend Rule 18.1.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities, by deleting RD1 (c) and replacing with the following minimum floor area requirements: (c) <del>A detailed site plan depicting the proposed title boundaries for each residential unit and any common areas (including access and services) must be provided, ensuring that a freehold (fee simple) or unit title subdivision complies with Rule 18.4.2 (Subdivision of multi-unit developments); The floor area of any unit or apartment in a Multi-Unit Development must comply with the following: Unit or Apartment Minimum Floor Area Studio unit 35m<sup>2</sup> 1 bedroom unit 45m<sup>2</sup> 2 bedroom unit 70m<sup>2</sup> 3 or more bedroom unit 90m<sup>2</sup></del> AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	The multi-unit developments currently contained in the subdivision rules should be within the land use section. The requested unit floor areas are consistent with those in Hamilton City.	Accept	76
FS1388.1032	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	Reject	76

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
602.18	Greig Metcalfe	Oppose	Amend Rule 18.1.3 RD1 (f) Restricted Discretionary Activities, as follows: Residential unit Minimum Living Court Area Minimum dimension Studio unit or 1 bedroom 10m2 2m 2 or more bedroom 4.5m2 12m2 2m Communal living court 10m2 per unit 2m AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	The requested living court areas are consistent with those in Hamilton City.	Reject	76
FS1388.1033	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	76
602.19	Greig Metcalfe	Oppose	Amend Rule 18.1.5 NC2 Non-Complying Activities, as follows: NC2 Residential activity on the ground floor <u>exclusive of any lobby, stairwell, lift, vehicle access, parking, manoeuvring or service court.</u> AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	Ancillary residential activities on the ground level are inevitable and should not require resource consent as a non-complying activity.	Reject	78
FS1388.1034	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</i>	Accept	78

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.		
FS1078.24	Hugh Green Limited	Support	Generally consistent with relief sought by HGL	The submission is allowed, in addition to the relief sought by HGL (392.14)	Reject	78
FS1078.42	Hugh Green Limited	Support	Generally consistent with relief sought by HGL	The submission is allowed if the alternative relief by HGL (392.9 and .14) is disallowed	Reject	78
<b>602.20</b>	<b>Greig Metcalfe</b>	Oppose	Amend Rule 18.1.5 NC3 Non-Complying Activities, as follows: NC3 A multi-unit development located on the ground floor <u>exclusive of any entrance lobby, stairwell, lift, vehicle access, parking, manoeuvring or service court.</u> AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	Ancillary residential activities on the ground floor are inevitable and should not require resource consent as a non-complying activity.	Reject	78
FS1078.48	Hugh Green Limited	Support	Generally consistent with relief sought by HGL	The submission is allowed if the alternative relief by HGL (392.13 and .15) is disallowed	Reject	78
FS1078.25	Hugh Green Limited	Support	Generally consistent with relief sought by HGL	The submission is allowed, in addition to the relief sought by HGL (392.15)	Reject	78
<b>602.21</b>	<b>Greig Metcalfe</b>	Oppose	Amend Rule 18.2.8 PI (a)(i) Outdoor storage, as follows: (i) Be associated with the <u>activity</u> operating from the site. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	The word 'activity' is missing from this sentence.	Accept	84
<b>602.22</b>	<b>Greig Metcalfe</b>	Oppose	Amend Rule 18.3.4 PI (a) Display windows and building facades, as follows: (a) Any new building <u>façade adjoining a road boundary</u> , or alteration of an existing building <u>façade adjoining a road boundary</u> , must comply with the following conditions: (i) Not be set back from the road boundary <u>at ground floor level</u> ; and (ii) Provide display windows comprising at least 50% of the building <u>façade at ground floor level.</u> AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	The display window interface is only relevant to facades facing a road boundary and at ground floor level only.	Accept	88
FS1078.49	Hugh Green Limited	Support	Generally consistent with relief sought by HGL	The submission is allowed, although the rule should still apply to sites subject to a verandah line identified on the planning maps.	Accept	88
<b>602.23</b>	<b>Greig Metcalfe</b>	Oppose	Amend Rule 18.3.8 PI (a)(i) Dwelling, as follows: (i) The dwelling must not be located at ground level <u>exclusive of</u>	Ancillary residential activities on the ground floor are inevitable and should not require	Accept	92

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			any entrance lobby, stairwell, lift, vehicle access, parking, manoeuvring or service court. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	resource consent as a non-complying activity.		
FS1078.27	Hugh Green Limited	Support	Generally consistent with relief sought by HGL	The submission is allowed, in addition to the relief sought by HGL (392.11)	Accept	92
FS1078.50	Hugh Green Limited	Support	Generally consistent with relief sought by HGL	The submission is allowed if the alternative relief by HGL (392.9, .11 and .14) is disallowed	Accept	92
FS1388.1035	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	92
602.24	Greig Metcalfe	Oppose	Amend Rule 18.3.9 PI(a)(iii) Living court, as follows: (iii) It is located on a balcony containing at least 10m <sup>2</sup> and with a minimum dimension of 2m, 15m <sup>2</sup> and a circle with a diameter of at least 2.4m. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	Consistency is required with the multi-unit development standards.	Reject	93
FS1388.1036	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	Accept	93

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
602.25	Greig Metcalfe	Oppose	Amend Rule 18.4.1 RD1 (a)(i) Subdivision - general, as follows: (a) Subdivision shall comply with all of the following conditions: (i) Proposed lots shall have a minimum size of 225m2 net site area, with the exception of access or utility allotments, or reserves to vest, or a Unit Title subdivision of existing lawfully established buildings; AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	Rule 18.3.3 anticipates small tenancies in the Town Centre Zone. Individual tenancies should be able to be held in unit title tenure.	Accept	95
FS1388.1037	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	95
602.26	Greig Metcalfe	Oppose	Amend Rule 18.4.2 RD1 (a)(i) Subdivision - Multi-unit subdivision, as follows: (i) An application for land use consent under Rule 18.1.3 (Multi-Unit Development) must either accompany the subdivision application or have been granted resource consent by Council; <del>The subdivision (including boundaries for each residential unit and any common areas including access and services) shall be in accordance with the land use consent.</del> AND Delete Rule 18.4.2 RD1 (a)(iii) Subdivision-Multi Unit Subdivision. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	Unit sizes should be established through the land use consent process. A subdivision should be in accordance with the approved land use.	Reject	96
FS1388.1038	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</i>	Accept	96

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
602.29	Greig Metcalfe	Oppose	Amend Rule 17.2.7.1 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).	Reject	56
602.30	Greig Metcalfe	Oppose	Amend Rule 18.2.7.1. 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.	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).	Reject	83

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.			
FS1323.81	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	<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>	Accept	83
602.31	Greig Metcalfe	Oppose	Amend Rule 19.2.6.1. 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).	Reject	110
633.19	Alan Henderson for Van Den Brink Group	Support	Retain the activities listed in Rule 17.1.2 P1 - P14 as Permitted Activities AND Add Retail activities as a Permitted activity to Rule 17.1.2 Permitted Activities. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	The specific activity status of retail activities is unclear - it could fall under a commercial activity. In the Town Centre zone, it is specifically listed which could cause ambiguity for future resource consent applications. Large format retail is specifically envisaged by Policy 4.5.8 and 4.5.10.	Reject	47
FS1387.37	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</i>	Accept	47

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>		
FS1078.28	Hugh Green Limited	Support	Consistent with relief sought by HGL (392.3)	The submission is allowed	Reject	47
633.20	Alan Henderson for Van Den Brink Group	Oppose	Add the construction of a building as a permitted activity (which complies with the development controls) to Rule 17.1.2 Permitted Activities. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	The activity status of buildings is unclear. The amendment is needed to clarify the activity status.	Reject	47
633.21	Alan Henderson for Van Den Brink Group	Oppose	Amend the activity status for more than one dwelling (i.e. multi-unit development) from Restricted Discretionary (Rule 17.1.3) to Permitted activity (Rule 17.1.2). AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	Mixed use development should be encouraged in the Business Zones as well as maximising an efficient use of land. Only enabling one dwelling per building as a permitted activity is inefficient.	Reject	48
FS1387.38	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Accept	48
633.22	Alan Henderson for Van Den Brink Group	Oppose	Delete Rule 17.3.2 Daylight Admission 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 and inappropriate regime.	Reject	60

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
633.23	Alan Henderson for Van Den Brink Group	Support	Retain Rule 17.2.3 P1 On-site parking areas - Landscaping in relation to the 1.5m landscape strip. OR Amend Rule 17.2.3 P1 On-site parking areas to reduce the 1.5m landscape strip requirement. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	The control is considered suitable to ensure adequate amenity. Would also support a reduction in width.	Reject	53
633.24	Alan Henderson for Van Den Brink Group	Support	Retain Rule 17.2.5.1 Earthworks - General.	The control is appropriate in managing effects.	Accept	55
633.25	Alan Henderson for Van Den Brink Group	Oppose	Add clarification to Rule 17.2.7.1 P2 (a) Signs that the rule applies to free standing signs only. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	There is no reason to restrict signage of buildings to the criteria in P2 (a).	Reject	56
633.26	Alan Henderson for Van Den Brink Group	Oppose	Amend Rule 17.2.7.1 P2 Signs to increase the area to at least 10m <sup>2</sup> per site. 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 3m <sup>2</sup> . 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 1m <sup>2</sup> would create more visual clutter than allowing a larger free standing in the first instance.	Reject	56
633.27	Alan Henderson for Van Den Brink Group	Oppose	Amend Rule 17.2.7.1 Signs to exclude signs from the yard setbacks. AND If the relief on daylight admission is not accepted, amend to exclude signs Rule 20.3.3 Daylight Admission. 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.	Without the proposed exclusions, signs should not be easily visible from the road, as they would be classified as a "building". This will create significant costs of compliance to achieve signage for site identification purposes.	Reject	56

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
633.28	Alan Henderson for Van Den Brink Group	Oppose	Amend Rule 17.2.7.2 Signs - Effects on Traffic to specify that Rule 20.2.7.2 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.	Accept	56
633.29	Alan Henderson for Van Den Brink Group	Oppose	Amend Rule 17.3.2 PI(a) (Daylight Admission) to increase height from 2.5m to 3m. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	There is no justification to reduce the height to boundary recession plane to a height which is lower than the previous Franklin provisions.	Reject	60
633.30	Alan Henderson for Van Den Brink Group	Oppose	Amend Rule 17.3.4.1 PI(a)(i) Building setback - Zone boundaries 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 to 7.5m when the previous Franklin provisions were more permissive.	Accept	31
633.31	Alan Henderson for Van Den Brink Group	Oppose	Amend Rule 17.3.7 PI (a) Living Court to reduce the balcony size requirements to 8m <sup>2</sup> and a depth of 1.5m. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	The balcony size requirements are too onerous and should be reduced to as a maximum the former Franklin standard. There is no justification to increase the balcony size from 8m <sup>2</sup> to 15m <sup>2</sup> .	Reject	64
FS1387.39	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	Accept	64

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
<b>633.34</b>	<b>Alan Henderson for Van Den Brink Group</b>	Support	Retain Objective 4.5.1 Commercial function and purpose, insofar as it gives effect to the relief sought.	Supports this objective to the extent that the submitters land is zoned Business.	Accept	9
<i>FS1387.40</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</i>
<b>633.35</b>	<b>Alan Henderson for Van Den Brink Group</b>	Support	Retain Policy 4.5.2 Commercial function and purpose, insofar as it gives effect to the relief sought.	Supports this policy to the extent that the land is zoned Business.	Accept	10
<i>FS1387.41</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</i>
<b>633.36</b>	<b>Alan Henderson for Van Den Brink Group</b>	Support	Retain Policy 4.5.4 Commercial purpose: Business Zone, insofar as it gives effect to the relief sought.	Supports the intention of the policy to enable a range of commercial activities.	Accept	12
<i>FS1387.42</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</i>	<i>Reject</i>	<i>12</i>

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
633.37	Alan Henderson for Van Den Brink Group	Support	Retain Policy 4.5.8 Role and function of the Business Zone insofar as it gives effect to the relief sought.	Supports the intention of the policy to enable large scale retail and commercial activities in the Business Zone. This is not reflected in the land use provisions.	Accept	15
FS1387.43	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	15
633.38	Alan Henderson for Van Den Brink Group	Support	Retain Policy 4.5.9 Employment opportunities: Business Town Centre Zone and Business Zone insofar as it gives effect to the relief sought.	Supports the intention of the policy to provide for employment opportunities.	Accept	16
FS1387.44	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	16

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>		
<b>633.39</b>	<b>Alan Henderson for Van Den Brink Group</b>	Support	Retain Policy 4.5.10 Retail: Business Town Centre Zone and Business Zone insofar as it gives effect to the relief sought.	Supports the intention of the policy to enable large scale retail and commercial activities in the Business Zone. This is not reflected in the land use provisions.	Accept	17
<i>FS1387.45</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>17</i>
<b>633.40</b>	<b>Alan Henderson for Van Den Brink Group</b>	Support	Retain Policy 4.5.11 Residential upper floors: Business Town Centre Zone and Business Zone insofar as it gives effect to the relief sought.	Supports the intention of the policy to mixed use developments, in particular residential activities in the Business Zone. Considers that providing for more than one residential activity as a Restricted Discretionary activity only does not given effect to this policy in the most efficient way.	Accept	18
<i>FS1078.30</i>	<i>Hugh Green Limited</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Inconsistent with relief sought by HGL</i>	<i>The submission is disallowed, and Policy 4.5.11 is amended to be consistent with the relief sought by HGL</i>	<i>Reject</i>	<i>18</i>
<i>FS1078.19</i>	<i>Hugh Green Limited</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Generally consistent with relief sought by HGL</i>	<i>The submission is allowed</i>	<i>Accept</i>	<i>18</i>
<b>633.41</b>	<b>Alan Henderson for Van Den Brink Group</b>	Oppose	No specific decision requested, but submission opposes Objective 4.5.25 Business Zone Character, where this is inconsistent with the submitter's primary relief to have their landholding re-zoned as Business.	The objective only requires maintenance of character - this is not consistent with developing new business areas to support residential growth.	Reject	32
<i>FS1387.46</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</i>	<i>Accept</i>	<i>32</i>

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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>		
633.42	Alan Henderson for Van Den Brink Group	Support	Retain Policy 4.5.26 Landscaping of onsite parking areas - Business Zone insofar as it gives effect to the relief sought.	Supports intention of these policies to manage effects in the Business Zone (and on other more sensitive activities in adjoining zones) subject to the relief sought by the submitter.	Accept	33
633.43	Alan Henderson for Van Den Brink Group	Support	Retain Policy 4.5.27 Front setback - Business Zone insofar as it gives effect to the relief sought.	Supports intention of these policies to manage effects in the Business Zone (and on other more sensitive activities in adjoining zones) subject to the relief sought by the submitter.	Reject	34
633.44	Alan Henderson for Van Den Brink Group	Support	Retain Policy 4.5.28 Height - Business Zone, insofar as it gives effect to the relief sought.	Supports intention of these policies to manage effects in the Business Zone (and on other more sensitive activities in adjoining zones) subject to the relief sought by the submitter.	Accept	35
633.45	Alan Henderson for Van Den Brink Group	Oppose	Delete the policy reference to design guidelines and architectural form in Policy 4.5.29 New Buildings: Business Zone. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	The policy is not supported by the rules and is inconsistent with the relief sought elsewhere in the submission.	Accept	36
FSI387.47	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</i>	Reject	36

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>		
633.46	Alan Henderson for Van Den Brink Group	Support	Retain Objective 4.5.30 Business Zone and Business Town Centre Zone - Amenity, insofar as it gives effect to the relief sought.	Supports the intention of the objective to protect amenity values, subject to the relief sought by the submitter.	Accept	37
633.48	Alan Henderson for Van Den Brink Group	Support	Retain Policy 4.5.33 Reverse Sensitivity, insofar as it gives effect to the relief sought.	Supports the intention of the objective to protect amenity values, subject to the relief sought elsewhere in the submission. Policy 4.5.33 is a duplicate of Policy 4.5.31.	Accept	38
FS1387.49	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	38
633.49	Alan Henderson for Van Den Brink Group	Oppose	Delete Policy 4.5.32(a)(ii) Adjoining site amenity to reduce height adjoining residential or reserve zoned land. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	Policy 4.5.31 Reverse sensitivity is a duplicate of Policy 4.5.42 Adjoining site amenity. The policy is not supported by the rules and is inconsistent with the relief sought elsewhere in the submission.	Reject	39
633.50	Alan Henderson for Van Den Brink Group	Support	Retain Rule 17.4.1(a) General Subdivision in relation to the minimum lot size of 225m2. OR Amend Rule 17.4.1(a) General Subdivision to reduce the minimum lot size. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief	The proposed lot sizes are considered an efficient use of land for business activities. Would also support a decrease in minimum area.	Accept	65

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			required to address the matters raised in the submission.			
FS1387.50	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	65
662.50	Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd	Oppose	Amend Rule 17.3.4.2 PI(a) Building setback - Waterbodies as follows: (a) Any building must be setback a minimum of: (i) 23m from the margin of any: A. Lake over 4ha; and B. Wetland; (v) 10m from a managed wetland AND Any consequential amendments.	A wetland as defined under the RMA is broad reaching and covers many features. Having a nominal 23m 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.	Accept	51
FS1387.123	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	51
662.51	Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd	Oppose	Amend Rule 18.3.7 PI(a) Building setback - Waterbodies as follows: (a) Any building must be setback a minimum of: (i) 23m from the margin of any: A. lake over 4ha; and B.	A wetland as defined under the RMA is broad reaching and covers many features. Having a nominal 23m setback applied to such a wide	Accept	90

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			wetland; ... (v) 10m from a managed wetland AND Any consequential amendments.	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.		
FS1387.124	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	90
695.34	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 4.5.2(a)(iii) Commercial function and purpose to provide for small convenience retail and community activities in all business zones.	It restricts small-scale convenience retail and community activity outside of Business Zone Tamahere and neighbourhood centres.	Reject	10
695.35	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Delete Policy 4.5.9(a) Employment opportunities: Business Town Centre Zone and Business Zone	The statement is superfluous as it states the obvious and does not require the applicant to undertake any specific action. It clutters the Proposed District Plan with unnecessary statements.	Reject	16
695.36	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 4.5.11 Residential upper floors: Business Town Centre Zone and Business Zone as follows: (a) Maintain the commercial viability of the Business Town Centre Zone and Business Zone while: (i) Providing for mixed use developments, ensuring residential activities are located above ground floor; and as applicable (ii) <u>Removal of any existing</u> Avoiding residential activity located at ground level, <u>or, relocating the existing residential activity currently located at ground level to above ground level where a business or other type of land use is to be located at the ground level.</u>	The policy does not account for existing residential activity.	Reject	18

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
<b>695.37</b>	<b>Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd</b>	Oppose	Delete Policy 4.5.14(a)(ii) Raglan Town Centre.	This statement is not well considered and should be deleted. In commercial areas with shops with footprints, it is impossible to not access a site by vehicle across a footpath where an access exists. Clause (a)(i) addresses the sought requirement, by stating 'prioritising and providing for pedestrian movement and safety.' This is all that needs to be stated.	Reject	21
<i>FS1276.151</i>	<i>Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>WED seeks that the whole submission point be disallowed.</i>	<i>Maintaining a pedestrian focus by discouraging vehicle access across footpaths does not amount to a prohibition. However, in a pedestrian area it is desirable to avoid conflict with vehicles as far as possible.</i>	<i>Accept</i>	<i>21</i>
<b>695.38</b>	<b>Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 4.5.15(a)(iv)B Huntly Town Centre to include an exemption statement for a building that is of a historical character where a veranda was not part of the original design.	Supports policy in principle with amendments.	Reject	22
<b>695.39</b>	<b>Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd</b>	Oppose	Delete Policy 4.5.17(a)(iv)D Te Kauwhata Town Centre.	The locality (and the Waikato in general) is known for a consistently damp climate. Roofs with a reasonable pitch assist the watertight integrity of buildings.	Accept	24
<b>695.40</b>	<b>Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd</b>	Oppose	Delete Policy 4.5.33 Reverse sensitivity.	This clause repeats itself in intent with slightly different working as in Policy 4.5.31	Accept	38
<b>695.42</b>	<b>Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 4.5.37 Managing the adverse effects of signs to list common requirements that apply across all zones in one section of the Proposed District Plan.	No reasons provided.	Accept	41
<b>746.60</b>	<b>The Surveying Company</b>	Support	Retain Rule 18.1.3 RD2 Restricted Discretionary Activities as notified.	It will ensure good design and character outcomes within the Town Centres.	Accept	76
<i>FS1387.936</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</i>	<i>Reject</i>	<i>76</i>

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>		
<b>746.61</b>	<b>The Surveying Company</b>	Oppose	Delete Rule 18.1.5 NC2 Non-complying Activities and amend to a discretionary activity as set out below AND Add a new rule to Rule 18.1.4 Discretionary Activities for residential activity on the ground floor.	The activity status is too restrictive and does not provide for innovation in design or development concepts which may promote good outcomes for the zone. Residential activities are seen as being appropriate for a residential zone and therefore the non-complying status does not enable this. Residential development at ground floor level may be an appropriate design response to the context of the site and surrounding area. Where buildings adjoin the residential zone, residential ground floor activities may be an appropriate design response.	Reject	78
<i>FS1387.937</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>78</i>
<b>746.62</b>	<b>The Surveying Company</b>	Oppose	Delete Rule 18.1.5 NC3-Non-Complying Activities and amend to be a discretionary activity as outlined below AND Add a new rule to Rule 18.1.4- Discretionary Activities for multi-unit development located on the ground floor.	The activity status is too restrictive and does not provide for innovation in design or development concepts which may promote good outcomes for the zone. Residential activities are seen as being appropriate for a residential zone and therefore the non-complying status does not enable this. Residential development at ground floor level may be an appropriate design response to the context of the site and surrounding area. Where buildings	Reject	78

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				adjoin the residential zone, residential ground floor activities may be an appropriate design response.		
FS1387.938	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	78
746.63	The Surveying Company	Oppose	Amend 18.3.1.1 P1- Height- Building general as follows: The maximum height of any building must not exceed 10m 15m.	The building height should be increased to allow for 4 storeys. This will ensure development and re-development (especially of smaller sites) is economically viable for developers and allow for a range of uses making residential development viable on upper floors.	Accept	85
746.64	The Surveying Company	Oppose	Amend Rule 18.3.2 P1- Daylight admission as follows: Buildings must not protrude through a height control plane rising at an angle of 35-45 degrees commencing at an elevation of 2.5m above ground level at every point of the site boundary.	Inconsistent with previous Planning documents which are less restrictive. It is too restrictive for urban areas. Adequate amenity and daylight for adjoining sites can be achieved with a less restrictive control plane. The 37 degree angle is difficult to calculate.	Reject	86
746.94	The Surveying Company	Oppose	Delete Policy 4.5.1 I (a)(ii)- Residential upper floors: Business Town Centre Zone and Business Zone.	There may be circumstances where ground floor residences are appropriate, especially where dealing with zone or heritage interfaces.	Reject	18
FS1387.965	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	Accept	18

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.		
FS1078.43	Hugh Green Limited	Support	Generally consistent with relief sought by HGL	The submission is allowed	Reject	18
FS1078.47	Hugh Green Limited	Support	Generally consistent with relief sought by HGL	The submission is allowed	Reject	18
<b>749.11</b>	<b>Housing New Zealand Corporation</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 4.5.15 Huntly Town Centre to include desired outcomes sought from the relevant Town Centre Character Statement (Appendix 10) if the policy matter is not already addressed AND Amend Policy 4.5.15 Huntly Town Centre to remove reference to Town Centre Character Statements. 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 generally supports the policies set out in 4.5.14 to 4.5.19. There are desired outcomes sought in each town and village with regard to development. These are identified in Appendix 10: Town Centre Character Statements in the Proposed District Plan. The submitter opposes the inclusion of Town Centre Character Statements in the Proposed District Plan, and seeks the deletion of all Town Centre Character Statements from the Proposed District Plan (reasons outlined later in submission). Any desired outcomes sought from each town and village as currently shown in the Town Centre Character Statement should be written out into policies to the respective town centre and village in section 4.5.14-4.5.19, if the policy matter is not already listed or included.	Reject	22
FS1368.1	Rosita Dianne-Lynn Darnes	Support	Allowed- particularly as it relates to an expanded residential zone around Ngaruawahia to maintain consistency with the WRPS.	I support the HNZN considerations regarding the lack of adequate land zoned for residential expansion around existing centres, the adequacy of the PWDP Objectives and Policies to address the Requirements of the WRPS in meeting the residential and economic growth targets for these areas. I further believe that the rules and/or zone specific requirements as currently drafted will not meet the requirements of the WRPS, with my specific interests being the extent and nature of the residential zoning proposed for the periphery of Ngaruawahia. It should be allowed particularly as it relates to an expanded residential zone around Ngaruawahia to maintain consistency with the WRPS.	Reject	22
FS1387.995	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	Accept	22

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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>		
749.12	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Neutral/Amend	<p>Amend Policy 4.5.16 Ngaaruwaahia Town Centre to include desired outcomes sought from the relevant Town Centre Character Statement (Appendix 10) if the policy matter is not already addressed AND Amend Policy 4.5.16 Ngaaruwaahia Town Centre to remove reference to Town Centre Character Statements. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan as consequential or additional relief as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission as necessary.</p>	<p>The submitter generally supports the policies set out in 4.5.14 to 4.5.19. There are desired outcomes sought in each town and village with regard to development. These are identified in Appendix 10: Town Centre Character Statements in the Proposed District Plan. The submitter opposes the inclusion of Town Centre Character Statements in the Proposed District Plan, and seeks the deletion of all Town Centre Character Statements from the Proposed District Plan (reasons outlined later in submission). Any desired outcomes sought from each town and village as currently shown in the Town Centre Character Statement should be written out into policies to the respective town centre and village in section 4.5.14-4.5.19, if the policy matter is not already listed or included.</p>	Reject	23
FS1368.2	Rosita Dianne-Lynn Darnes	Support	<p>Allowed- particularly as it relates to an expanded residential zone around Ngaruawahia to maintain consistency with the WRPS.</p>	<p>I support the HNZC considerations regarding the lack of adequate land zoned for residential expansion around existing centres, the adequacy of the PWDP Objectives and Policies to address the Requirements of the WRPS in meeting the residential and economic growth targets for these areas. I further believe that the rules and/or zone specific requirements as currently drafted will not meet the requirements of the WRPS, with my specific interests being the extent and nature of the residential zoning proposed for the periphery of Ngaruawahia. It should be allowed particularly as it relates to an expanded residential zone around Ngaruawahia to maintain consistency with the WRPS.</p>	Reject	23

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1387.996	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	23
749.13	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 4.5.17 Te Kauwhata Town Centre to include desired outcomes sought from the relevant Town Centre Character Statement (Appendix 10) if the policy matter is not already addressed AND Amend Policy 4.5.17 Te Kauwhata Town Centre to remove reference to Town Centre Character Statements. 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 generally supports the policies set out in 4.5.14 to 4.5.19. There are desired outcomes sought in each town and village with regard to development. These are identified in Appendix 10: Town Centre Character Statements in the Proposed District Plan. The submitter opposes the inclusion of Town Centre Character Statements in the Proposed District Plan, and seeks the deletion of all Town Centre Character Statements from the Proposed District Plan (reasons outlined later in submission). Any desired outcomes sought from each town and village as currently shown in the Town Centre Character Statement should be written out into policies to the respective town centre and village in section 4.5.14-4.5.19, if the policy matter is not already listed or included.	Reject	24
FS1387.997	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	Accept	24

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FS1368.3	Rosita Dianne-Lynn Darnes	Support	Allowed- particularly as it relates to an expanded residential zone around Ngaruawahia to maintain consistency with the WRPS.	I support the HNZC considerations regarding the lack of adequate land zoned for residential expansion around existing centres, the adequacy of the PWDP Objectives and Policies to address the Requirements of the WRPS in meeting the residential and economic growth targets for these areas. I further believe that the rules and/or zone specific requirements as currently drafted will not meet the requirements of the WRPS, with my specific interests being the extent and nature of the residential zoning proposed for the periphery of Ngaruawahia. It should be allowed particularly as it relates to an expanded residential zone around Ngaruawahia to maintain consistency with the WRPS.	Reject	24
749.14	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 4.5.18 Pokeno Town Centre to include desired outcomes sought from the relevant Town Centre Character Statement (Appendix 10) if the policy matter is not already addressed AND Amend Policy 4.5.18 Pokeno Town Centre to remove reference to Town Centre Character Statements. 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 generally supports the policies set out in 4.5.14 to 4.5.19. There are desired outcomes sought in each town and village with regard to development. These are identified in Appendix 10: Town Centre Character Statements in the Proposed District Plan. The submitter opposes the inclusion of Town Centre Character Statements in the Proposed District Plan, and seeks the deletion of all Town Centre Character Statements from the Proposed District Plan (reasons outlined later in submission). Any desired outcomes sought from each town and village as currently shown in the Town Centre Character Statement should be written out into policies to the respective town centre and village in section 4.5.14-4.5.19, if the policy matter is not already listed or included.	Reject	25
FS1368.4	Rosita Dianne-Lynn Darnes	Support	Allowed- particularly as it relates to an expanded residential zone around Ngaruawahia to maintain consistency with the WRPS.	I support the HNZC considerations regarding the lack of adequate land zoned for residential expansion around existing centres, the adequacy of the PWDP Objectives and Policies to address the Requirements of the WRPS in meeting the residential and economic growth targets for these areas. I further believe that the rules and/or zone specific requirements as currently drafted will not meet the requirements of the WRPS, with my specific interests being the extent and nature of the residential zoning	Reject	25

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>proposed for the periphery of Ngaruawahia. It should be allowed particularly as it relates to an expanded residential zone around Ngaruawahia to maintain consistency with the WRPS.</i>		
749.15	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 4.5.19 Tuakau Town Centre to include desired outcomes sought from the relevant Town Centre Character Statement (Appendix 10) if the policy matter is not already addressed AND Amend Policy 4.5.19 Tuakau Town Centre to remove reference to Town Centre Character Statements. 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 generally supports the policies set out in 4.5.14 to 4.5.19. There are desired outcomes sought in each town and village with regard to development. These are identified in Appendix 10: Town Centre Character Statements in the Proposed District Plan. The submitter opposes the inclusion of Town Centre Character Statements in the Proposed District Plan, and seeks the deletion of all Town Centre Character Statements from the Proposed District Plan (reasons outlined later in submission). Any desired outcomes sought from each town and village as currently shown in the Town Centre Character Statement should be written out into policies to the respective town centre and village in section 4.5.14-4.5.19, if the policy matter is not already listed or included.	Reject	26
FS1368.5	Rosita Dianne-Lynn Darnes	Support	Allowed- particularly as it relates to an expanded residential zone around Ngaruawahia to maintain consistency with the WRPS.	<i>I support the HNZC considerations regarding the lack of adequate land zoned for residential expansion around existing centres, the adequacy of the PWDP Objectives and Policies to address the Requirements of the WRPS in meeting the residential and economic growth targets for these areas. I further believe that the rules and/or zone specific requirements as currently drafted will not meet the requirements of the WRPS, with my specific interests being the extent and nature of the residential zoning proposed for the periphery of Ngaruawahia. It should be allowed particularly as it relates to an expanded residential zone around Ngaruawahia to maintain consistency with the WRPS.</i>	Reject	26
749.16	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 4.5.23 Height: Business Town Centre Zone as follows: a) <u>Ensure the height of new buildings is complementary to, and promotes, a high intensity and compact built form of three storeys in each town.</u> <del>Ensure the height of new buildings is complementary to, and promotes, the existing character of the business town centre within each town.</del> AND Amend the Proposed District Plan as consequential or additional relief as necessary to address the matters raised	The submitter supports this policy with a minor amendment to change the word 'character' to 'built form'. Character could imply the look and visual qualities of a building. Built form implies the height and scale of a building in an area, not the characteristics of buildings.	Reject	30

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			in the submission as necessary.			
FS1368.6	Rosita Dianne-Lynn Darnes	Support	Allowed- particularly as it relates to an expanded residential zone around Ngaruawahia to maintain consistency with the WRPS.	I support the HNZC considerations regarding the lack of adequate land zoned for residential expansion around existing centres, the adequacy of the PWDP Objectives and Policies to address the Requirements of the WRPS in meeting the residential and economic growth targets for these areas. I further believe that the rules and/or zone specific requirements as currently drafted will not meet the requirements of the WRPS, with my specific interests being the extent and nature of the residential zoning proposed for the periphery of Ngaruawahia. It should be allowed particularly as it relates to an expanded residential zone around Ngaruawahia to maintain consistency with the WRPS.	Reject	30
749.17	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 4.2.24 New buildings: Business Town Centre Zone as follows: (a) New buildings within the Business Town Centre Zone are designed in a manner that are consistent with the Waikato District Council Urban Design Guidelines Town Centres (Appendix 3.3), and in particular: (i)... AND Amend the Proposed District Plan as consequential or additional relief as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission as necessary.	Housing New Zealand supports the intent of the 4.5.24 Policy - New Buildings: Business Town Centre Zone, however seeks the deletion of the town centre urban design guidelines from the Proposed District Plan (reasons outlined later in submission).	Reject	31
FS1387.998	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
FS1368.7	Rosita Dianne-Lynn Darnes	Support	Allowed- particularly as it relates to an expanded residential zone around Ngaruawahia to maintain consistency with the WRPS. The 'Medium' zoning could perhaps take the form of an	I support residential zoning Rules or Standards that promote a variety of housing choices and densities that are in keeping with the expectations of the	Reject	31

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			'Overlay; for specific areas.	WRPS but with due consideration as to the serviceability of the land whilst ensuring that productive rural land, where such rural land uses are sustainable, remain in rural production. I consider that land adjoining existing residential communities, with a location adjacent to major water bodies that limit many farming practices, are ideal for exploring residential intensification as proposed by a "Residential Medium" zoning.		
<b>749.18</b>	<b>Housing New Zealand Corporation</b>	Support	Retain Objective 4.5.30 Business Zone and Business Town Centre Zones - Amenity, as notified.	The submitter supports this objective.	Accept	37
FS1368.8	Rosita Dianne-Lynn Darnes	Support	Allowed- particularly as it relates to an expanded residential zone around Ngaruawahia to maintain consistency with the WRPS. The 'Medium' zoning could perhaps take the form of an 'Overlay' for specific areas.	There is a need for residential intensification in a new "Medium Density" zone around and within existing town centres and urban settlements. I support residential zoning Rules or Standards that promote a variety of housing choices and densities that are in keeping with the expectations of the WRPS but with due consideration as to the serviceability of the land whilst ensuring that productive rural land, where such rural land uses are sustainable, remain in rural production. I consider that land adjoining existing residential communities, with a location adjacent to major water bodies that limit many farming practices, are ideal for exploring residential intensification as proposed by a "Residential Medium" zoning. It should be allowed particularly as it relates to an expanded residential zone around Ngaruawahia to maintain consistency with the WRPS. The "Medium" zoning could perhaps take the form of an "Overlay" for specific areas.	Accept	37
<b>749.19</b>	<b>Housing New Zealand Corporation</b>	Support	Retain Policy 4.5.32 Adjoining site amenity, as notified.	The submitter supports this policy.	Accept	39
FS1387.1249	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	Reject	39

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FS1368.9	Rosita Dianne-Lynn Darnes	Support	Allowed- particular as it relates to an expanded residential zone around Ngaruawahia to maintain consistency with the WRPS.	I support the "walkability" aspect of the submission by HNZC which promotes easy walking access from areas for residential intensification to existing centres/ Existing zoning initiatives in the PWDP are unlikely to achieve the density requirements and/or population targets of the WRPS and achieve this "walkability".	Accept	39
749.48	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Neutral/Amend	Amend the definition of "Gross leasable floor area" in Chapter 13 Definitions to include a link to the definition "Gross floor area". 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 generally supports the proposed definition; however, is unclear to how it links with the definition of 'Gross floor area'.	Reject	123
780.20	John Lawson (Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Incorpora on behalf of Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Incorporated Society	Oppose	Delete Rule 18.3.5 Pl(a)(vi) Verandahs	It is inconsistent with Policy 4.5.14 (v)(B) which refers to post supported verandahs (for the Raglan Town Centre)	Accept	89
780.26	John Lawson (Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Incorpora on behalf of Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Incorporated Society	Oppose	Amend Rule 17.1.3 RDI (a)(i) Restricted Discretionary activities as follows: The extent to which the development is consistent with 4.5.3 Policy - Commercial purpose: <u>Business Town Centre Zone, in strengthening those areas as the primary retail, administration, commercial service and civic centre for each town and with Town Centre Guidelines contained in Appendix 3.3</u>	The 2006 Supporting Information for Lorenzen Bay Business Zone said at 4.4.3 that "It is likely that a Service Centre would comprise convenience shops such as a dairy or fruit and vegetable shop." It was on that basis that the area was rezoned from Residential to Business. By specifying a minimum lot size of 225m2 it is unlikely that such small shops are going to occupy the site. A large supermarket is more likely, which would affect the viability of Raglan CBD.	Reject	48
FS1092.5	Garth & Sandra Ellmers	Oppose	We are opposed to any restrictions requested in this submission on the discretionary activities on the Lorenzen Bay Structure Plan business zoned land. There is a dire shortage of available parking in the Raglan town center. Locals who need regular access to service based businesses (e.g. supermarket, medical professionals, childcare, pharmacy, butcher, building supplies etc) find it almost impossible to find parking due to the substantial increase all year round of tourism in Raglan. The large Rangitahi residential development will also considerably add to the severe shortage of parking and business zoned land	There is no evidence to suggest that the establishment of a new business development in the LBSP area will compromise the existing businesses in the Raglan CBD. There is substantial evidence that there is a dire shortage of available parking in the Raglan CBD and a dire shortage of available and affordable land for businesses to expand in the Raglan township. Re-location of some of the service related businesses which are predominantly supported by the local population will ease the	Accept	48



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
780.28	<b>John Lawson (Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Incorporation on behalf of Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Incorporated Society</b>	Support	Retain Rule 18.3.1.1 Height - Building general.	Submitter is pleased that note was taken of objections to the proposed increase to 12m. However, 10m should not become a target and most buildings should remain single storey.	Accept	85
780.46	<b>John Lawson (Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Incorporation on behalf of Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Incorporated Society</b>	Oppose	Add a rule to Section 17.3 Land Use - Building to the effect that: (a) Construction of a building or other structure within sight of SH23 at Raglan is a permitted activity if it will be screened from SH23 by planting with indigenous species that will achieve an average height of 3m after 5 years, mature to over 9m in the residential zone and 12m in the business zone and be of sufficient density to visually screen the activity from SH23. (b) Any activity that does not comply with a condition for a permitted activity is a discretionary activity.	The zone extensions have increased the extent of urban development along the main approach to Raglan. That could be mitigated by screening further development.	Reject	58
FS1387.1208	<i>Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D</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>	Accept	58
FS1269.74	<i>Housing New Zealand Corporation</i>	Oppose	Null	<i>Housing New Zealand opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission.</i>	Accept	58
780.47	<b>John Lawson (Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Incorporation on behalf of Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Incorporated Society</b>	Oppose	Amend Rule 17.3.5 Horotiu Acoustic Area, to also apply to the Raglan business zones.	The SH23 business zone is next to the Lorenzen Bay residential zone.	Accept	62

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1142.13	Greig Metcalfe	Oppose	<i>This rule relates specifically to Horotiu whereby additional controls are necessary to mitigate noise from the Waikato Expressway, North Island Main Trunk Railway and Industrial Activities. There is no evidence to suggest mitigation such as this is required at Raglan.</i>		Reject	62
<b>781.12</b>	<b>Ministry of Education</b>	Neutral/Amend	Add a rule for education facilities to Rule 18.1.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities as follows: Activity <u>RD3 Education Facilities</u> Council's discretion shall be restricted to the following matters: a. <u>The extent to which it is necessary to locate the activity within the Business Town Centre Zone</u> b. <u>Reverse sensitivity effects of adjacent activities</u> c. <u>The extent to which the activity may adversely impact on the transport network</u> d. <u>The extent to which the activity may adversely impact on the streetscape</u> e. <u>The extent to which the activity may adversely impact on the noise environment</u>	Education facilities are not listed in the Business Town Centre Zone and are therefore a non-complying activity in terms of Rule 18.1.5. Education facilities such as tertiary education institutions, work skills training centres and early childhood education centres may need to be located within this zone for the convenience of parents and students.	Reject	76
FS1387.1217	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Accept	76
FS1272.14	KiwiRail Holdings Ltd	Support	Null	<i>Should the relief sought be granted and a new rule introduced to the Proposed Plan, KiwiRail supports the consideration of the effects of any new educational facilities, which must include their potential impacts on the land transport network including the railway corridor.</i>	Reject	76
FS1202.82	New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Support submission point 781.12.	<i>The Transport Agency supports the inclusion of c. the extent to which the activity may adversely impact on the transport network.</i>	Reject	76
<b>781.13</b>	<b>Ministry of Education</b>	Neutral/Amend	Add a rule for education facilities to Rule 19.1.2 Restricted Discretionary Activities as follows: Activity <u>RD2 Education Facilities</u> Council's discretion shall be restricted to the following matters: <u>The extent to which it is necessary to locate the activity within the Business Zone</u>	Education facilities are not listed in the Business Zone Tamahere and are therefore a non-complying activity in terms of Rule 19.1.4. Education facilities such as tertiary education institutions, work skills training centres and early	Reject	106

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p>Tamahere. 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.</p>	<p>childhood education centres may need to be located within this zone for the convenience of parents and students.</p>		
785.11	Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Limited and Mobil Oil NZ Limited for 'Oil Companies'	Neutral/Amend	<p>Retain Rule 17.2.5.1 PI Earthworks - General, except for the amendments sought below  AND  Amend Rule 17.2.5.1 PI Earthworks - General as follows:  PI Earthworks within a site must meet the following conditions:  Be located more than 1.5m from a public sewer, open drain, overland flow path or other public service pipe;  Not exceed a volume of more than 250m<sup>3</sup> and an area of more than 1000m<sup>2</sup> within a site;  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);  Areas exposed by earthworks are re-vegetated to achieve 80% ground cover within 6 months of the commencement, or otherwise stabilised as soon as practicable at the completion of the earthworks;  Sediment resulting from the earthworks is retained on the site through implementation and maintenance of erosion and sediment controls;  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 supports in part the General Earthworks rules for the Business Zone, except for the amendments sought. The submitter seeks the retention of Rules 17.2.5.1. PI Earthworks - General, subject to ensuring that the separation distances required are clearly from public service pipes and not pipes per se, and clarifying that earthworks areas need to be stabilised appropriately (which may include re-vegetation, but which may also include an alternative form of reinstatement) in order to improve clarity and practical application. The submitter notes there is no specific Section 32 Report for earthworks. While earthworks are discussed within the Section 32 report for Infrastructure, this relates to earthworks associated with subdivision activities only. The submitter seeks that PI (a) (i) only applies to public infrastructure and will not capture earthworks within 1.5m of on-site service pipes (such as onsite storm water pipes within the forecourt of a service station). A 'service pipe' is not defined within the proposed definition and therefore earthworks undertaken within 1.5m of onsite stormwater infrastructure could be interpreted to require restricted discretionary activity consent. This is not considered appropriate in the context of earthworks within 1.5m of private service pipes (i.e. onsite stormwater pipes) or considered to be the intent of the proposed control. The submitter supports the requirement to re-vegetate groundcover within 6 months of the commencement of earthworks as PI (a) (iv). Earthworks undertaken in areas of hardstanding cannot be 're'-vegetated. Given there are no proposed controls to require the general reinstatement of areas disturbed by earthworks</p>	Accept	55

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				that are not vegetated, such areas are not required to be reinstated as a permitted activity. The submitter considers it appropriate to include additional wording to clause PI (a) (iv) to ensure areas disturbed by earthworks without vegetation are still reinstated to avoid potential erosion and sediment issues effects.		
785.12	Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Limited and Mobil Oil NZ Limited for 'Oil Companies'	Neutral/Amend	<p>Retain Rule 18.2.4.1 PI Earthworks - General, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Rule 18.2.4.1 PI Earthworks - General as follows: PI Earthworks within a site must meet the following conditions: Be located more than 1.5m from a public sewer, open drain, overland overland flow path or other public service pipe; Not exceed a volume of more than 250m<sup>3</sup> and an area of more than 1000m<sup>2</sup> within a site; 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); Areas exposed by earthworks are re-vegetated to achieve 80% ground cover within 6 months of the commencement, or otherwise stabilised as soon as practicable at the completion of the earthworks; Sediment resulting from the earthworks is retained on the site through implementation and maintenance of erosion and sediment controls; 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 supports in part the General Earthworks rules for the Business Town Centre Zone. The submitter seeks the retention of Rule 18.2.4.1.PI subject to ensuring that the separation distances required are clearly from public service pipes and not pipes per se, and clarifying that earthworks areas need to be stabilised appropriately (which may include re-vegetation, but which may also include an alternative form of reinstatement) in order to improve clarity and practical application. The submitter notes there is no specific Section 32 Report for earthworks. While earthworks are discussed within the Section 32 report for Infrastructure, this relates to earthworks associated with subdivision activities only. The submitter seeks that PI (a) (i) only applies to public infrastructure and will not capture earthworks within 1.5m of on-site service pipes (such as onsite storm water pipes within the forecourt of a service station). A 'service pipe' is not defined within the proposed definition and therefore earthworks undertaken within 1.5m of onsite stormwater infrastructure could be interpreted to require restricted discretionary activity consent. This is not considered appropriate in the context of earthworks within 1.5m of private service pipes (i.e. onsite stormwater pipes) or considered to be the intent of the proposed control. The submitter supports the requirement to re-vegetate groundcover within 6 months of the commencement of earthworks as PI (a) (iv). Earthworks undertaken in areas of hardstanding cannot be 're'-vegetated. Given there are no proposed controls to require the general reinstatement of areas disturbed by earthworks</p>	Accept	82

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				that are not vegetated, such areas are not required to be reinstated as a permitted activity. The submitter considers it appropriate to include additional wording to clause PI (a) (iv) to ensure areas disturbed by earthworks without vegetation are still reinstated to avoid potential erosion and sediment issues effects.		
785.13	Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Limited and Mobil Oil NZ Limited for 'Oil Companies'	Support	Retain Rule 17.2.5.1 P2 Earthworks - General, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Rule 17.2.5.1 P2 (a)(i) Earthworks - General as follows: P2 The importation of infill material to a site must meet all of the following conditions in addition to Rule 17.2.5.1 P1: Does not exceed a total volume of 500m3 per site and a depth of 1m (excluding backfill); ... AND Any consequential amendments or additional relief to give effect to the submission.	The submitter seeks the retention of Rules 17.2.5.1.P2 subject to amendments to ensure that any cut to the permitted depth can be backfilled as a permitted activity. PI (a) (iii) permits the maximum permitted cut in stable ground to a depth of 1.5m. P2 (a) (i) permits the maximum permitted fill to be 1m. It could be interpreted that a 1.5m cut cannot be backfilled to ground level as a permitted activity and therefore restricted discretionary activity consent is required. The submitter seeks inclusion for clean fill that is used as backfill within P2 (a) (i) to reflect the intent of the rule.	Accept	55
785.14	Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Limited and Mobil Oil NZ Limited for 'Oil Companies'	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 18.2.4.1 P2 Earthworks - General, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Rule 18.2.4.1 P2 Earthworks - General as follows: P2 The importation of infill material to a site must meet all of the following conditions in addition to Rule 18.2.4.1 P1: Does not exceed a total volume of 500m3 per site and a depth of 1m (excluding backfill); ... AND Any consequential amendments or additional relief to give effect to the submission.	The submitter seeks the retention of Rule 18.2.4.1.P2 subject to amendments to ensure that any cut to the permitted depth can be backfilled as a permitted activity. PI (a) (iii) permits the maximum permitted cut in stable ground to a depth of 1.5m. P2 (a) (i) permits the maximum permitted fill to be 1m. It could be interpreted that a 1.5m cut cannot be backfilled to ground level as a permitted activity and therefore restricted discretionary activity consent is required. The submitter seeks inclusion for clean fill that is used as backfill within P2 (a) (i) to reflect the intent of the rule.	Accept	82
785.15	Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Limited and Mobil Oil NZ Limited for 'Oil Companies'	Support	Retain Rule 17.2.5.1 RDI 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	55

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
785.16	Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Limited and Mobil Oil NZ Limited for 'Oil Companies'	Support	Retain Rule 18.2.4.1 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	82
785.25	Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Limited and Mobil Oil NZ Limited for 'Oil Companies'	Support	Retain Rule 17.2.1.2 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.	Accept	51
785.26	Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Limited and Mobil Oil NZ Limited for 'Oil Companies'	Support	Retain Rule 18.2.1.2 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.	Accept	79
785.29	Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Limited and Mobil Oil NZ Limited for 'Oil Companies'	Support	Retain Rule 17.2.4 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	54
785.30	Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Limited and Mobil Oil NZ Limited for 'Oil Companies'	Support	Retain Rule 18.2.3 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	Accept	81

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				controlled through matters of discretion.		
<b>785.38</b>	<b>Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Limited and Mobil Oil NZ Limited for 'Oil Companies'</b>	Neutral/Amend	Add a new activity to Rule Chapter 17.1.2 - Permitted Activities as follows: <u>Service Station activity</u> <u>Activity Specific Conditions Nil</u> OR Retain commercial and retail activities as permitted activities in Rule 17.1.2 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 Submitter seeks to retain the activity status of Service Stations as permitted activities in the Business Zone, not subject to any Activity Specific Conditions. The submitter has sought to include a new definition for a 'service station activity' (refer to submission point 785.3) The submitters service station activities are afforded to the following Business zonings under the Proposed District Plan: - Z Ngaruawahia - BP2Go Raglan and Hungry As Café - Mobil Mercer - Mobil Huntly In the Business Zone service stations are considered to be Permitted (as either a Retail or Commercial Activity). That activity status is supported, irrespective of whether service stations are provided for as commercial or retail activities or as separate service station activities.	Accept	47
FSI 193.25	Van Den Brink Group	Support	The submission is allowed.	If allowed the amendment would allow for an activity appropriate in a Business zone and should not be restricted to existing sites only.	Accept	47
<b>785.39</b>	<b>Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Limited and Mobil Oil NZ Limited for 'Oil Companies'</b>	Neutral/Amend	Add a new activity to Rule 18.1.2 Permitted Activities; as follows: <u>Service Station activity</u> <u>Activity Specific Conditions: Nil</u> OR Retain commercial and retail activities as 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 Submitter seeks to retain the activity status of Service Stations as permitted activities in the Business Town Centre Zone, not subject to any Activity Specific Conditions. The submitter has sought to include a new definition for a 'service station activity'. The submitter's service station activities are afforded the following zonings under the proposed District Plan: Z Pokeno Truckstop In the Business Town Centre Zone service stations are considered to be Permitted (as either a Retail or Commercial Activity). That activity status is supported, irrespective of whether service stations are provided for as commercial or retail activities or as separate service station activities.	Reject	75
<b>785.51</b>	<b>Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Limited and Mobil Oil NZ Limited for 'Oil Companies'</b>	Neutral/Amend	Add a new Permitted Activity Rule to Chapter 17 - Business 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</u>	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 17 to provide for health and safety required by legislation. The proposed	Reject	56

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p><u>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>		
<b>785.52</b>	<b>Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Limited and Mobil Oil NZ Limited for 'Oil Companies'</b>	Neutral/Amend	<p>Add a new Permitted Activity Rule to Chapter 18 - Business Town Centre 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.</p>	<p>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 18 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.</p>	Reject	83
<b>785.56</b>	<b>Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Limited and Mobil Oil NZ Limited for 'Oil Companies'</b>	Support	<p>Retain Policy 4.5.36 Signage, except for the amendments sought below; AND Amend Policy 4.5.36 (a)(i) Signage, to include health and safety signage as follows: (a) In the Business Town Centre and Business Zone provide 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 ... AND Any consequential amendments or additional relief to give effect to the submission.</p>	<p>Submitter seeks the retention of Policy 4.5.36 with amendments The proposed policy framework for signage within the Business zone and Business Town Centre Zone does not provide for Health and Safety signage. The submitter seeks a permitted activity rule for Health and Safety signage within the Business, Business Town Centre and Business Tamahere Zones. The submitter seeks that Health and Safety signage is provided for within the relevant policy framework.</p>	Reject	40
<b>785.57</b>	<b>Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ</b>	Support	<p>Retain Policy 4.5.37 Managing the adverse effects of signs as</p>	<p>The submitter supports the intent of the policy</p>	Accept	41

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
	Limited and Mobil Oil NZ Limited for 'Oil Companies'		notified.	framework for signage within the Business Zone and the Business Town Centre Zone.		
785.59	Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Limited and Mobil Oil NZ Limited for 'Oil Companies'	Support	Retain Rule 17.2.7.1 P2 Signs - General as notified.	The submitter supports the rules pertaining to signage in the Business Zone, specifically the maximum height limit of 10m (noting that a prime sign is a standard and integral feature of service station sites and is important to ensure the safe and efficient movement of traffic from the surrounding road network).	Accept	56
785.60	Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Limited and Mobil Oil NZ Limited for 'Oil Companies'	Support	Retain Rule 18.2.7.1 P2 Signs - General as notified.	The submitter supports the rules pertaining to signage in the Business Town Centre Zones, specifically the maximum height limit of 10m (noting that a prime sign is a standard and integral feature of service station sites and is important to ensure the safe and efficient movement of traffic from the surrounding road network).	Accept	83
785.63	Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Limited and Mobil Oil NZ Limited for 'Oil Companies'	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 17.2.7.1 Signs - General, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Rule 17.2.7.1 RDI Signs - General to be consistent with equivalent rules in Chapter 18, 20 and 21 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 matters of discretion for signage across 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.	Reject	56
785.64	Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Limited and Mobil Oil NZ Limited for 'Oil Companies'	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 18.2.7.1 Signs - General, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Rule 18.2.7.1 RDI Signs - General as follows: <u>RDI</u>	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.	Reject	83

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			A sign that does not comply with Rule XXX PX or PX. Council's discretion shall be restricted to the following matters: Amenity values; Character of the locality; Effects on traffic safety; Glare and artificial light spill; Effects on a notable tree; Effects on the heritage values of any heritage item due to the size, location, design and appearance of the sign; Effects on cultural values of any Maaori Site of Significance; and Effects on notable architectural features of a building.	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. The submitter supports the rule and seeks a consistent approach to the RDA matters of discretion for signage across Chapter 17, 18, 20 and 21.		
FS1323.83	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	That the amendment sought is declined.	The restricted discretionary 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	83
785.67	Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Limited and Mobil Oil NZ Limited for 'Oil Companies'	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.2.7.2 Signs - Effects on traffic 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.	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 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 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.	Reject	56
785.68	Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Limited and Mobil Oil NZ Limited for 'Oil Companies'	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.2.7.2 Signs - Effects on Traffic to be consistent with the equivalent rules in Chapter 17, 20 and 21 as follows: <u>PI (a) Any sign directed at road users must:</u>	Submitter seeks a consistent approach to signage across Chapters 17, 18, 20 and 21. There is no specific section 32 report which	Reject	83

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p><u>(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 P1.</u> AND Any consequential amendments or additional relief to give effect to the submission.</p>	<p>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. There is not rationale provided by Council to justify these inconsistencies in the absence of a section 32 analysis 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.</p>		
<b>798.28</b>	<b>Ngati Te Ata</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend the Pokeno Town Centre Design Guidelines to address: Sustainable development; Road contaminants being treated through vegetated swales or rain gardens; and Enhancement of significant streams- there does not seem to be any discussion around enhancement of these areas.	No reasons provided.	Reject	120
FS1108.37	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)	Support	Null	General agreement with the submission.	Reject	120
FS1387.1288	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	120

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
81.123	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend to include cross-referencing to Policies in Section 4.5 Business and Business Town Centre Zones, including Policies 4.5.14 - 4.5.19, and any other relevant sections of the plan, to enable plan users to obtain a full understanding of the policy direction in relation to the character of these places, and for an integrated approach to be taken to their growth and development.	The policies sitting under this Objective should be cross-referenced to Policies in Section 4.5 Business and Business Town Centre Zones, including Policies 4.5.14 - 4.5.19, and any other relevant sections of the plan. This would enable plan users to obtain a full understanding of the policy direction in relation to the desired settlement patterns and urban outcomes of these places, and for an integrated approach to be taken to their growth and development. The submission notes the relevant sections of the WRPS.	Reject	5
81.125	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend rules in Chapter 17: Business Zone to capture the intended location specific character and density sought.	There are no rules or other methods in Chapter 17 that are clearly targeted to achieve the outcomes sought for particular towns and villages identified in Policies 4.10-4.1.18. The submission notes the relevant sections of the WRPS.	Reject	45
FS1223.158	Mercury NZ Limited	Oppose	Mercury seeks that the submission point is allowed.	It opposes the principle of increasing the density of any sensitive activity within any land use zoned until natural hazard risk is assessed. Mercury supports the provision of well-planned urban development and intensification in appropriate locations. The Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) requires Waikato District Council to evaluate natural hazard risk in its section 32 assessment and to have regard to the evaluation report when preparing the PWDP. Mercury does not consider that such an adequate assessment has been undertaken for the PWDP.	Accept	45
81.133	Waikato Regional Council	Support	Retain Policy 4.5.1 Commercial function and purpose.	This Policy assists with giving effect to the WRPS' policy direction relating to the Future Proof settlement pattern and commercial development in the Future Proof area. (Note: WRPS Policies 6.1, 6.14, 6.16, Section 6A; and Table 6-4).	Accept	9
FS1223.24	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	Accept	9

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>		
<b>81.134</b>	<b>Waikato Regional Council</b>	Support	Retain Policy 4.5.2 Commercial function and purpose.	This Policy assists with giving effect to the WRPS' policy direction relating to the Future Proof settlement pattern and commercial development in the Future Proof area. (Note: WRPS Policies 6.1, 6.14, 6.16, Section 6A; and Table 6-4).	Accept	10
<i>FS1223.25</i>	<i>Mercury NZ Limited</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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>10</i>
<b>81.135</b>	<b>Waikato Regional Council</b>	Support	Retain Policy 4.5.3 Commercial purpose: Business Town Centre Zone.	This Policy assists with giving effect to the WRPS' policy direction relating to the Future Proof settlement pattern and commercial development in the Future Proof area. (Note: WRPS Policies 6.1, 6.14, 6.16, Section 6A; and Table 6-4).	Accept	11
<i>FS1223.26</i>	<i>Mercury NZ Limited</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include</i>	<i>Accept</i>	<i>11</i>

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
81.136	Waikato Regional Council	Support	Retain Policy 4.5.4 Commercial purpose: Business Zone.	This Policy assists with giving effect to the WRPS' policy direction relating to the Future Proof settlement pattern and commercial development in the Future Proof area. (Note: WRPS Policies 6.1, 6.14, 6.16, Section 6A; and Table 6-4).	Accept	12
FS1223.27	Mercury NZ Limited	Support	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	12
81.138	Waikato Regional Council	Support	Retain Policy 4.5.13 Town centre built form.	This policy gives effect to the WRPS' direction on encouraging walking, cycling and multi-modal transport and maximising opportunities for people to live, work and play within their local areas. (Note: WRPS Policies 6.1, 6.14, 6.16, Section and Table 6-4.)	Accept	20
81.153	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.1.2 Permitted Activities - P1 Commercial activity and P2 Commercial services to clarify which particular activities are appropriate for each zone.	These rules allow for commercial activity and commercial services as permitted activities in both the Business and Business Town Centre zones. Allowing the same activities to occur in both zones creates unnecessary and inappropriate competition between the Town Centre and Business Zones, and does not promote a supportive, complimentary role for them. This is not consistent with the policy approach set out in Section 4.5, which seeks to encourage a wide range of commercial activities	Accept	47

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				in both zones, the town centres focusing on retail, administration, commercial and civic centre activities, the Business Zone discouraging small scale retail and focusing on large format retail. The submitter seeks clarification about the rationale behind the rules, and is concerned that they do not give proper effect to the WRPS' Policy 6.16 or the policy framework for these zones contained in Section 4.5: of the Proposed Plan.		
FSI 223.30	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	47
FSI 193.21	Van Den Brink Group	Oppose	The submission is disallowed.	If allowed the amendment would unduly restrict development options for VDB.	Reject	47
FSI 078.2	Hugh Green Limited	Oppose	The amendment unduly restricts development options for HGL (on the basis that 392.1 is allowed)	The submission is disallowed	Reject	47
<b>81.154</b>	<b>Waikato Regional Council</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.1.2 P1 Commercial activity and P3 Commercial services to clarify which particular activities are appropriate for each zone.	These rules allow for Commercial activity and Commercial services as permitted activities in both the Business and Business Town Centre zones. Allowing the same activities to occur in both zones creates unnecessary and inappropriate competition between the Town Centre and Business Zones, and does not promote a supportive, complimentary role for them. This is not consistent with the policy approach set out in Section 4.5, which seeks to encourage a wide range of commercial activities in both zones, the town centres focusing on retail, administration, commercial and civic centre activities, the Business Zone discouraging small scale retail and focusing on large format retail. The submitter seeks clarification about	Reject	75

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				the rationale behind the rules, and is concerned that they do not give proper effect to the WRPS' Policy 6.16 or the policy framework for these zones contained in Section 4.5: of the Proposed Plan.		
FS1223.31	Mercury NZ Limited	Support	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	75
FS1078.3	Hugh Green Limited	Oppose	The amendment unduly restricts development options for HGL	The submission is disallowed	Accept	75
81.156	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Add to Rule 17.1.3 - RD   A Multi-Unit development a new condition as follows: <u>The development is either serviced by or within 400m walking distance of public transport.</u>	The submitter supports this provision, however, seeks an incentive in the rule, similar to Rule 16.1.2 P3 to encourage this type of development to locate within 400 metres walking distance of public transport. This helps to give effects to WRPS Policies 6.1 and 6.3 and Section 6A Development Principles. Proposals not meeting the relief sought could be assessed as discretionary activities but has this not been sought this as specific relief.	Reject	48
FS1223.32	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	Reject	48

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FS1202.80	New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Support submission point 81.156.	The Transport Agency supports provisions that promote alternative transport options to the private motor vehicle.	Reject	48
FS1078.4	Hugh Green Limited	Oppose	The amendment unduly restricts development options for HGL, and is not necessary given that the Town Centre zone provides for necessary activities within walking distance of proposed multi-unit development (therefore public transport is not required)	The submission is disallowed	Accept	48
81.157	Waikato Regional Council	Support	Retain Rule 18.1.3 RDI Restricted Discretionary Activities.	The submitter supports the provision for multi-unit development in the Business Town Centre Zone, and considers that it will assist with achieving Objective 4.2.16 and Policies 4.2.17 and 4.2.18.	Accept	76
FS1223.33	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	76
FS1223.163	Mercury NZ Limited	Support	Mercury seeks that the submission point is allowed.	Mercury supports these submission points as it supports the need for an assessment of development feasibility, including the economic cost of natural hazard mitigation, as required by the National Policy Statement-Urban Development Capacity (NPS-UDC). Mercury considers that as the economic cost of natural hazard mitigation has not yet been assessed, the PWDP has not been prepared in accordance with the NPS-UDC.	Accept	76
825.20	John Lawson	Oppose	Delete Rule 18.3.5 PI(a)(vi) Verandahs	It is inconsistent with Policy 4.5.14 (v)(B) which refers to post supported verandahs (for the Raglan Town Centre)	Accept	89

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
825.26	John Lawson	Oppose	Amend Rule 17.1.3 RD1 (a)(i) Restricted Discretionary activities as follows: The extent to which the development is consistent with <u>4.5.3 Policy - Commercial purpose: Business Town Centre Zone, in strengthening those areas as the primary retail, administration, commercial service and civic centre for each town and with</u> Town Centre Guidelines contained in Appendix 3.3	The 2006 Supporting Information for Lorenzen Bay Business Zone said at 4.4.3 that " It is likely that a Service Centre would comprise convenience shops such as a dairy or fruit and vegetable shop." It was on that basis that the area was rezoned from Residential to Business. By specifying a minimum lot size of 225m2 it is unlikely that such small shops are going to occupy the site. A large supermarket is more likely, which would affect the viability of Raglan CBD.	Reject	48
FS1387.1324	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	48
FS1325.6	Avondale Trust	Oppose	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed.	Raglan has a severe shortage of business zoned land. The LBSP (LorenzenBay Structure Plan) is close to the township so idea for expansion of the business area.	Accept	48
FS1092.11	Garth & Sandra Ellmers	Oppose	We are opposed to any restrictions requested in this submission on the discretionary activities on the LorenzenBay Structure Plan business zoned land. There is a dire shortage of available parking in the Raglan towncenter. Locals who need regular access to service based businesses (e.g. supermarket, medical professionals, childcare, pharmacy, butcher, building supplies etc) find it almost impossible to find parking due to the substantial increase all year round of tourism in Raglan. The large Rangitahi residential development will also considerably add to the severe shortage of parking and business zoned land in the Raglan CBD. The high cost of land close to the CBD has led to a shortage of available and affordable land to be developed for parking and/or expansion of existing businesses within the township center. Any restriction on the size of lots or activities in the LBSP business area is unacceptable as the demand is there	There is no evidence to suggest that the establishment of a new business development in the LBSP area will compromise the existing businesses in the Raglan CBD. There is substantial evidence that there is a dire shortage of available parking in the Raglan CBD and a dire shortage of available and affordable land for businesses to expand in the Raglan township. Re-location of some of the service related businesses which are predominantly supported by the local population will ease the demand on parking in the township and will provide larger lots some businesses currently located in the CBD require to enable businesses expansion.	Accept	48

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<i>for a variety of service and other businesses to establish out of the CBD but close to the township. The minimum or maximum size lot required will depend on the type of business e.g. a garage/service station would require a much larger piece of land than a shoe repair business.</i>			
825.27	John Lawson	Oppose	Amend Rule 17.4.1 - RD1 (a)(i) General subdivision as follows: (a) Subdivision of land must comply with all of the following conditions: (i) <del>Proposed lots must have a minimum size of 225m<sup>2</sup> net site area</del> with the exception of access or utility allotments or reserves to vest; (ii) Proposed lots must be connected to public-reticulated water supply and wastewater.	It is inconsistent with Policy 4.5.3- Commercial purpose: Business Town Centre Zone, which aims to strengthen town centres as the primary retail, administration, commercial service and civic centre for each town.	Reject	65
FS1387.1325	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Accept	65
825.28	John Lawson	Support	Retain Rule 18.3.1.1 Height - Building general.	Submitter is pleased that note was taken of objections to the proposed increase to 12m. However, 10m should not become a target and most buildings should remain single storey.	Accept	85
825.30	John Lawson	Neutral/Amend	Add a new clause (iv) to Policy 4.5.38 Artificial outdoor lighting as follows (or similar wording): <u>iv. Artificial outdoor lighting is installed and operated so that light spill does not contribute to pollution of the night sky.</u>	Light pollution can cause adverse impacts to wildlife and migratory birds and disrupt their normal patterns of behaviour. Collectively our villages and towns contribute to the wider adverse impacts. All exterior lighting should have shields to force lighting towards the ground. While there are rules such as 6.2.3 relating to glare and artificial light spill that must not exceed 10 lux measured horizontally and vertically within any other site, there are no policies dealing with the adverse effects of night sky pollution. As there is a rush to LED use because	Reject	42

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				of cost savings, LED lights need to be coated with phosphor that converts the blue light to yellow to avoid the adverse effects of blue light.		
<b>825.46</b>	<b>John Lawson</b>	Oppose	Add a rule to Section 17.3 Land Use - Building to the effect that: (a) Construction of a building or other structure within sight of SH23 at Raglan is a permitted activity if it will be screened from SH23 by planting with indigenous species that will achieve an average height of 3m after 5 years, mature to over 9m in the residential zone and 12m in the business zone and be of sufficient density to visually screen the activity from SH23. (b) Any activity that does not comply with a condition for a permitted activity is a discretionary activity.	The zone extensions have increased the extent of urban development along the main approach to Raglan. That could be mitigated by screening further development.	Reject	58
<i>FS1387.1330</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>58</i>
<b>825.47</b>	<b>John Lawson</b>	Oppose	Amend Rule 17.3.5 Horotiu Acoustic Area, to also apply to the Raglan business zones.	The SH23 business zone is next to the Lorenzen Bay residential zone.	Accept	62
<i>FS1142.14</i>	<i>Greig Metcalfe</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>This rule relates specifically to Horotiu whereby additional controls are necessary to mitigate noise from the Waikato Expressway, North Island Main Trunk Railway and Industrial Activities. There is no evidence to suggest mitigation such as this is required at Raglan.</i>		<i>Reject</i>	<i>62</i>
<b>831.15</b>	<b>Gabrielle Parson on behalf of Raglan Naturally</b>	Oppose	Amend Policy 4.5.3 Commercial Purpose: Business Town Centre Zone, to acknowledge the importance of Ultra-Fast Broadband in allowing businesses to develop and reduce transport needs.	Internet and broadband are each only mentions in the definition section of the Proposed District Plan. Facilitate rollout of Ultra-Fast Broadband to allow businesses to connect with the global business community. Raglan Club and Yacht Club are in Raglan's town centre and have had problems associated with them, including noise	Reject	11

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				and financial viability.		
831.26	Gabrielle Parson on behalf of Raglan Naturally	Oppose	Amend matter of Discretion (a)(i) in Rule 17.1.3 RD1 Restricted Discretionary Activities, as follows: (i) To the extent which the development is consistent with 4.5.3 Policy - Commercial purpose: Business Town Centre Zone, in strengthening those areas as the primary retail, administration, commercial service and civic centre for each town and with Town Centre Guidelines contained in Appendix 3;	The 2006 Supporting Information for Lorezen Bay Business Zone said at 4.5.3 that "It is likely that a Service centre would comprise convenience shops such as a dairy or fruit and vegetable shop." It was on that basis that the area was rezoned from Residential to Business. By specifying a minimum lot size of 225m2 it is unlikely that such small shops are going to occupy the site. A large supermarket is more likely, which would affect the viability of the Raglan CBD.	Reject	48
831.28	Gabrielle Parson on behalf of Raglan Naturally	Support	Delete Rule 17.4.1 RD1 (a)(i) General subdivision.	This rule is inconsistent with Policy 4.5.3 which aims to strengthen town centres as the primary retail, administration, commercial service and civic centre for each town.	Reject	65
831.29	Gabrielle Parson on behalf of Raglan Naturally	Oppose	Amend Policy 4.5.2 (a)(ii) Commercial function and purpose, to identify that the Raglan Wharf is not suited to large scale commercial activities AND Add policies and rules to address the relationship between boat owners and business people at Raglan Wharf.	The submitter identifies the need to address the friction between boats and business people at Raglan Wharf.	Reject	10
831.76	Gabrielle Parson on behalf of Raglan Naturally	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 4.5.3 Commercial purpose: Business Town Centre Zone, to acknowledge entertainment venues AND Add policies and rules for control and support of clubs in town centres.	Internet and broadband are each only mentioned in the definition section of the Proposed District Plan. Facilitate rollout of Ultra Fast Broadband to allow businesses to connect with the global business community. Raglan Club and Yacht Club are in Raglan's town centre and have had problems associated with them, including noise and financial viability.	Reject	11
831.90	Gabrielle Parson on behalf of Raglan Naturally	Oppose	Add rules to Chapter 18: Business Town Centre Zone, to provide for the protection of defined views from public places to the harbour, coast and natural backdrops and to include at least the following defined views: From SH3 (north of Maungatawhiri Road) to Kaitoke Creek All existing views of the bard from Main Road, Bow St and Norrie Avenue All existing views of Kariroi from Raglan CBD From Wainui Road to the coast between the	Views are an inherent part of Raglan's seaside character and retaining these is a priority action. Policy 3.3.3 needs to be achieved. The protection of views that affect the wellbeing of residents is a matter that needs to be considered in accordance with section 5 of the RMA.	Reject	74

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			Bryant Reserve and the Bible Crusade Camp From SH23 summit to Karioi Aro Aro salt marsh from Wallis St AND Consequently amend the planning maps as necessary to satisfy the relief sought in this submission.			
FS1258.57	Meridian Energy Limited	Oppose	Disallow	The submission point does not provide sufficient detail to determine the precise spatial extent of the view protection areas and does not define what 'protection' means in terms of rules and policy framework. It is not possible to determine what the potential effect would be for structures, including infrastructure installations. In the absence of this detail, Meridian opposes the submission point.	Accept	74
FS1276.159	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Support	WED seeks that the whole submission point be allowed.	This supports WED's submission that views should be protected by the Plan.	Reject	74
871.10	<b>Brendon John &amp; Denise Louise Strong</b>	Support	Retain Chapter 17 Business Zone, with the exception of Rules 17.3.1.1 P1 Height - Building General; 17.3.2 P1 Daylight admission; 17.3.4.2 Building setbacks - Water bodies; and 17.4.1.7 Esplanade reserves and esplanade strips (which are addressed in other submission points).	Supports the general business provisions in Chapter 17 with the exception of the specific points raised elsewhere in the submission.	Accept	45
871.11	<b>Brendon John &amp; Denise Louise Strong</b>	Oppose	Amend Rule 17.3.2 P1 (a) Daylight admission, as follows: Buildings must not protrude through a height control plane rising at an angle of <del>37</del> 45 degrees commencing at an elevation of 2.5m above ground level at every point of the site boundary.	The submitter opposes the height control plane rising at an angle of 37 degrees commencing at an elevation of 2.5m above ground level at every point of the site boundary for the following reasons: Inconsistency with previous planning documents which are less restrictive. Too restrictive for urban areas. Adequate amenity and daylight for adjoining sites can be achieved with a less restrictive control plane., The 37 degrees angle is difficult to calculate.	Reject Accept	60
871.12	<b>Brendon John &amp; Denise Louise Strong</b>	Oppose	Amend Rule 17.3.4.2 Building setbacks - waterbodies, to match Rule 24.3.6.3 Building Setback - water bodies; AND Amend Rule 17.3.4.2 Building setbacks - waterbodies, as follows: P1 (a)(ii) ... from the bank of any <u>named</u> river ... P3. <u>A building must be set back a minimum of 10m from the bank of a perennial or intermittent named or unnamed stream.</u>	These are not consistent with other zones or the existing Waikato District Plan - Franklin Section provisions; a building must be set back a minimum of 10 metres from the bank of a perennial or intermittent stream. It is important to also define a stream to avoid confusion with the definition of a river. the RMA defines a river as "a continually or intermittently flowing body of fresh water; and includes a stream and modified watercourse." If a watercourse is named "Stream" then it should be subject to the appropriate setback by the Plan.	Reject	61

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1387.1420	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	61
FS1371.38	Lakeside Development Limited	Support	Lakeside Development Limited seeks that the submission made in relation to retaining the 10m building setbacks requirement along perennial and intermittent streams to be allowed.	Will allow for the appropriate setback of buildings form all waterbodies. Will promote the sustainable management of resources and will achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991. Will enable the wellbeing of the community. Will meet the reasonably foreseeable need of future generations. Will enable the efficient use and development of the district's assets. Will represent the most appropriate means of exercising the Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means.	Reject	61
871.13	Brendon John & Denise Louise Strong	Oppose	Amend Rule 17.4.1.7 Esplanade reserves and esplanade strips, by replacing with the Waikato District Plan - Franklin Section Rule 11.5 Esplanade Reserves and Strips.	The submitters accept the esplanade reserves and esplanade strips enable public access and recreation. However, this needs to be assessed on a case by case basis and Council should allow a waiver or reduction in width in certain circumstances.	Reject	72
923.46	Waikato District Health Board	Neutral/Amend	Add to Policy 4.5.11 (a)- Residential Upper Floors: Business Town Centre Zone and Business Zone as follows: (iii.) Provide for mixed use developments which promote urban design protocols.	The submitter supports Policy 4.5.11 in principle but requests that it include promotion of the urban design protocols and guidelines as referenced in Appendix 3.3- Town Centre Guidelines. The purpose of the principles is to guide the design of environments, products and communications and describe the concepts of designing all products and the built environment to be aesthetic and usable to the greatest extent possible by everyone, regardless of age, disability or status.	Reject	18

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1387.1499	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	18
923.47	Waikato District Health Board	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 4.5.13 (i)- Town Centre Built Form as follows: (i) Provide for a safe, accessible, compact and attractive town centre environment <u>which promotes urban design protocols (Appendix 3.3)</u> .	The submitter supports Policy 4.5.13 in principle but requests that it include promotion of the urban design protocols and guidelines as referenced in Appendix 3.3- Town Centre Guidelines, to optimize health and wellbeing outcomes for everyone. The purpose of the principles is to guide the design of environments, products and communications and describe concepts of designing all products and the built environment to be aesthetic and usable to the greatest extent possible by everyone, regardless of age, disability or status.	Reject	20
923.58	Waikato District Health Board	Support	Retain Objective 4.5.1- Commercial function and purpose as notified.	Objective is supported as it assists with giving effect to the Waikato Regional Policy Statement's policy direction relating to the Future Proof settlement pattern and commercial development in the Future Proof area.	Accept	9
FS1387.1505	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	Reject	9

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
<b>923.59</b>	<b>Waikato District Health Board</b>	Support	Retain Policy 4.5.2- Commercial function and purpose as notified.	Policy is supported as it assists with giving effect to the Waikato Regional Policy Statement's policy direction relating to the Future Proof settlement pattern and commercial development in the Future Proof area.	Accept	10
<i>FSI387.1506</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</i>
<b>923.60</b>	<b>Waikato District Health Board</b>	Support	Retain Policy 4.5.3- Commercial purpose: Business Town Centre as notified.	Policy is supported as it assists with giving effect to the Waikato Regional Policy Statement's policy direction relating to the Future Proof settlement pattern and commercial development in the Future Proof area.	Accept	11
<i>FSI387.1507</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</i>	<i>Reject</i>	<i>11</i>

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>appropriate.</i>		
<b>923.61</b>	<b>Waikato District Health Board</b>	Support	Retain Policy 4.5.4- Commercial Zone- Business Zone as notified.	Policy assists with giving effect to the WRPS' policy direction relating to the Future Proof settlement pattern and commercial development in the Future Proof area.	Accept	12
<i>FS1387.1508</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</i>
<b>923.62</b>	<b>Waikato District Health Board</b>	Support	Retain Policy 4.5.7- Commercial Purpose: Neighborhood Centres in Structure Plans as notified.	The submitter supports the Policy in principle given the important role of neighbourhood centres in providing local commercial and community services which can contribute to positive health and wellbeing outcomes.	Accept	14
<b>923.63</b>	<b>Waikato District Health Board</b>	Support	Retain Policy 4.5.13- Town centre built form as notified.	The submitter supports the policy as providing for a safe, accessible, compact and attractive town centre environment can have positive impacts on community health and wellbeing for local residents. Policy gives effect to the Future Proof Growth Strategy and Waikato Regional Policy Statements' directions on encouraging and promoting walking, cycling and multimodal transport and maximizing opportunities for people to live, work, learn and play within their local communities.	Accept	20
<b>942.23</b>	<b>Angeline Greensill for Tainui o Tainui</b>	Support	Retain Policy 4.5.14 Raglan Town Centre AND No specific decision sought, but submission opposes Policy 4.5.14(a)(v)(F) Raglan Town Centre, particularly the change from one storey to two storeys.	The submitter supports the policy but opposes a changes from one to two storeys which would change the character of Raglan's main street.	Accept	21

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
942.91	Angeline Greensill for Tainui o Tainui	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, but submission refers to Rule 17.4.1.1 Esplanade Reserves and Esplanade strips.	No reasons provided.	Accept	72
943.36	McCracken Surveys Limited	Support	Retain Child care facility, as a permitted activity in Rule 17.1.2 P6.	No reason provided.	Accept	47
FS1387.1583	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	47
FS1325.4	Avondale Trust	Support	I seek that the whole of the submission be allowed.	A Childcare Facility as a permitted activity in the Lorenzen Bay Structure Plan area.	Accept	47
986.57	Pam Butler on behalf of KiwiRail Holdings Limited (KiwiRail)	Neutral/Amend	Add a new rule to Rule 17.3.4 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"> <li>• KiwiRail seeks that a 5 metre setback apply to all new building development adjacent to operational railway corridor boundaries (i.e. not just sensitive land uses).</li> <li>• Ensuring all new structures in all zones are set back from the rail corridor allows access and maintenance to occur without the landowner or occupier needing to gain access to the rail corridor- potentially compromising their own safety. For these safety reasons setting back buildings from the rail corridor boundary is a means of ensuring people's health and wellbeing through good design.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	Reject	51

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				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.		
FS1033.10	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	51
FS1032.10	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	51
FS1031.10	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	51
FS1193.30	Van Den Brink Group	Oppose	The submission is disallowed.	Setback's from the NIMT (greater than a normal yard control) imposes unnecessary development restrictions on the use of land.	Accept	51
<b>986.58</b>	<b>Pam Butler on behalf of KiwiRail Holdings Limited (KiwiRail)</b>	Neutral/Amend	Add a new rule to Rule 18.3 Land use - Building 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.	• 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	Reject	91

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				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.		
FS1033.11	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	91
FS1032.11	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	91
FS1031.11	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	91
<b>986.63</b>	<b>Pam Butler on behalf of KiwiRail Holdings Limited (KiwiRail)</b>	Neutral/Amend	Add new matters of discretion relating to non-compliance with the 5m Building setback - railway corridor (sought elsewhere in other submission points) in Rule 17.1 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.	• 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	61
FS1193.31	Van Den Brink Group	Oppose	The submission is disallowed.	Setbacks from NIMT (greater than a normal yard control) imposes unnecessary restrictions on the use	Accept	61

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>of land.</i>		
FS1269.90	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Oppose	Null	Housing New Zealand opposes the relief sought.	Accept	61
986.64	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 18.1 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"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	Reject	91
986.76	Pam Butler on behalf of KiwiRail Holdings Limited (KiwiRail)	Neutral/Amend	Add a new clause (b) to Policy 4.5.33 Reverse sensitivity as follows (or similar amendments to achieve the requested relief): (a) Reverse sensitivity is managed by ensuring residential activities and development within the Business Town Centre Zone and Business Zone are acoustically insulated to mitigate the adverse effects of noise. <u>(b) Reverse sensitivity is managed by providing sufficient setbacks to provide for residents' safety and amenity.</u> AND Any consequential amendments to link and/or accommodate the requested changes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The policies applying to each zone requiring setbacks from the railway corridor should include reference to the purpose of the setback.</li> <li>• Existing and sought changes to the Plans objectives lend sufficient support the need for setbacks for amenity and safety, and the efficient integration of development and infrastructure.</li> <li>• Adding an additional item to these plan sections will also facilitate assessment of situations where the proposed 5 metre Building setback - railway corridor rule cannot be met, or it is inappropriate to require compliance.</li> </ul>	Accept	38
FS1193.36	Van Den Brink Group	Oppose	<i>The submission is disallowed.</i>	<i>A 5m setback from the NIMT imposes unnecessary development restrictions on the use of land.</i>	Reject	38
986.92	Pam Butler on behalf of KiwiRail Holdings Limited (KiwiRail)	Neutral/Amend	Add a new matter of discretion to Rule 17.4.1 General Subdivision 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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	Reject	65

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				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.		
<b>986.93</b>	<b>Pam Butler on behalf of KiwiRail Holdings Limited (KiwiRail)</b>	Neutral/Amend	Add a new matter of discretion to Rule 18.4.1 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	95
<b>378.101</b>	<b>Fire and Emergency New Zealand</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 19.3.1 Height - Building, to include the following: 19.3.1 Height- Building The maximum height of any building must not exceed 10m, <u>except hose drying towers up to 15m associated with emergency service facilities.</u> AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make further or consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.	Fire and Emergency New Zealand supports the height standard of Rule 19.3.1, however the inclusion of a specific exemption for hose drying towers will appropriately provide for the operational requirements of Fire and Emergency New Zealand. Fire stations are single storied buildings of approximately 8-9m in height and are typically able to achieve the height standards in a District Plan. Some fire stations also include a hose drying tower of between 12-15m in height. Fire and Emergency New Zealand considers 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	112
FS1035.208	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	112
<b>559.213</b>	<b>Sherry Reynolds on behalf of Heritage New Zealand Lower</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.3.5 PI Verandahs as follows: PI (a) Any new building, or alteration to an existing building, <u>except a</u>	The submitter opposes Rule 18.3.5 Verandahs in part as this rule has the potential to undermine	Accept	89

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
	<b>Northern Office</b>		building included in Schedule 30.1 - Historic Heritage Items, on land with a verandah line identified on the planning maps, must be provided with a verandah that complies with the following conditions: ...	the heritage values of items contained within Schedule 30.1 Historic Heritage Items and cause adverse effects. The plan does not provide clear guidance that Heritage items should be exempt from these types of design rules, Heritage New Zealand seeks that the rule is amended to exclude Heritage items from being subject to the Verandah rules.		
<b>559.214</b>	<b>Sherry Reynolds on behalf of Heritage New Zealand Lower Northern Office</b>	Support	Retain Rule 18.3.5 DI Verandahs (subject to historic heritage items being excluded from these requirements).	The submitter supports the discretionary activity status of Rule 18.3.5, subject to historic heritage items being excluded from these requirements, as identified in the submission point relating to 18.3.5 PI Verandahs.	Accept	89
<b>559.246</b>	<b>Sherry Reynolds on behalf of Heritage New Zealand Lower Northern Office</b>	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 17.4.1.5 RDI Subdivision - land containing heritage items, except for the amendments sought below. AND Amend Rule 17.4.1.5 RDI Subdivision - land containing heritage items as follows: (a) Subdivision of land containing a heritage item listed in Schedule 30.1 (Historic Heritage Items) (b) The Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters: (i) Effects on heritage values; (ii) Context and setting of the heritage item; (iii) The extent to which the relationship of the heritage item with its setting is maintained <u>within one lot</u> . AND Amend Rule 17.4.1.5 RDI Subdivision - land containing heritage items, to be consistent with the equivalent rules in other zone chapters, including heritage items being retained in one lot.	The submitter supports in part the restricted discretionary activity status of the rule relating to the subdivision of land containing heritage items and the associated matters of discretion, as these assessment criteria will assist to give effect to the related policy. An amendment is required to the assessment criteria to recognise that the retention of a heritage item and its setting is best achieved when they are located within the same lot. The inclusion of threshold creates a clear distinction for those administering the Plan as to when the activity becomes a non-complying activity.	Accept	70
<b>559.247</b>	<b>Sherry Reynolds on behalf of Heritage New Zealand Lower Northern Office</b>	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 18.4.6 RDI Subdivision - land containing heritage items, except for the amendments sought below. AND Amend Rule 18.4.6 RDI Subdivision - land containing heritage items as follows: (a) Subdivision of land containing a heritage item listed in Schedule 30.1 (Historic Heritage Items) (b) Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters: (i) Effects on heritage values; (ii) Context and setting of the heritage item; (iii) The extent to which the relationship of the heritage item with its setting is maintained <u>within one lot</u> . AND	The submitter supports in part the restricted discretionary activity status of the rule relating to the subdivision of land containing heritage items and the associated matters of discretion, as these assessment criteria will assist to give effect to the related policy. An amendment is required to the assessment criteria to recognise that the retention of a heritage item and its setting is best achieved when they are located within the same lot. The inclusion of threshold creates a clear distinction for those administering the Plan as to when the activity	Accept	100

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			Amend Rule 18.4.6 RD1 Subdivision - land containing heritage items to be consistent with the equivalent rules in other zone chapters, including heritage items being retained in one lot.	becomes a non-complying activity.		
<b>559.253</b>	<b>Sherry Reynolds on behalf of Heritage New Zealand Lower Northern Office</b>	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 17.4.1.5 NCI Subdivision - land containing heritage items, except for the amendments sought below. AND Amend Rule 17.4.1.5 NCI Subdivision - land containing heritage items to be consistent with the equivalent rules in other zone chapters.	The submitter supports the non-complying status of the rule relating to the subdivision of land containing heritage items, when the restricted discretionary activity status of the rule is not achieved. This stringent assessment will assist to ensure that the heritage values of the heritage item with its setting are maintained.	Accept	70
<b>559.254</b>	<b>Sherry Reynolds on behalf of Heritage New Zealand Lower Northern Office</b>	Support	Amend Rule 18.4.6 DI Subdivision - land containing heritage items to reflect a non-complying activity status for proposals that cannot achieve compliance with RD1. AND Amend Rule 18.4.6 DI Subdivision - land containing heritage items to be consistent with the equivalent rules in other zone chapters.	The submitter supports the non-complying status of the rule relating to the subdivision of land containing heritage items, when the restricted discretionary activity status of the rule is not achieved. This stringent assessment will assist to ensure that the heritage values of the heritage item with its setting are maintained.	Accept	100
<b>559.262</b>	<b>Sherry Reynolds on behalf of Heritage New Zealand Lower Northern Office</b>	Support	Retain Rule 17.4.1.4 RD1 Title boundaries - Significant Natural Areas, Maaori sites and Maaori areas of Significance, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Rule 17.4.1.4 RD1 Title boundaries - Significant Natural Areas, Maaori sites and Maaori areas of Significance to be consistent with other zone chapters, including sites and areas not being divided by a proposed lot boundary line. AND Amend Rule 17.4.1.4 RD1 Title boundaries - Significant Natural Areas, Maaori sites and Maaori areas of Significance to be consistent with the equivalent rules in other zone chapters.	The submitter supports Rule 17.4.1.4 RD1 Title boundaries - Significant Natural Areas, Maaori sites and Maaori areas of Significance. This rule will give effect to Part 2, section 6 Matters of national Importance, in particular s6(e) and 6(f).	Accept	69
<b>559.263</b>	<b>Sherry Reynolds on behalf of Heritage New Zealand Lower Northern Office</b>	Support	Retain Rule 18.4.5 RD1 Title boundaries - Maaori sites and areas of Significance to Maaori, except for the amendments sought below. AND Amend Rule 18.4.5 RD1 Title boundaries - Maaori sites	The submitter supports Rule 18.4.5 RD1 Title boundaries - Significant Natural Areas, Maaori sites and Maaori areas of Significance. This rule will give effect to Part 2, section 6 Matters of national Importance, in particular	Accept	99

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			and areas of Significance to Maaori to be consistent with other zone chapters, including sites and areas not being divided by a proposed lot boundary line. AND Amend Rule 18.4.5 RDI Title boundaries - Maaori sites and areas of Significance to Maaori to be consistent with the equivalent rules in other zone chapters.	s6(e) and 6(f).		
<b>559.267</b>	<b>Sherry Reynolds on behalf of Heritage New Zealand Lower Northern Office</b>	Support	Retain Rule 17.4.1.4 NCI Title boundaries - Significant Natural Areas, Maaori sites and Maaori areas of Significance to Maaori, except for the amendments sought below. AND Amend Rule 17.4.1.4 NCI Title boundaries - Significant Natural Areas, Maaori sites and Maaori areas of Significance to be consistent with the equivalent rules in other zone chapters, including the provision of heritage items.	The submitter supports Rule 17.4.1.4 NCI Title boundaries - Significant Natural Areas, Maaori sites and Maaori areas of Significance. This rule and the more stringent activity status will give effect to Part 2, section 6 Matters of national Importance, in particular s6(e) and 6(f).	Accept	69
<b>559.268</b>	<b>Sherry Reynolds on behalf of Heritage New Zealand Lower Northern Office</b>	Support	Retain Rule 18.4.5 NCI Title boundaries - Significant Natural Areas, Maaori sites and Maaori areas of Significance, except for the amendments sought below. AND Amend Rule 18.4.5 NCI Title boundaries - Significant Natural Areas, Maaori sites and Maaori areas of Significance to be consistent with the equivalent rules in other zone chapters, including the provision of heritage items.	The submitter supports Rule 18.4.5 NCI Title boundaries - Significant Natural Areas, Maaori sites and Maaori areas of Significance. This rule and the more stringent activity status will give effect to Part 2, section 6 Matters of national Importance, in particular s6(e) and 6(f).	Accept	99
<b>559.274</b>	<b>Sherry Reynolds on behalf of Heritage New Zealand Lower Northern Office</b>	Support	Retain Rule 17.4.1.4 RDI Title boundaries - Significant Natural Areas, Maaori sites and Areas of Significance to Maaori.	The submitter supports Rule 17.4.1.4 RDI Title boundaries - Significant Natural Areas and Areas of Maaori sites and Areas of Significance to Maaori. This rule will give effect to Part 2, section 6 Matters of national Importance, in particular s6(e) and 6(f).	Accept	69
<b>559.275</b>	<b>Sherry Reynolds on behalf of Heritage New Zealand Lower Northern Office</b>	Support	Retain Rule 17.4.1.4 NCI Title boundaries - Significant Natural Areas, Maaori sites and Areas of Significance to Maaori.	The submitter supports Rule 17.4.1.4 NCI Title boundaries - Significant Natural Areas and Maaori sites of Significance. This rule and the more stringent activity status will give effect to Part 2, section 6 Matters of national Importance, in particular s6(e) and 6(f).	Accept	69

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
695.186	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Support	Retain a maximum area of earthworks in Rule 17.2.5.1 P1 (a)(ii) Earthworks General. AND Amend Rule 17.2.5.1 P1(a)(ii) Earthworks General to apply a ration based on a site area, i.e. 1:1 so that a 450m2 site would provide 450m3 earthworks.	The submitter supports the retention of a maximum are of earthworks. The Proposed District Plan penalises bigger sites for no apparent outcome, especially when a bigger site is likely to be better able to absorb and diffuse effects.	Accept	55
695.187	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.2.5.1 P2 Earthworks - General to be consistent with the rest of the Proposed District Plan.	It is ultra-vires. It lacks any comprehension of building and development requirements. If it is meant to refer to unauthorised clean-fill, it should state so. The statement is objected to it (in its present form). The stated prohibition on importation of all clean-fill would make almost all development impossible. Building sand, crushed stone, shells or bark for gardens can all be regarded as clean-fill if received from an authorised source. Some sites need earth brought in to address drainage or where building of the soil level is required for stability and building platform integrity.	Accept	55
695.188	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.3.2 P1(a) Daylight admission as follows: P1(a) Any building must not protrude through a height control plane rising at angle of 3745 degrees commencing at an elevation of 2.53m above ground level at the site boundary.	There is no logical planning reason for this differentiation. All daylight control planes should be made to be consistent with each other and that used by adjoining Councils.	Reject Accept	60
695.189	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.3.7(a)(iii) Living Court so to revise and make consistent with outdoor living provisions elsewhere in the Proposed District Plan.	This is excessive for a balcony.	Reject	64
FS1387.351	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	Accept	64

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
695.192	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.1.3 RD1(f) Restricted Discretionary Activities so that an additional 10m2 bedroom be required for outdoor living space for 3 bedrooms or more, and the 4m dimension reduced to 3m.	The Council should be aiming for regional consistency. There is no obvious need for such wide variances to occur. The minimum dimensions in the Proposed District Plan are difficult to achieve, particularly on many narrow sites that occur in the District. This requirement is 60% greater than that for Hamilton City with no logical explanation for such a great difference.	Reject	76
FS1387.352	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Accept	76
695.193	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.2.4.1 P1(a)(ii) Earthworks - General so that earthworks are applied as a ratio to site area i.e. a 1:1 ratio based on a site area e.g. a 450m2 area would provide 450m3 earthworks.	The Proposed District Plan penalizes bigger sites for no apparent outcome, especially when a bigger site is likely to be better able to absorb and diffuse effects. Earthworks totals should not cancel each other out, i.e. cut and fill add together	Reject	82
695.194	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.2.4.1 P2(a)(i) Earthworks - General to enable importation of fill to occur.	This is allowed in this zone but is avoided in the residential zone. Importation in all zones enables development to occur.	Reject	82
695.195	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.3.2 P1 Daylight admission as follows: (a) Any building must not protrude through a height control plane rising at an angle of 37 45 degrees commencing at an elevation of 2.53m above ground level at the site boundary where it adjoins the: ...	There is no logical planning reason for this differentiation. All daylight control planned should be consistent with each other and that are used by adjoining Councils.	Reject	86

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
695.196	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.3.9(a)(iii) Living court, to be revised and made consistent with outdoor living provisions elsewhere in the Proposed District Plan.	It is excessive for a balcony.	Reject	93
FSI387.353	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	93
695.197	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Support	Retain a maximum area of earthworks in Rule 18.2.4.1 PI (a)ii) Earthworks - General.	No reasons provided.	Accept	82
695.198	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 19.2.4 PI(a)(ii) Earthworks to be applied on a ratio based on site area. i.e. a 1:1 ratio so that a 450m2 site would provide 450m3 earthworks.	The Proposed District Plan penalizes bigger sites for no apparent outcome, especially when a bigger site is likely to be better able to absorb and diffuse effects. Earthworks totals should not cancel each other out, i.e. cut and fill add together.	Reject	109
695.199	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 19.3.3 PI Daylight admission as follows: Any building must not protrude through a height control plane rising at an angle of 37.45 degrees commencing at an elevation of 2.53m above ground level at every point of the boundary of a site within the Business Zone Tamahere.	There is no logical planning reason for this differentiation. All daylight control planned should be consistent with each other and that are used by adjoining Councils.	Reject	114
695.200	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Support	Retain the maximum area of earthworks in Rule 19.2.4 PI (a)(ii) Earthworks.	No reasons provided.	Accept	109
697.161	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Chapter 17 Business Zone heading to read as follows: Business Zone Rules	For increased clarity and consistency with other chapters.	Accept	46
FSI387.461	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	Reject	46

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
697.162	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17(2) Chapter 17: Business Zone, as follows: The rules that apply to subdivision in the Business Zone are contained in Rule 17.4 and the relevant rules in 14 Infrastructure and Energy; and 15 Natural Hazards and Climate Change (Placeholder).	To clarify that the rules in Chapter 14: Infrastructure and Energy and Chapter 15: Natural Hazards and Climate Change apply to subdivision as well as to land use activities.	Accept	46
FS1387.462	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	46
697.163	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.1.2(1) Permitted Activities, as follows: The activities listed below are permitted activities if they <del>comply with</del> meet all of the following: (a) <del>Activity-specific conditions;</del> and (b) Land Use - Effects rules in Rule 17.2 (unless the activity-specific rule and/or conditions identifies a condition(s) that does not apply); and (c) Land Use - Building rules in Rule 17.3 (unless the activity-specific rule and/or conditions identifies a condition(s) that does not apply); and <del>(d) Activity-specific conditions.</del>	Additional clarity to make it clear how the activity-specific conditions are to be applied.	Accept	47
FS1387.463	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	Reject	47

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
697.164	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 17.1.2 (P2) Commercial services.	There is duplication between the terms "commercial activities" and "commercial services" and this is more appropriately represented by a single term.	Reject	47
FS1387.464	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	47
FS1193.23	Van Den Brink Group	Oppose	The submission is disallowed.	If allowed the amendment would unduly restrict development options for VDB. The Proposed plan contains two separate activities (both commercial activities and commercial service as defined terms therefore both should be permitted in a Business zone).	Accept	47
FS1078.34	Hugh Green Limited	Oppose	Generally inconsistent with relief sought by HGL	The submission is disallowed, unless Rule 17.1.2 P1 is amended to instead state 'Commercial activity, including commercial services and retail activity'	Accept	47
697.165	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 17.1.2 P11 Hauora.	The term is included in "Marae complex" and "papakaiinga housing development" so there is no need for a separate activity.	Reject	47

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1387.465	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	47
697.167	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.1.3 RD1 (a) (i) and (ii) Restricted Discretionary Activities, as follows; (i) Land Use - Effects rules in... AND (ii) Land Use - Building rules in...	Alignment with other zone chapters.	Accept	48
FS1387.467	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	48
697.168	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.1.3 RD1 (a)(iv) Restricted Discretionary, as follows: (iv) A detailed site plan depicting the proposed <del>lot</del> record of title boundaries for each residential unit and any common areas (including access and services) must be provided, ensuring that a freehold (fee simple) or unit title subdivision complies with Rule 18.4.2 (Subdivision of multi-unit developments);		Accept	48
FS1387.468	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	Reject	48

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
697.169	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Add to Rule 17.1.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities RD1 a new condition (viii) as follows: (viii) Each residential unit must meet the following minimum unit size: Unit of Apartment Minimum Unit Area Studio unit or 1 bedroom unit 60m2 2 bedroom unit 80m2 3 bedroom unit 100m2	Include residential unit size table for consistency with the subdivision rule.	Reject	48
FS1387.469	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	48
FS1291.11	Havelock Village Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	HVL supports amendments to the Plan that provide for a greater development potential and a wider variety of densities and housing types.	Accept	48
FS1377.212	Havelock Village Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	HVL supports amendments to the Plan that provide for a greater development potential and a wider variety of densities and housing types.	Accept	48
697.170	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Add to Rule 17.1.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities a new activity rule, as follows: RD2 A new retirement village or alterations to an existing retirement village: (a) All residential units must not be located at ground level; (b) The site is connected to public water and wastewater infrastructure; (c) Minimum living court or balcony area	Retirement villages in the Business Zone should be provided for within towns and villages provided they can be serviced by infrastructure. Retirement villages provide opportunities for residential development (aged care) that is not only confined to the residential zone.	Reject	48

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			and dimensions: (i) Apartment - 10m <sup>2</sup> area with minimum dimension horizontal and vertical of 2.5m; (ii) Studio unit or 1 bedroom unit - 12.5m <sup>2</sup> area with minimum dimension horizontal and vertical of 2.5m; or (iii) 2 or more bedroomed unit - 15m <sup>2</sup> area with minimum dimension horizontal and vertical of 2.5m; (d) Minimum service court is either: (i) Apartment - Communal outdoor space (ie no individual service courts required) of at least 5m <sup>2</sup> with a minimum dimension of 1.5 metres for each apartment; or (ii) All other units - 10m <sup>2</sup> with a minimum dimension of 1.5 metres for each unit; (e) The following Land Use - Effects rule in Rule 17.2 does not apply: (i) Rule 17.2.7 (Signs); (f) The following Infrastructure and Energy rule in Chapter 14 does not apply: A. Rule 14.12.1 P4(1)(a) (Traffic generation). Matters of Discretion (a) Effects on amenity values; (b) Integration with the existing business environment; (c) Connectivity to public reticulated public water supply and wastewater; (d) Bulk and scale of the retirement village development; (e) Potential reverse sensitivity effects; (f) Effects on the roading network.			
FS1387.470	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	48
697.171	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 17.1.4 D1 Discretionary Activities; AND Consequential renumbering of D2 and D3.	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	49
FS1387.471	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	Accept	49

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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>		
697.172	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.1.4 D2 Discretionary Activities as follows: Any <u>permitted</u> activity that does not comply with one or more of the activity-specific conditions for a permitted activity under in Rule 17.1.2.	Consistency with other chapters and additional clarity of the rule.	Accept	49
FS1387.472	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	49
697.173	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 17.2.1(1) Noise; AND Undertake consequential renumbering.	Reduce duplication - this noise rule is adequately covered by points (2) and (3).	Accept	51
697.174	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 17.2.1.1 P3 and P4 Noise - General; AND Add to Rule 17.2.1.1 P2 Noise - General, as follows: (a) Noise measured within any site: (i) In the Business Zone must not exceed: A. 65dB (LAeq), 7am to 11pm every day; and B. 55dB (LAeq) and 85dB (LAmax), 11pm to 7am the following day; (ii) In the Residential or Village Zone must not exceed: A. 55dB (LAeq), 7am to 7pm; B. 50dB (LAeq), 7pm to 10pm; C. 45dB (LAeq) and 75dB (LAmax), 10pm to 7am the following day. (b) Noise measured within any site in any zone other than the	To clarify that the conditions are associated with noise and are not an activity in their own right.	Accept	51

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			Business Zone, Residential Zone or Village 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 Amend Rule 17.2.1.1 D1 Noise-General, as follows: Noise that does not comply with Rule 17.2.1.1 P2, P3 or P4.			
697.175	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.2.1.2 P1 Noise - Construction, as follows: (a) Construction noise must <del>not exceed</del> meet the limits in NZS 6803:1999 (Acoustics - Construction Noise); and	Additional clarity of the rule - construction noise should not exceed the limits, rather than meet the limits in the NZ Standard.	Accept	51
697.176	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.2.1.2 RD1 Noise - Construction, as follows: (a) Construction noise that does not comply with Rule 17.2.1.2 P1.	Correct the rule reference.	Accept	51
697.177	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.2.2 P1 Servicing and hours of operation, as follows: The loading and unloading of vehicles and the receiving of customers and deliveries associated with a commercial activity on a site adjoining the Residential and Village Zones <del>may</del> must only occur between 6.30am and 7.30 8.00pm.	Increase the hours of operation to allow more reasonable use of the site.	Accept	52
FS1291.12	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	Havelock Village will contain a small Neighbourhood Centre and commercial activity in the Centre will be supported by increased flexibility regarding hours of operation.	Accept	52
FS1377.213	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	Havelock Village will contain a small Neighbourhood Centre and commercial activity in the Centre will be supported by increased flexibility regarding hours of operation.	Accept	52
697.178	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.2.4 P1 Glare and artificial light spill, as follows: Illumination from glare and artificial light spill <del>must shall</del> not exceed 10 lux measured horizontally and vertically at any point within any other site zoned Residential, Village or Country Living Zone.	Consistency of wording with other chapters. The focus of the rule in the Business Zone should be to control light spill outside the Business Zone into the residential zones.	Accept	54
697.179	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.2.5(1) Earthworks, as follows: (1) Rules 17.2.5.1 - Earthworks - General provides the permitted rules for earthworks activities for the Business Zone. <u>This rule does not apply in those areas specified in Rules</u>	Clarify that the earthworks general rule does not apply in those areas where there is a specific rule.	Accept	55

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			17.2.5.1A, 17.2.5.2 and 17.2.5.3.			
FSI387.473	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	55
697.180	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Permitted Activities Rule 17.2.4 PI, as follows: <del>llumination from Glare</del> and artificial light spill <del>must shall</del> not exceed 10 lux measured horizontally and vertically at <del>any point within any other site zoned Residential, Village or Country Living Zone.</del>	Consistency of wording with other chapters. The focus of the rule in the Business Zone should be to control light spill outside the Business Zone into the residential zones.	Accept	54
FSI377.214	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	Havelock Village will contain a small Neighbourhood Centre and commercial activity in the Centre will be supported by increased flexibility regarding hours of operation.	Accept	54
697.181	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.2.5.1 Earthworks - General, as follows: PI (a) Earthworks ( <del>excluding the importation of fill material</del> ) within a site must meet <del>all of</del> 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 250m <sup>3</sup> and an area of more than 1,000m <sup>2</sup> <del>over any single consecutive 12 month period within a site;</del> (iii) The height of the resulting cut, filled areas or fill batter face in stable ground, <del>not including any surcharge,</del> does not exceed 1.5m, with a maximum slope of 1:2 (1 vertical to 2 horizontal); (iv) <u>Earthworks are set back at least 1.5m from all boundaries;</u> (v) Areas exposed by earthworks are re-vegetated to achieve 80% ground cover within 6 months of the commencement of the earthworks; (vi) Sediment resulting from the earthworks is retained on the site through implementation and maintenance of erosion and sediment controls; (vii) Do not divert or change the nature of natural water flows, water bodies or established drainage paths. AND	Consistency with the equivalent rule in other chapters. Also enabling the importation of fill for a building platform as a permitted activity.	Accept	55

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p>Add a new P2 as follows: <u>P2 (a) Earthworks for the purpose of creating a building platform within a site using imported fill material.</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend P2 as follows: <u>P23 (a) Earthworks for purposes other than creating a building platform within a site, using imported fill material (excluding cleanfill) must meet all of the following conditions. The importation of fill material to a site must meet all of the following conditions in addition to Rule 17.2.45.1 P1: (i) Must Does not exceed a total volume of 500m3 per site and a depth of 1m; (iii) Is fit for compaction; (ii) The slope height of the resulting batter face filled area in stable ground must not exceed 1.5m with a maximum slope of 1:2 (1m vertical to 2m horizontal); (iii) Fill material is setback at least 1.5m from all boundaries; (vi) Does not restrict the ability for land to drain; (vii) Is not located within 1.5m of public sewers, utility services or manholes; (viii) The sediment from fill material is retained on the site. (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.</u> RD1 (a) Earthworks that do not comply with Rule 17.2.45.1 P1 or <u>P23</u> (b) Council's discretion is <u>limited restricted</u> to the following matters: (i) Amenity values and landscape effects; (ii) Volume, extent and depth of earthworks; (iii) Nature of fill material; (iv) Contamination of fill material; (v) Location of the earthworks to waterways, significant indigenous vegetation and habitat; (vi) Compaction of the fill material; (vii) Volume and depth of fill material; (viii) Protection of the Hauraki Gulf Catchment Area; (ix) Geotechnical stability; (x) Flood risk, including natural water flows and established drainage paths (xi) Land instability, erosion and sedimentation; and (xii) Proximity to underground services and service connections.</p>			
697.190	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 17.2.7.2 P1 (a)(vi) Signs - Effects on traffic.	Delete the rule as it is unreasonable given the small size of the towns and villages.	Accept	56
697.191	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.2.7.1 P2 (a)(viii) Signs - General, as follows:	Improve clarity of the rule.	Accept	56

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			(i) The sign is not attached to a for the purpose of identification and interpretation of a Maaori Site of Significance listed in Schedule 30.3 (Maaori Sites of Significance) except for the purpose of identification and interpretation;			
697.192	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.2.7.1 P3 (i) and (ii) 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) It relates to the sale of the site on which it is located; (ii) There is no more than 3 signs per agency site;	Amend rule for increased clarity.	Accept	56
697.193	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.2.7.2 PI (a) Signs - Effects on traffic, as follows: (a) Any sign directed at road users must meet the following conditions:	Amend for additional clarity.	Accept	56
697.194	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.2.8 PI(a) Outdoor storage, as follows: (a) Outdoor storage of goods or materials must comply with all the following conditions:	Amend for additional clarity.	Accept	57
697.195	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Permitted Activities Rule 17.2.8 PI Outdoor storage, to include a maximum height conditions for the outdoor storage of goods or materials.	Include maximum height of goods and materials stored outdoors to more effectively manage amenity and access to sunlight on adjoining Residential and Village zoned properties.	Accept	57
697.201	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.3.1.2 PI Height - Buildings, structures and vegetation within an airport obstacle limitation surface, as follows: Any building, structure or vegetation must not protrude through the airport obstacle limitation surfaces as shown identified on the planning maps and in Appendix 9 - Te Kowhai Airfield, and defined in Section E Designation N - Waikato Regional Airport.	Amend rule for additional clarity.	Accept	59
FS1339.91	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	NZTE seeks that this submission be allowed.	NZTE supports the clarification of the OLS Height rules in the PWDP and supports the inclusion of a calculation to determine a permitted height in the OLS. NZTE also seeks that Rules 17.3.1.2 PI and 17.3.1.2 DI be amended in accordance with point number 823.8 in NZTE's submission on the PWDP for the OLS rule to include a tree or other vegetation.	Reject	59
FS1253.7	Waikato Regional Airport Ltd	Support	Seek that this submission be allowed in part, subject to the following changes: PI: Any building, structure, tree or other	The additional wording makes it clearer to the reader what applies to this rule however the wording needs	Accept	59

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			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 Section E, Designation N- Waikato Regional Hamilton Airport.	to align with that which applies to the Residential Zone.		
697.202	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.3.2 RD1 Daylight admission, as follows: (b) Council's discretion is <del>limited</del> <u>restricted</u> to the following matters: (i) Height of the building; (ii) Design and location of the building; (iii) Level of shading on an <u>adjoining any other sites</u> ; (iv) Privacy on other sites; (v) Amenity values of the locality.	Consistency with the equivalent rule in other chapters.	Accept	60
697.203	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.3.4.1 P1 Building setbacks - Zone boundaries, as follows: (a) Any building must be set back a <u>minimum of at least...</u>	Consistency with the equivalent rule in other chapters.	Accept	61
697.204	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.3.4.2 P2 Building setbacks - Water bodies, as follows: A public amenity of up to 25m <sup>2</sup> , or a pump shed ( <u>public or private</u> ) within <u>any</u> building setback identified in Rule 17.3.4.2 P1	Correct errors and improve clarity of the rule.	Accept	61
FS1387.477	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	61
697.205	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.3.4.2 P1 Building setbacks - Water bodies, as follows: (a) Any building must be setback a minimum of: (i) <del>23</del> <u>27.5m</u> from the margin of any: A. Lake; B. Wetland. (ii) <del>23</del> <u>27.5m</u> from the bank of any river (other than the Waikato River and Waipa River); and (iii) <del>28</del> <u>32.5m</u> from the margin of either the Waikato River and the Waipa River; (iv) <del>23</del> <u>27.5m</u> from mean high water springs.	Amend the rule so that the setback represents 25m esplanade reserve plus the yard setback for the Waikato and Waipa Rivers, and 20m esplanade plus the yard setback for all other waterbodies.	Accept	61
FS1387.478	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither	Reject	61

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FS1108.3	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)	Support	Null	Support increased setbacks from waterways.	Accept	61
FS1139.3	Turangawaewae Trust Board	Support	Null	Support increased setbacks from waterways.	Accept	61
<b>697.208</b>	<b>Waikato District Council</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.3.5 P1 Horotiu Acoustic Area, to include the correct table reference from Table 8 to Table 11.	Correcting a table reference.	Accept	62
<b>697.209</b>	<b>Waikato District Council</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.3.5 D1 from Discretionary Activity D1 to Restricted Discretionary Activity RD1.	Rule needs to refer to the correct activity status, Restricted Discretionary Activity, not Discretionary.	Accept	62
<b>697.210</b>	<b>Waikato District Council</b>	Neutral/Amend	Add new Permitted Activities Rule after 17.3.5, as follows: <u>17.3.5A Building - Te Kowhai Noise Buffer P1 Construction of, or addition, or alteration to, a dwelling within the Te Kowhai Noise Buffer that is designed and constructed to achieve the internal design sound levels specified in Section 3.2 of Appendix 1 (Acoustic Insulation).</u> AND Add Restricted Discretionary Rule, as follows: <u>RD1 (a) Construction of, or addition, or alteration to, a dwelling that does not comply with Rule 17.3.5A P1 (b) Council's discretion shall be restricted to the following matters: (i) on-site amenity values; (ii) noise levels received at the notional boundary of the dwelling; (iii) timing and duration of noise received at the notional boundary of the dwelling; (iv) potential for reverse sensitivity effects</u>	The Business Zone does not currently have a rule relating to the Te Kowhai noise buffer, but there is Business Zoned land within close proximity to Te Kowhai Airpark. There is a possibility that residential units could be proposed on this site so there needs to be a noise insulation rule.	Reject	62
FS1339.93	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that this submission be allowed with amendments.	NZTE supports the inclusion of a rule managing noise limits in dwellings and noise sensitive activities in the Business Zone but opposes the Rule 17.3.5A and the relevant Restricted Discretionary Rule as the	Reject	62

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>Te Kowhai Noise Buffer is no longer required as Taxiing Noise is now dealt within the Air Noise Control Boundaries designed by Marshall Day and sought in the NZTE submission. Point 823.25 of the NZTE Submission seeks to have Rule 3.2 in Appendix I deleted.</p> <p>NZTE submits that internal noise levels in the Business Zone would be better controlled by the insertion of a new Rule 17.3.9 PI and RDI Noise Sensitive Activities drafted in accordance with a similar rule for the Residential Zone in point 823.15 of NZTE's submission (as set out in the submission) as it is drafted to reflect the Air Noise Control Boundaries designed by Marshall Day and sought in the NZTE submission.</p>		
697.211	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.3.6 PI Dwelling, to include the correct table reference from Table 8 to Table 14.	Correcting a table reference.	Accept	63
FS1387.481	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	63
697.212	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.3.6 Dwelling, as follows: PI (a) One dwelling on the CFR a record of title. (i) The dwelling must not be located at ground level; (ii) The dwelling is designed and constructed to achieve the internal design sound levels specified in Appendix I (Acoustic Insulation) - Table 814. .... D1 A residential activity dwelling that does not comply with conditions of Rule 17.3.6 PI.	<p>Correct and consistent use of terminology.</p> <p>Correct reference to diagrams within appendices.</p>	Accept	63
FS1387.482	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<p>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure.</p>	Reject	63

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>		
<b>697.213</b>	<b>Waikato District Council</b>	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 17.3.6 NCI Dwelling.	Deleting duplicated rule. Rule DI and NCI are addressing the same activity.	Accept	63
FS1387.483	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	63
FS1078.35	Hugh Green Limited	Support	Consistent with relief sought by HGL (392.8)	The submission is allowed	Accept	63
<b>697.214</b>	<b>Waikato District Council</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.3.7 PI (a) Living court, to read as follows: A living court shall <u>must</u> be provided...	Consistency across zone chapters.	Accept	64
FS1387.484	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</i>	Reject	64

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				appropriate.		
<b>697.215</b>	<b>Waikato District Council</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.3.7 PI(a)(i) Living court, to read as follows: It is readily accessible from a living area of the dwelling; and	Consistency across zone chapters.	Accept	64
FS1387.485	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	64
<b>697.220</b>	<b>Waikato District Council</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend 17.4 Subdivision heading, to read as follows: Subdivision <u>Rules</u>	Consistency across zone chapters.	Accept	65
FS1387.486	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	65
<b>697.221</b>	<b>Waikato District Council</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend 17.4.1 General subdivision heading, to read as follows: <del>General</del> Subdivision - General	Consistency across zone chapters.	Accept	65
FS1387.487	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	Reject	65

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
697.222	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.4.1 General subdivision, as follows: (1) Rule 17.4.1 provides for subdivision density <u>within the Business Zone.</u>	Additional clarity on the relationship between rules.	Accept	65
FS1387.488	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	65
697.223	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.4 (4) Subdivision, as follows: (4) Rules 17.4.1 are <u>is also</u> subject to <u>compliance with</u> the following <u>rules subdivision controls</u> : (i) Rule 17.4.1.3 - subdivision boundary adjustments (ii) Rule 17.4.1.4 - subdivision amendments and updates to cross lease flats plans (iii) Rule 17.4.1.5 - subdivision title boundaries Significant Natural Areas, heritage items, archaeological sites, sites of significance to Maaori (iv) Rule 17.4.1.6 - subdivision of land containing heritage items (v) <u>Rule 17.4.1.6A - subdivision of land within the National Grid Corridor</u> (vi) Rule 17.4.1.7 - subdivision road frontage (vii) Rule 17.4.1.8 - subdivision esplanade reserves and esplanade strips. AND Add new rule after Rule 17.4.1.5 as follows; <u>17.4.1.5A Subdivision of land within the National Grid Corridor</u>	Replicate the subdivision rule within the National Grid Corridor from Chapter 14 (where this is relevant to the Business Zone) into Chapter 17 for increased clarity and usability of the Plan.	Accept	65

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p><u>RD1 (a) 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) The risk of electrical hazards affecting public or individual safety, and the risk of property damage; (iv) The nature and location of any vegetation to be planted in the vicinity of National Grid transmission lines.</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Add new non-complying rule, as follows; <u>NC1 Any subdivision of land within the National Grid Corridor that does not comply with one or more of the conditions of Rule 17.4.1.5A RD1.</u></p>			
FS1350.124	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 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</i></p>	Reject	65

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>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.</i>		
697.224	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.4.1 RD1 (a) General subdivision as follows: (a) Subdivision of land must comply with all of the following conditions: (i) Proposed lots <u>The record of title to be subdivided</u> must have a minimum size of 225m2 net site area with the exception of access or utility allotments or reserves to vest; (ii) <u>All Proposed lots</u> must be connected to public-reticulated water supply and wastewater.	Increased clarity and consistent use of terms.	Accept	65
FS1387.489	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	65
697.225	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.4.1.1 RD1 (a) (i) Subdivision - Multi-unit development, to read as follows: An application for land use consent under Rule 17.1.4 (Multi-unit housing development) must...)	Consistency with the defined term.	Accept	66
FS1387.490	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</i>	Reject	66

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
697.226	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.4.1.2 C1(a)(i) Subdivision - Boundary adjustments, to read as follows: The conditions specified in either:	Consistency across zone chapters.	Accept	67
FS1387.491	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	67
697.227	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.4.1.2 C1 (b) Subdivision - Boundary adjustments, as follows: (b) The Council's control shall be limited to reserved over the following matters: (i) Subdivision layout; (ii) Shape of title and variation in title lot size.	Increased clarity and consistent use of terms.	Accept	67
FS1387.492	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate	Reject	67

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
697.228	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.4.1.3 CI Subdivision - Amendments and updates to cross lease flats plans, as follows: (a) <del>An amendment or update to a cross lease or flats plan where:</del> (i) <del>An amendment</del> The purpose is to convert a cross lease or flats plan to a fee simple title; or <del>(a)</del> (ii) An amendment or update <del>to includes for</del> additions or alterations to buildings, accessory buildings and areas for exclusive use by an owner or owners. (b) The Council's control <del>shall be limited to</del> is reserved over the following matters: (i) Purpose of the amendment or update to cross lease or flats plan boundary adjustment; (ii) Effects on existing buildings; (iii) Site layout and design of cross lease or flats plan; (iv) Compliance with permitted building rules where the amendment is to convert a cross lease title to fee simple.	Provide clarity of rule and consistency with other zones.	Accept	68
697.229	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.4.1.4 NCI Subdivision - Title boundaries - Significant Natural Areas, Maaori Sites and Areas of Significance to Maaori to be a Discretionary activity rather than non-complying as follows: <del>NCDI</del> Subdivision that does not comply with Rule 17.4.1.4 RDI	Discretionary is a more appropriate activity cascade for subdivisions that cannot meet the conditions.	Reject	69
697.230	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.4.1.5 NCI Subdivision - land containing heritage items, to be a Discretionary Activity rather than Non-Complying as follows: <del>NCDI</del> Subdivision that does not comply with Rule 17.4.1.4 RDI	Discretionary is a more appropriate activity cascade for subdivisions that cannot meet the conditions.	Reject	70
FS1323.78	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	<i>That the amendment sought is declined.</i>	HNZPT is concerned that if the assessment criteria of the associated restricted discretionary activity cannot be met, it is likely that the activity is inappropriate. Therefore this should elevate appropriately to a non-complying activity rather than discretionary activity status, to avoid adverse effects on historic heritage.	Accept	70
697.231	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.4.1.6 RDI Subdivision - Road frontage, as follows: RDI (a) <del>Subdivision of land</del> Every proposed lot with a road frontage boundary, other than any access or utility allotment, right of way or access leg, must provide have: (i) <del>A</del> a width along the road boundary of at least 15m; and (b) <del>Rule 17.4.1.6 (a)(i) (a) does not apply to a proposed access allotment or utility allotment.</del> (c) (b) The Council's discretion shall	Improving the clarity of the rule.	Accept	71

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			be limited restricted to the following matters: (i) Road efficiency and safety and efficiency of vehicle access and road network; (ii) Amenity and streetscape.			
697.232	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.4.1.7 Esplanade reserves and esplanade strips heading, to read as follows: <u>Subdivision - Esplanade reserves and esplanade strips</u>	Consistency across zone chapters.	Accept	72
697.233	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.4.1.7 RD1 (a) Esplanade reserves and esplanade strips, as follows: (a) <del>Subdivision must create a</del> <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 is being subdivided is proposed to:</u> (i) less than 4ha and within 20m of any: A. mean high water springs; B. the 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; and (ii) 4ha or more <u>and located</u> within 20m of any: A. mean high water springs or B. a water body identified in Appendix 4 (Esplanade Priority Areas).	Improving the clarity of the rule.	Accept	72
697.234	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 17.4.1.7 (RD1) matter of discretion (b)(vi) Esplanade reserves and esplanade strips.	Deletion of a matter of discretion that is inappropriate as it is not an effect that should be considered in a resource consent application.	Accept	72
697.245	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend the heading for Chapter 18 to read as follows: <u>Business Town Centre Zone Rules</u>	For increased clarity.	Accept	73
FS1387.500	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is	Reject	73

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>appropriate.</i>		
<b>697.246</b>	<b>Waikato District Council</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Chapter 18 (2) Business Town Centre Zone, as follows: The rules that apply to subdivision in the Business Town Centre Zone are contained in Rule 18.4 and the relevant rules in 14 Infrastructure and Energy and 15 Natural Hazards and Climate Change (Placeholder).	To clarify that the rules in Chapter 14: Infrastructure and Energy and Chapter 15 Natural Hazards and Climate Change apply to subdivision as well as to land use activities.	Accept	73
<i>FS1387.501</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>73</i>
<b>697.247</b>	<b>Waikato District Council</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.1.2 Permitted activity Rule (a), as follows: (a) The following activities listed below are permitted activities if they meet all the following: (i) Activity-specific conditions; and (ii) Land Use - Effects rules in Rule 18.2 (unless the activity-specific rule and/or conditions identifies a condition(s) that does not apply); and (iii) Land Use - Building rules in Rule 18.3 (unless the activity-specific rule and/or conditions identifies a condition(s) that does not apply); and (iii) Activity-specific conditions.	Additional clarity to make it clear how the activity-specific conditions are to be applied.	Accept	75
<i>FS1387.502</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</i>	<i>Reject</i>	<i>75</i>

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
<b>697.248</b>	<b>Waikato District Council</b>	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 18.1.2 P3 Commercial services.	There is duplication between the terms "commercial activities" and "commercial services" and this is more appropriately represented by a single term.	Reject	75
<i>FS1078.36</i>	<i>Hugh Green Limited</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Generally inconsistent with relief sought by HGL</i>	<i>The submission is disallowed, unless Rule 18.1.2 P1 is amended to instead state 'Commercial activity, including commercial services and retail activity'</i>	Accept	75
<i>FS1387.503</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>	Accept	75
<b>697.249</b>	<b>Waikato District Council</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.1.2 P10 (e) A temporary event, as follows: (e) The site is returned to its <del>original</del> <u>previous</u> condition no more than 3 days after the end of the event:	Consistency with other chapters.	Accept	75
<i>FS1387.504</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>	Reject	75
<b>697.250</b>	<b>Waikato District Council</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.1.3 Restricted Discretionary Rule RDI (c), as follows: (c) A detailed site plan depicting the	Consistency across the chapters.	Accept	76

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			proposed <u>record of title</u> boundaries for each residential unit and any common areas (including access and services) must be provided, ensuring that a freehold (fee simple) or unit title subdivision complies with Rule 18.4.2 (Subdivision of multi-unit developments);			
<b>697.251</b>	<b>Waikato District Council</b>	Neutral/Amend	Add Rule 18.1.3 RDI (g) Restricted Discretionary Activity, as follows: <u>(g) Each residential unit must meet the following minimum unit size: Unit of Apartment Minimum Unit Area Studio Unit or 1 bedroom unit 60m2 2 bedroom unit 80m2 3 bedroom unit 100m2</u>	Include residential unit size table for consistency with the subdivision rule.	Accept	76
FS1387.505	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	76
<b>697.252</b>	<b>Waikato District Council</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.1.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities table heading, as follows: <u>The Council's discretion shall be limited to the following matters: Matters of Discretion</u>	Alignment with other zone chapters.	Accept	76
FS1387.506	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is	Reject	76

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>appropriate.</i>		
<b>697.253</b>	<b>Waikato District Council</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.1.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities RDI (a), to read as follows: (a) A multi-unit development that meets all of the following conditions: (i) The Land Use - Effects in Rule 18.2; (ii) The Land Use - Building in Rule 18.3, except the following rules do not apply: A. Rule 18.3.9 (Dwellings) does not apply; B. Rule 18.3.10 (Living court) does not apply;	Alignment with other zone chapters.	Accept	76
<i>FS1387.507</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>76</i>
<b>697.254</b>	<b>Waikato District Council</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.1.3 RDI (i) Restricted Discretionary Activities, as follows: (vi) A communal service court is provided comprising: A. a minimum of 20m <sup>2</sup> ; and B. minimum dimension of 3m;	The communal service court needed a minimum size dimension.	Accept	76
<i>FS1387.508</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>76</i>
<b>697.255</b>	<b>Waikato District Council</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.1.4 Discretionary Activities (DI), as	Provide additional clarity in the rule.	Accept	77

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			follows: Any <u>permitted</u> activity that does not comply with one or more of the activity-specific conditions for a permitted activity (in Rule 18.1.2) <del>unless a lesser activity status under Land Use – Effects Rule 18.2 or Land Use – Building Rule 18.3 applies.</del>			
FS1387.509	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	77
697.256	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 18.2.1 Noise (1); AND Amend Rule 18.2.1 Noise - for consequential renumbering of (2) and (3).	Reduce duplication - this noise rule is adequately covered by points (2) and (3).	Accept	79
FS1387.510	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	79
697.257	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete 18.2.1.1 Rules P3 and P4 Noise - General; AND Add to Rule 18.2.1.1 P2 Noise - General, as follows: (a) Noise measured within any site: (i) In the Business Town Centre Zone must not exceed: A. 65dB (LAeq),	To clarify that the conditions are associated with noise and are not an activity in their own right.	Accept	79

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			7am to 11pm every day; and B. 55dB (LAeq) and 85dB (LAmax), 11pm to 7am the following day; or (ii) In the Residential Zone and Village Zone must not exceed: A. 55dB (LAeq), 7am to 7pm; and B. 50dB (LAeq), 7pm to 10pm; and C. 40dB (LAeq) and 65dB (LAmax), 10pm to 7am the following day. (b) <u>Noise measured within any site in any zone other than the Business Town Centre Zone, Residential Zone or Village 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> AND Amend Rule 18.2.1.1 D1 Noise - General, as follows: Noise that does not comply with Rules 18.2.1.1 P2, P3 or P4.			
697.258	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.2.1.2 P1 Noise - Construction, as follows: (a) Construction noise must <u>not exceed</u> meet the limits in NZS 6803:1999 (Acoustics - Construction Noise); and	Additional clarity of the rule - construction noise should not exceed the limits, rather than meet the limits in the NZ Standard.	Accept	79
697.259	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.2.2 P1 Servicing and hours of operation, as follows: The loading and unloading of vehicles <u>and</u> or the receiving of customers <u>and</u> or deliveries associated with a commercial activity on a site adjoining the Residential and Village Zones may occur between <u>6.30am</u> and <u>7.30 8.00pm</u> .	Increase the hours of operation to allow more reasonable use of the site.	Accept	80
697.260	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.2.3 P1 Glare and artificial light spill, as follows: Illumination from glare and artificial light spill must not exceed 10 lux measured horizontally and vertically at any <del>other</del> site zoned Residential, Village or Country Living Zone.	Consistency of wording with other chapters. The focus of the rule in the Business Town Centre Zone should be to control light spill outside the Business Town Centre Zone into the residential zones.	Accept	81
697.261	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.2.4 (1) Earthworks, as follows: (1) Rules 18.2.4.1 - Earthworks - General provides the permitted rules for earthworks activities for the Business Town Centre Zone. <u>This rule does not apply in those areas specified in Rules 18.2.4.1A and 18.2.4.2.</u>	Clarify that the earthworks general rule does not apply in those areas where there is a specific rule.	Accept	82
FS1350.93	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Oppose	<i>Disallow in terms of sought relocation of National Grid provisions. Notwithstanding the location of the provisions,</i>	<i>Related to the original submission by Waikato District Council seeking relocation/replicating of the</i>	<a href="#">Reject</a> <a href="#">Accept</a>	82

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p><i>Transpower seeks that all amendments sought in its original submission be included.</i></p>	<p><i>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 respective chapters, supply of a revised full set of provisions would be beneficial to enable Transpower to fully assess the implications and workability of the requested changes. Notwithstanding the location of National Grid provisions relating to earthworks within the proposed plan, Transpower seeks the specific changes to earthwork provisions as sought in its original submission point 576.55. Note: It is not evident from the summary if there is a submission point applicable for Chapter 17. If so, this further submission covers that point.</i></p>		
697.263	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.2.4.1 PI Earthworks - General, as follows: PI (a) Earthworks (excluding the importation of fill	Consistency with the equivalent rule in other chapters. Also enabling the importation of fill for	Accept	82

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p><del>material</del>) within a site must meet all of the following conditions: (i) <del>Earthworks must be</del> located more than 1.5m from a public sewer, open drain, overland flow path or other service pipe; (ii) <del>Earthworks must Not</del> exceed a volume of more than 250m<sup>3</sup> and an area of more than 1,000m<sup>2</sup> <del>over any single consecutive 12 month period within a site</del>; (iii) The height of the resulting cut, filled areas or fill batter face in stable ground, <del>not including any surcharge</del>, does not exceed 1.5m, with a maximum slope of 1:2 (1 vertical to 2 horizontal); (iv) <del>Earthworks are set back at least 1.5m from all boundaries</del>; (v) Areas exposed by earthworks are re-vegetated to achieve 80% ground cover within 6 months of the commencement of the earthworks; (vi) Sediment resulting from the earthworks is retained on the site through implementation and maintenance of erosion and sediment controls; (vii) <del>Earthworks must not</del> Do not divert or change the nature of natural water flows, waterbodies or established drainage paths; <del>(vii) Earthworks must not result in the site being unable to be serviced by gravity sewers.</del> P2 (a) <u>Earthworks for the purpose of creating a building platform within a site using imported fill material.</u> P23 (a) <u>Earthworks for purposes other than creating a building platform within a site, using imported fill material (excluding cleanfill) must meet all of the following conditions. The importation of fill material to a site must meet the following conditions, in addition to the conditions in Rule 18.2.4.1.4 P1:</u> (i) <u>Must</u> Does not exceed a total volume of 500m<sup>3</sup> per site and a depth of 1m; (ii) <u>Is fit for</u> compaction; (iii) The <u>slope height</u> of the resulting filled area batter face in stable ground must not exceed 1.5m with a maximum slope of 1:2 (1m vertical to 2m horizontal); (iii) <u>Fill material is setback at least 1.5m from all boundaries</u>; (iv) <u>Does not restrict the ability for land to drain</u>; (v) <u>Is not located within 1.5m of public sewers, utility services or manholes</u>; (vi) <u>The sediment from fill material is retained on the site.</u> (iv) <u>Areas exposed by earthworks are re-vegetated to achieve 80% ground cover within 6 months of the commencement of the earthworks</u>; (v) <u>Sediment resulting from the earthworks is retained on the site through implementation and maintenance of erosion and sediment controls</u>; (vi) <u>Do not divert or change the nature of natural water flows, water bodies or established drainage paths.</u> RD1 (a) Earthworks that do not comply with Rules 18.2.4.1 P1 or P23. (b) The Council's discretion shall be <del>limited</del> <u>restricted</u> to the</p>	<p>a building platform as a permitted activity.</p>		

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			following matters: (i) Amenity values and landscape effects; (ii) Volume, extent and depth of earthworks; (iii) Nature of fill material; (iv) Contamination of fill material; (v) Location of the earthworks in relation to waterways, significant indigenous vegetation and habitat; (vi) Compaction of the fill material; (vii) Volume and depth of fill material; (viii) Protection of the Hauraki Gulf Catchment Area; (ix) Geotechnical stability; (x) Flood risk, including natural water flows and established drainage paths (xi) Land instability, erosion and sedimentation; (xii) Proximity to underground services and service connections.			
697.270	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.2.7.1 P2 (a)(ix) Signs - General, as follows: (ix) The sign is <del>not attached to a</del> for the purpose of identification and interpretation of a Maaori Site of Significance listed in Schedule 30.3 (Maaori Sites of Significance) <del>except for the purpose of identification and interpretation;</del>	Improve clarity of the rule.	Accept	83
FS1323.82	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	<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>	Reject	83
697.271	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.2.7.1 P3 (a)(i) and (ii) Signs - General, as follows: (b) A real estate 'for sale' or 'for rent' sign <del>relating to the site on which it is located</del> must comply with all of the following conditions: (i) <del>It relates to the sale of the site on which it is located;</del> (ii) There is no more than <del>4</del> 3 signs per <del>agency</del> site;	Amend rule for increased clarity.	Accept	83
697.272	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.2.7.2 P1 Signs - Effects on traffic, as follows: (b) Any sign directed at road users must <del>meet the following conditions:</del>	Amend for additional clarity.	Accept	83
697.273	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 18.2.7.2 P1 (a)(iv) Signs - Effects on traffic.	It is not realistic or reasonable to require signs to be 130m from the entrance in a Business Town Centre Zone. This would result in clutter and confusion for motorists within the town centre.	Accept	83
697.274	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.2.8 P1 (a)(i) Outdoor storage, as follows: (a) Outdoor storage of goods or materials must comply with the following conditions: (i) Be associated with	Amend for additional clarity.	Accept	84

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			the <u>activity</u> operating from the site			
697.275	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.2.8 PI Outdoor storage, to include a maximum height condition for the outdoor storage of goods or materials where this is appropriate to manage amenity effects such as next to Residential, Village or Country Living Zones.	Include maximum height of goods and materials stored outdoors to more effectively manage amenity and access to sunlight on adjoining Residential and Village zoned properties.	Accept	85
697.276	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.2.8 PI Outdoor storage, to include effective screening mechanisms for the outdoor storage of goods, where this is appropriate to manage amenity effects such as next to Residential, Village or Country Living Zones.	Consider whether a close boarded fence or screening planting is the most effective means of ensuring amenity values are retained.	Accept	84
697.277	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.3.2 RDI Daylight admission, as follows: (b) Council's discretion is <del>limited</del> restricted to the following matters: (i) Height of <u>the</u> building; (ii) Design and location of the building; (iii) Level of shading on an <del>adjoining any other</del> sites; (iv) Privacy of <del>on</del> other sites; (v) <del>Effects on</del> Amenity values and town centre character.	Consistency with the equivalent rule in other chapters.	Accept	86
697.278	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.3.3 PI Gross leasable floor area, as follows: (a) <del>Any Every</del> individual tenancy....	Improved clarity of the rule.	Accept	87
697.279	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.3.5 PI(a) Verandahs, as follows: (a) Any new building, or alteration <u>that increases the height or footprint</u> of an existing building, on land with a verandah line identified on the planning maps, must be provided with a verandah that complies with the following conditions:	Amend to only require verandahs to be provided where alterations increase the height or footprint of the building. It is not reasonable to require verandahs for internal alterations and modifications.	Accept	89
697.280	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.3.7 PI Building setbacks - Water-bodies, as follows: PI (a) Any building must be setback a minimum of: (i) <del>23</del> 27.5m from the margin of any: A. lake; B. wetland; (ii) <del>23</del> 27.5m from the bank of any river (other than the Waikato and Waipa Rivers); (iii) <del>28</del> 32.5m from the bank of either the Waikato River and the Waipa River; and (iv) <del>23m</del> 27.5m from mean high water springs.	Amend the rule so that the setback represents 25m esplanade reserve plus the yard setback for the Waikato and Waipa Rivers, and 20m esplanade plus the yard setback for all other waterbodies.	Accept	90
FS1387.514	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	Reject	90

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
697.283	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.3.8 PI (a) and (b) Dwelling, as follows: (a) One dwelling on a record of title within a lot must comply with all of the following conditions: (b) The dwelling must comply with all of the following conditions	Correct and consistent use of terminology.	Accept	92
FS1387.517	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	92
697.290	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend 18.4 Subdivision heading, to read as follows: Subdivision <u>Rules</u>	Alignment with other zone chapters.	Accept	93
697.291	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.4 Subdivision (1), to read as follows: Rules 18.4.1 and 18.4.2 provide for subdivision density and apply across within the Business Town Centre Zone.	Alignment with other zone chapters.	Accept	94
FS1387.518	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure.	Reject	94

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>		
<b>697.292</b>	<b>Waikato District Council</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.4 (1)(a)(iii) Subdivision, as follows: (iii) Rule 18.4.5 - subdivision title boundaries, Maaori sites of significance and Maaori areas of significance to Maaori	Consistency of terms.	Accept	94
FS1387.519	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	94
<b>697.293</b>	<b>Waikato District Council</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.4.1 RD1 (a) Subdivision - general, as follows: (a) Subdivision shall <del>must</del> comply with all of the following conditions: (i) <del>Proposed lots</del> <u>The record of title to be subdivided must shall</u> have a minimum size of 225m2 net site area, with the exception of access or utility allotments or reserves to vest; (ii) <del>All Proposed lots</del> shall be connected to public-reticulated water supply and wastewater.	Consistency of terms with other chapters.	Accept	95
FS1387.520	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is</i>	Reject	95

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
697.294	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.4.2 RD1 (a) Subdivision - Multi-unit subdivision, as follows: Subdivision for multi-unit development shall must..."	Alignment with other zone chapters.	Accept	96
FS1387.521	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	96
697.295	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.4.2 RD1 (a)(ii) Subdivision - Multi-unit subdivision, as follows: Be connected to public wastewater and water reticulation; and	Alignment with other zone chapters.	Accept	96
FS1387.522	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	96
697.296	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.4.3 C1 Subdivision - Boundary adjustments, as follows: (a) A Boundary adjustments	Consistency of terms with other chapters.	Accept	97

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			must comply with the following: (i) The conditions specified in either: A. Rule 18.4.1 (Subdivision - General); or B. Rule 18.4.2 (Subdivision- multi-unit development); and (b) Proposed RTs lots must not generate any additional building infringements to those which legally existed prior to the boundary adjustment. (c) The Council's control shall be limited reserved over to the following matters: (i) Purpose of the boundary adjustment; (ii) Effects on existing buildings.; (iii) Shape of title and variation in lot size.			
FS1387.523	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	97
697.297	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.4.4 C1 (a) Subdivision - Amendments and updates to cross lease or flats plans, as follows: (a) An amendment or update to a cross lease or flats plan where: (i) The purpose is to convert a cross lease or flats plan to a fee simple title; and or (ii) The An amendment or update must identify for additions or alterations to buildings, accessory buildings and areas for exclusive use by an owner or owners	Increased clarity of the rule.	Accept	98
697.298	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.4.5 Subdivision-Title boundaries-Maori Sites and Areas of significance to Maori heading, as follows: 18.4.5 Subdivision - Title boundaries - Maori Sites and <del>Maori</del> Areas of significance to <del>Maori</del>	Consistency of terminology.	Accept	99
697.299	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.4.5 Subdivision - Title boundaries - Maori Sites and Areas of significance to Maori, as follows: (a) Subdivision of any lots containing any <del>Significant Natural Areas</del> , Maori sites of significance.....	Delete references to significant natural areas in the rule as this is not relevant to the Business Town Centre Zone.	Accept	99

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
697.300	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.4.5 NCI Subdivision - Title boundaries - Maaori Sites and Areas of significance to Maaori, to change from Non Complying to Discretionary as follows: NCDI	Amend the activity status upon non-compliance with a standard to be discretionary rather than non-complying. It may be possible to manage the effects of dividing a significant area or item across title boundaries, with no adverse effects on the item.	Reject	99
697.301	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.4 Subdivision (2)(a), as follows: <u>(v) Rule 18.4.6A - subdivision of land within the National Grid Corridor</u> (vi) Rule 18.4.7 - subdivision esplanade reserves and esplanade strips. AND Add new rule, after Rule 18.4.6, as follows: <u>18.4.6A Subdivision of land within the National Grid Corridor</u> RDI (a) 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) The risk of electrical hazards affecting public or individual safety, and the risk of property damage; (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 18.4.6A RDI.	Replicate the subdivision rule within the National Grid Corridor from Chapter 14 into Chapter 18 (where this is relevant to the Business Town Centre Zone) for increased clarity and usability of the Plan.	Accept	94
FS1350.125	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	Reject	94

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>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.</p>		
FS1387.524	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	94
697.305	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.3.1.2 Buildings, structures and vegetation within an airport obstacle limitation surface, to include a calculation to determine the permitted height with the airport obstacle limitation surface.	This rule needs to be able to be clearly interpreted by customers in relation to the Waikato Regional Airport.	Accept	59

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1253.8	Waikato Regional Airport Ltd	Oppose	Seek that the whole part of this submission be disallowed.	The clarification/calculation sought is provided for already in Appendix N of the Proposed District Plan. Using the defined coordinates and elevations from this Appendix architects, draft person etc can work out whether the development is within or outside the OLS.	Reject	59
FS1339.92	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that this submission be allowed.	NZTE supports the clarification of the OLS Height rules in the PWDP and supports the inclusion of a calculation to determine a permitted height in the OLS. NZTE also seeks that Rules 17.3.1.2 P1 and 17.3.1.2 D1 be amended in accordance with point number 823.8 in NZTE's submission on the PWDP for the OLS rule to include a tree or other vegetation.	Accept	59
697.322	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend all controlled activities in Chapter 18 as follows: The Council reserves control is limited to over the following matters:	Correct the reference for controlled activities to reflect the correct wording of the Resource Management Act.	Accept	4
697.327	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Add new provisions to Chapter 17 Business Zone to include new provisions for new retirement villages to establish; AND Add provisions for alterations and additions to existing retirement villages as a Restricted Discretionary Activity; AND Add new policies similar to Policies 4.2.13 and 4.2.19 (Residential Zone) to Chapter 4 Urban Environment, to support the proposed provisions.	Retirement Villages have been provided for in the Residential Zone only. Council are seeking to include Retirement Villages into the Business Zone. Retirement Villages provide a range of housing options for older persons.	Reject	48
FS1387.528	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	48
FS1193.27	Van Den Brink Group	Support	The submission is allowed.	If allowed the amendment would allow for an activity	Reject	48

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>appropriate in a business zone.</i>		
<b>697.391</b>	<b>Waikato District Council</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend the definition of "Gross leasable floor area" as follows: Means the total sum of any floor areas (within the external walls for buildings or, <del>in the absence of a wall on any side, it shall be measured to the exterior edge of the floor boundary for outdoor areas</del> ) designed....	Amend the definition to provide more clarity.	Accept	123
<del>697.451</del>	<del>Waikato District Council</del>	<del>Neutral/Amend</del>	<del>Amend Rule 19.3.2 Buildings, structures and vegetation within an airport obstacle limitation surface, to include a calculation to determine the permitted height with the airport obstacle limitation surface.</del>	<del>This rule needs to be able to be clearly interpreted by customers in relation to the Waikato Regional Airport.</del>	<del>Accept</del>	<del>113</del>
<del>FS1253.10</del>	<del>Waikato Regional Airport Ltd</del>	<del>Oppose</del>	<del>Seek that the whole part of this submission be disallowed.</del>	<del>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.</del>	<del>Reject</del>	<del>113</del>
<b>697.459</b>	<b>Waikato District Council</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.1.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities, to clarify the number of units that can be built based on the 300m2 net site area per residential unit.	Council seeks to amend these rules further to clarify the number of units that can be built based on the 300m2 net site area per residential unit.	Reject	76
<del>FS1387.565</del>	<del>Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D</del>	<del>Oppose</del>	<del>Null</del>	<del>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</del>	<del>Accept</del>	<del>76</del>
FS1078.37	Hugh Green Limited	Oppose	The amendment unduly restricts development options for HGL, is inconsistent with the density provided for by Rule 18.4.1 RD1(a)(i) and inconsistent with the objective and policies of the Business Town Centre Zone	The submission is disallowed	Awaiting recommendation	
<b>697.463</b>	<b>Waikato District Council</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.3.4.2 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.	Accept	61

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1387.568	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	61
FS1387.576	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	61
FS1108.12	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)	Oppose	Null	Unclear as to what is sought by the submission.	Reject	61
FS1139.11	Turangawaewae Trust Board	Oppose	Null	Unclear as to what is sought by the submission.	Reject	61
<b>697.464</b>	<b>Waikato District Council</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.3.7 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.	Accept	90
FS1387.569	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure.	Reject	90

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>		
FS1108.13	<i>Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)</i>	Oppose	Null	Unclear as to what is sought by the submission.	Reject	90
FS1139.12	<i>Turangawaewae Trust Board</i>	Oppose	Null	Unclear as to what is sought by the submission.	Reject	90
<b>697.477</b>	<b>Waikato District Council</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend for consistency of reading, the following rule: Rule 17.4.1.3 Subdivision - Amendments and updates to cross lease flats plans.	Rules 16.4.6, 17.4.1.3 and 18.4.4 are worded differently from each other and should be worded the same for consistency given that it relates to the same subdivision process.	Accept	68
<b>697.478</b>	<b>Waikato District Council</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend for consistency of reading, the following rule: Rule 18.4.4 Subdivision - Amendments and updates to cross lease or flats plans.	Rules 16.4.6, 17.4.1.3 and 18.4.4 are worded differently from each other and should be worded the same for consistency given that it relates to the same subdivision process.	Accept	98
<b>697.546</b>	<b>Waikato District Council</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend 4.5 Business and Business Town Centre Zones heading as follows: Business and Business Town Centre Zones and Neighbourhood Centres	The heading needs to indicate that the objectives and policies apply to Neighbourhood Centres.	Accept	4
FS1387.601	<i>Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D</i>	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Reject	4
<b>697.547</b>	<b>Waikato District Council</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Objective 4.5.1 Commercial function and purpose as follows: Commercial activity is focused within a differentiation of commercial zones and development	Re-wording provides additional clarification to the objective.	Accept	9

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			(comprising the Business Town Centre Zone, the Business Zone, and the Business Zone Tamahere and neighbourhood centres).			
FS1387.602	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	9
697.548	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 4.5.6 Commercial purpose: Neighbourhood Centres as follows: Policy - Commercial purpose: Neighbourhood Centres Centres	This grammar is incorrect.	Accept	13
697.549	Waikato District Council	Oppose	Delete Policy 4.5.29 New buildings: Business Zone.	This policy is not required, as the Urban Design Guidelines apply only to the Business Town.	Accept	36
FS1029.1	Z Energy Limited	Support	The submission point is supported in part.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Z Energy south the amendment of Policy 4.5.29 to ensure satisfactory provision for the continued use and redevelopment of existing commercial sites. The urban design guidelines reference in Policy 4.5.29 is designed to achieve a certain type of built form. Z Energy sought to amend the policy to ensure that business activities which have a different form and function to that envisaged in the guidelines is recognised.</li> <li>• That said, Z Energy recognises that as currently drafted, the urban design guidelines specifically focus on the Business Town Centre Zone, whereas Policy 4.5.29 forms part of the (overall) Business Zone policy framework (not just the policy framework for the Business Town Centre Zone).</li> <li>• Z Energy therefore supports the approach by the submitter to delete Policy 4.5.29 insofar as the policy applies the Business Town Centre urban design guidelines to the Business Zone. However, if the intent is to provide a policy that specifically applies the urban design guidelines to the Business Town</li> </ul>	Accept	36

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				Centre Zone, then Z Energy would support the retention of Policy 4.5.29 amended to specifically refer to 'Business Town Centre Zone' and amended as sought in Z Energy's primary submission (584.9).		
FS1387.603	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
FS1078.38	Hugh Green Limited	Support	Generally consistent with relief sought by HGL	The submission is allowed	Accept	36
697.550	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 4.5.41 (a) Earthworks as follows: <del>Ensure that the adverse effects of Manage earthworks in the Business Town Centre Zone and Business Zone on adjoining properties and water bodies, are managed to minimise the adverse effects and sediment of dust and stormwater runoff.</del>	Provides additional clarification to the policy.	Accept	43
697.576	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.4.7 Esplanade reserves and esplanade strips heading, as follows: <u>Subdivision - Esplanade reserves and esplanade strips</u>	Alignment with other zone chapters.	Accept	101
697.577	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.4.7 RD1 Esplanade reserves and esplanade strips, as follows: <del>(a) Subdivision must create a</del> An esplanade reserve or <del>esplanade strip</del> 20m wide (or other width stated in Appendix 4 (Esplanade Priority Areas) <del>is required to be created and vested in Council from every subdivision where the land is being subdivided is proposed lot:—</del> (i) less than 4ha and within 20m of: A. mean high water springs; B. the 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; and (ii) 4ha or more <del>and located within 20m of any: A. mean high water springs or B. a water body identified in Appendix 4</del>	Improving the clarity of the rule.	Accept	101

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			(Esplanade Priority Areas). (b) The Council's discretion shall be limited restricted to the following matters:.....			
697.578	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete from Rule 18.4.7 Esplanade reserves and esplanade strips, as follows: <del>(vi) Costs and benefits of acquiring the land.</del>	Deletion of a matter of discretion that is inappropriate as it is not an effect that should be considered in a resource consent application.	Accept	101
697.579	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend the heading for Chapter 19 Business Zone Tamahere, as follows: Business Zone Tamahere Rules	For increased clarity.	Accept	103
697.580	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Chapter 19 Business Zone Tamahere Rule 19(2), as follows: The rules that apply to subdivision in the Business Zone Tamahere are contained in Rule 19.4 <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.	Accept	103
697.581	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 19.1.1 Permitted Activities, as follows: (1) The following activities are permitted activities if they meet all the following: (a) <u>Activity-specific conditions;</u> and <del>(a) (b)</del> Land Use - Effects rules in Rule 19.2 (unless the activity <u>specific</u> rule and/or activity-specific conditions identify a condition(s) that does not apply); and <del>(b) (c)</del> Land Use - Building rules in Rule 19.3 (unless the activity <u>specific</u> rule and/or activity-specific conditions identifies a condition(s) that does not apply); and <del>(c) (e)</del> <u>Activity-specific conditions.</u>	Additional clarity to make it clear how the activity-specific conditions are to be applied.	Accept	105
697.582	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 19.1.3 D1 Discretionary Activities, as follows: Any permitted activity that does not comply with <u>one or more of the activity-specific conditions in Rule 19.1.1</u>	Consistency with other chapters and additional clarity of the rule.	Accept	107
697.583	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 19.1.3 D2 Discretionary Activities Rule, as follows: Any <del>restricted</del> discretionary activity that does not comply with Rule 19.1.2 RD1.	Correcting an incorrect term.	Accept	107
697.584	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 19.2.1 Noise (1) and consequentially renumber (2) and (3).	Reduce duplication - this noise rule is adequately covered by points (2) and (3).	Accept	108
697.585	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete 19.2.1.1 P3 and P4 Noise - General; AND Add to Rule 19.2.1.1 (P2) Noise - General; as follows:	To clarify that the conditions are associated with noise and are not an activity in their own right.	Accept	108

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p>P2 (b) Noise measured at the notional boundary within any site in the Country Living Zone, must not exceed: (i) 50dB (LAeq), 7am to 7pm every day; (ii) 45dB (LAeq), 7pm to 10pm every day; and (iii) 40dB (LAeq) and 65dB (LAmax), 10pm to 7am every day. (c) Noise levels must be measured in accordance with the requirements of NZS 6801:2008 'Acoustics - Measurement of Environmental Sound' and (d) Noise levels must be assessed in accordance with the requirements of NZS 6802:2008 'Acoustic-Environmental noise'.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend Rule 19.2.1.1 (D1) Noise - General; as follows: Noise that does not comply with Rule 19.2.1.1 P2, P3-<del>or</del> P4.</p>			
697.586	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 19.2.1.2 P1 Construction noise, as follows: (a) Construction noise must <u>not exceed</u> meet the limits in NZS 6803:1999 (Acoustics - Construction Noise); and...	Additional clarity of the rule - construction noise should not exceed the limits, rather than meet the limits in the NZ Standard.	Accept	108
697.587	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	<p>Amend Rule 19.2.4 Earthworks, as follows: P1 (a) Earthworks within a site must meet all of the following conditions: (i) Earthworks must be located more than 1.5m from a public sewer, open drain, overland flow path or other service pipe; (ii) Earthworks must not exceed a volume of more than 5000m<sup>3</sup> and an area of more than 1,000m<sup>2</sup> within a site; (iii) The height of the resulting cut, filled areas or fill batter face in stable ground, <del>not including any surcharge</del>, 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.</p> <p>P2 (a) Earthworks for the purpose of creating a building platform within a site using imported fill material. P3 (a) Earthworks for purposes other than creating a building platform within a site, using imported fill material (excluding cleanfill) must meet all of the following conditions. (i) Must not exceed a total volume of 500m<sup>3</sup> per site and a depth of 1m; (ii) The slope of the resulting filled area in stable ground must not exceed maximum slope of 1:2 (1m vertical to 2m horizontal); (iii) Fill material is setback at least 1.5m from all boundaries; (iv) Areas exposed by earthworks are re-vegetated to achieve</p>	Consistency with the equivalent rule in other chapters. Also enabling the importation of fill for a building platform as a permitted activity.	Accept	109

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			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) Does not divert or change the nature of natural water flows, water bodies or established drainage paths. RDI (a) Earthworks that do not comply with Rule 19.2.4.1 P1 or P3 (b) Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters: (i) Amenity values and landscape effects; (ii) Volume, extent and depth of earthworks; (iii) Nature of fill material; (iv) Contamination of fill material; (v) Location of the earthworks to waterways, significant indigenous vegetation and habitat; (vi) Compaction of the fill material; (vii) Volume and depth of fill material; (viii) Protection of the Hauraki Gulf Catchment Area; (ix) Geotechnical stability; (x) Flood risk, including natural water flows and established drainage paths (xi) Land instability, erosion and sedimentation; and (xii) Proximity to underground services and service connections. D+ Earthworks that do not comply with Rule 19.2.4 P1			
FS1387.620	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	109
697.590	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 19.2.6.1 P3 (a)(i) and (ii) 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) It relates to the sale of the site on which it is located; (ii) There is no more than 3 signs per agency site; ...	Amend rule for increased clarity.	Accept	110
697.591	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 19.2.6.1 P3 (a)(iv) Signs - General.	Real estate signs often are located within berms.	Accept	110

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
697.592	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 19.2.6.2 PI Signs - Effects on traffic, as follows: (a) Any sign directed at road users must <u>meet the following conditions</u> :	Amend for additional clarity.	Accept	110
697.593	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 19.2.6.2 PI (a)(vi) Signs - Effects on traffic.	It is not realistic to require signs to be 130m from the entrance in a Business Town Centre Zone. This would result in clutter and confusion for motorists within the town centre.	Accept	110
697.594	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 19.2.7 PI (a) Outdoor storage, as follows: (a) Outdoor storage of goods or materials must <u>comply with all the following conditions</u> :	Amend for additional clarity.	Accept	111
697.595	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.2.7 PI Outdoor storage, to include effective screening mechanisms for the outdoor storage of goods, particularly where boundaries are adjoined by Residential, Village or Country Living Zones.	Consider whether a close boarded fence or screening planting is the most effective means of ensuring amenity values are retained.	Reject	111
697.596	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 19.3.1 Height-Building heading, as follows: Height - building general	Consistency with the equivalent rule in other chapters.	Accept	112
697.597	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend the heading to Rule 19.3.2 Buildings, structures, vegetation and objects within an airport obstacle limitation surface, as follows: <del>Buildings, structures, and vegetation and objects within an airport obstacle limitation surface</del>	Amend the title to match the rule.	Accept	113
FS1253.11	Waikato Regional Airport Ltd	Support	Seek that part of this submission be allowed, subject to the wording of Rule 19.3.2 being amended to be consistent with that set out in submission points 697.131 and 697.201 for the Residential and Business Zones.	<del>—The word 'objects' capture all things outside of the definition of buildings and structures. Whilst it could be provided for, our preference is that the rule (and heading for the rule) aligns with that suggested for Rule 16.3.3.3 and 17.3.1.2, as they all relate to the same issues, just for differing zones. There needs to be consistency between the zones for the same rules.</del>	Accept	113
697.598	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 19.3.2 PI Buildings, structures, vegetation and objects within an airport obstacle limitation surface, as follows: <del>Any building, structure or vegetation must not protrude through any airport obstacle limitation surface as shown identified on the planning maps and defined in Section E Designation N – Waikato Regional Airport.</del>	Amend rule for additional clarity.	Accept	113
FS1253.12	Waikato Regional Airport Ltd	Support	Seek that this submission be allowed, subject to the following changes: <del>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-</del>	<del>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</del>	Accept	113

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<del>Te Kowhai Airfield park and defined in Section E, Designation N- Waikato Regional Hamilton Airport.</del>	<del>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.</del>		
697.599	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 19.3.3 PI Daylight admission, as follows: Any building must not protrude through a height control plane rising at an angle of 37 degrees commencing at an elevation of 2.5m above ground level at every point of the boundary of a site within the Business Zone Tamahere.	Amend to delete unnecessary wording.	Accept	114
697.600	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 19.3.3 RD1 Daylight admission, as follows: (a) Any building that does not comply with Rule 19.3.3 PI. (b) Council's discretion is limited to the following matters: (i) Height of the building; (ii) Design and location of the building; (iii) <del>Extent Level</del> of shading on any other adjacent sites; (iv) <del>Effects on</del> Privacy of on other sites; (v) <del>Effects on a</del> Amenity values of other sites the locality	Amend for consistency with other chapters.	Accept	114
697.601	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 19.3.5 PI Gross Leasable Floor Area, as follows: (a) <del>Any Every</del> individual tenancy....	Improved clarity of the rule.	Accept	115
697.602	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 19.3.6 PI Building setbacks, as follows: (a) <del>The Any</del> building must be set back a minimum of at least....	Consistency with the equivalent rule in other chapters.	Accept	116
697.603	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 19.3.6 DI Building setbacks, as follows: Any building that does not comply with Rule 19.3.6.1 PI.	Correct a rule reference.	Accept	116
697.604	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 19.4.1 RD1 (b)(ii) Subdivision - Restricted Discretionary Activities, as follows: (ii) Matters referred to in Appendix 3.2.3 Tamahere Business <del>Zone</del> - Development Plan Guidelines;	Correct reference to the appendix.	Accept	117
742.134	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Retain Rule 17.1.2 P17 Permitted Activities - Temporary event as notified.	The submitter supports no direct access from a national route or regional arterial road. Temporary events are subject to Rule 14.12.1.4 which would ensure that for events exceeding a certain size any effects on the transport network could be addressed.	Accept	47
FS1387.885	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood	Reject	47

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
742.135	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 17.1.3 RDI Restricted Discretionary Activities, except for the amendments sought below AND Add to Rule 17.1.3 RDI Restricted Discretionary Activities new matters of discretion as follows (x) On-site parking and manoeuvring (xi) <u>Safety and efficiency of the land transport network.</u> AND Request any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the submission.	The potential adverse effects on the transport network from a multi-unit development should be considered.	Reject	48
FSI 387.886	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	48
742.136	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Retain Rule 17.2.4 PI Glare and artificial light spill, as notified; AND Retain Rule 17.2.4 RDI Glare and artificial light spill, as notified.	The submitter supports all rules in this section.	Accept	54

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
742.137	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Retain Rule 17.2.7.1 P1 Signs general as notified AND Retain Rule 17.2.7.1 RD1 Signs general as notified.	Rule 17.2.7.1 P1 allows the submitter to erect signage as a permitted activity. The submitter supports the matters of discretion under RD1, particularly (b)(ii), (b)iii) and (b)(iv).	Accept	56
742.138	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 17.2.7.1 P2 Signs- General, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Rule 17.2.7.1 P2(a)(v) Signs - General as follows: Where the sign is a freestanding sign, it must: A. Not exceed an area of 3m <sup>2</sup> for one sign per site, and 1m <sup>2</sup> for any other one additional freestanding sign on the site; and B. Be set back at least 5m from the boundary of the Residential 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.	The submitter supports Rule 17.2.7.1 P2, but considers amendments are required to ensure that adverse effects on the transport network are avoided.	Reject	56
FS1089.15	Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Limited and Mobil Oil NZ Limited for 'Oil Companies'	Oppose	Oppose submission point 742.138.	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	Accept	56

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>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 17.2.7.1 as proposed by the submitter (742.138) and continue to seek the retention of the proposed rule as sought through the Oil Companies' primary submission.</i>		
<b>742.139</b>	<b>Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency</b>	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 17.2.7.2 PI Signs- effects on traffic, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Rule 17.2.7.2 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 Request any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the submission.	The submitter supports the intent of Rule 17.2.7.2 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.	Accept	61
<b>742.140</b>	<b>Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency</b>	Support	Retain Rule 17.2.7.2 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	56
<b>742.141</b>	<b>Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency</b>	Oppose	Add to Rule 17.3.4 Building setbacks a new rule as follows: <u>17.3.4.3 Building setbacks - State highways PI (a) Any building must be setback a minimum of: (i) 15m from a national route or regional arterial. (ii) 25m from the designated boundary of the Waikato Expressway. DI Any building that does not comply with Rule 17.3.4.3 PI.</u> AND Request any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the submission.	There is no rule specifying building setbacks from state highways in the Business Zone. The Operative District Plan provided 15m from national/regional arterials and 25m from the Waikato Expressway.	Accept	61
<b>742.142</b>	<b>Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency</b>	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 17.3.6 PI DI and NCI Dwelling as notified, subject to the amendments sought to Appendix I being accepted (addressed elsewhere in the submission).	The submitter supports acoustic conditions for dwellings in the Business Zone. However, Appendix I needs to be amended to include sound insulation standards, vibration standards and ventilation requirements for buildings near road/rail to ensure health and wellbeing is protected.	Accept	63
<i>FS1387.887</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</i>	<i>Reject</i>	<i>63</i>

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
742.143	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Retain Rule 17.4.1.6 RDI Subdivision - Road frontage as notified.	The submitter supports a minimum 15 m width for lots with road frontages as it will assist in avoiding adverse effects on network safety and efficiency.	Accept	71
742.192	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Retain Rule 18.1.2 P10 Permitted Activity - temporary event as notified.	The submitter supports no direct access from a national route or regional arterial road. Temporary events are subject to Rule 14.12.1.4 which would ensure that, for events exceeding a certain size, any effects on the transport network could be addressed.	Accept	75
FS1387.892	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
742.193	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 18.1.3 RDI Restricted Discretionary Activities, except for the amendments sought below AND Add to Rule 18.1.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities new	The potential adverse effects on the transport network from a multi-unit development should be considered.	Reject	76

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			matters of discretion, as follows: (k) <u>On-site parking and manoeuvring</u> ; (l) <u>Safety and efficiency of the land transport network</u> . AND Request any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the submission.			
FS1387.893	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	76
742.194	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Retain Rule 18.2.3 PI Glare and artificial light spill, as notified; AND Retain Rule 18.2.3 RDI Glare and artificial light spill, as notified.	The submitter supports all rules in this section.	Accept	81
742.195	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Retain Rule 18.2.7.1 PI Signs - General as notified AND Retain Rule 18.2.7.1 RDI Signs - General, as notified.	Rule 18.2.7.1 PI allows the Transport Agency to erect signage as a permitted activity. The submitter supports the matters of discretion under RDI, particularly (b)(iv), (v) and (vi).	Accept	83
742.196	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 18.2.7.1 P2 Signs- General, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Rule 18.2.7.1 P2(a)(v) Signs - General as follows: Where the sign is a freestanding sign, it must: A. Not exceed an area of 3m <sup>2</sup> for one sign per site, and 1m <sup>2</sup> for any other <u>one additional</u> freestanding sign on the site; and B. Be set back at least 5m from the boundary of the Residential Zone; and C. <u>Be set back at least 1.5m from the boundary of a state highway</u> . AND Request any consequential changes necessary to give effect	The submitter supports Rule 18.2.7.1 P2(a) but seeks an additional permitted activity standard to ensure that adverse effects on the transport network are avoided.	Reject	83

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1089.16	Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Limited and Mobil Oil NZ Limited for 'Oil Companies'	Oppose	to the relief sought in the submission. Oppose submission point 742.196.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•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.</li> <li>•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 18.2.7.1 as proposed by the submitter (742.196) and continue to seek the retention of the proposed rule as sought through the Oil Companies' primary submission.</li> </ul>	Accept	83
742.197	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Neutral/Amend	<p>Retain Rule 18.2.7.2 PI Signs- Effects on traffic, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Rule 18.2.7.2 PI (a) Signs- Effects on traffic as follows: (a) Any sign directed at road users must: ... (iii) Not obstruct sight lines of drivers turning in or out of a site entrance and intersections (iv) Contain no more than 40 characters and no more than 6 <u>words, symbols or</u></p>	The submitter supports the intent of Rule 18.2.7.2 PI but seeks an additional permitted activity standard to ensure that adverse effects on the transport network are avoided.	Accept	83

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			graphics; AND Consequently renumber the two clauses that follow. AND Request any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the submission.			
742.198	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Not Stated	Retain Rule 18.2.7.2 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	83
742.199	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Oppose	Add a new building setback rule as follows: <u>18.3.7A Building setbacks - State highways PI (a) Any building must be setback a minimum of: (i) 15m from a national route or regional arterial. (ii) 25m from the designated boundary of the Waikato Expressway. DI Any building that does not comply with Rule 18.3.7A PI</u> AND Request any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the submission.	There is no rule specifying building setbacks from state highways in the Business Town Centre Zone. The Operative District Plan provides 15m from national/regional arterials and 25m from the Waikato Expressway.	Reject	91
FS1387.894	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	91
742.200	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Retain Rule 18.3.8 PI, DI and NCI Dwelling, as notified subject to the amendments sought to Appendix I being accepted (addressed elsewhere in the submission).	The submitter supports acoustic conditions for dwellings in the Business Town Centre Zone. However, Appendix I needs to be amended to include sound insulation standards; vibration standards and ventilation requirements for buildings near road/rail to ensure health and wellbeing are protected.	Accept	92

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
749.126	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Support	Retain Rule 17.1.2 Permitted Activities as notified.	The submitter generally supports the permitted activities listed in Rule 17.1.2.	Accept	47
FSI387.1045	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	47
749.127	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.1.3 RDI Restricted Discretionary Activities as follows: (a) A multi-unit development that meets all of the following conditions: ... (v) <del>Each residential unit must be designed and constructed to achieve the internal design sound levels specified in Appendix 1 (Acoustic Insulation), Table 14; ...</del> (vii) Living court area are provided above ground floor level to meet the following minimum requirements for each residential unit: ... Studio unit or 1 bedroom min area 10m2 <u>Min dimension: 1.5m 2m 2</u> or more bedroom min area 15m2 <u>Min dimension: 1.5m 2m</u> AND Amend the matters of discretion for Rule 17.1.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities Matters of Discretion as follows: (a) Council's discretion is limited to <u>any of</u> the following matters: (i) <del>The extent to which the development is consistent with Town-Centre Guidelines contained in Appendix 3.3;</del> (ii) <del>The extent to which the development is consistent with the Multi-unit design guidelines contained in Appendix 3.4;</del> (iii) The extent to which the development contributes to and engages with adjacent streets and public open space; (iv) <del>The extent to which the development creates visual quality and interest through the separation of buildings, variety in built form and architectural detailing, glazing and materials;</del> (v) The extent to which the design of the development incorporates energy efficiency measures	The submitter considers that a medium density requirement for multi-unit development is not required and seeks a deletion of such rule in the Proposed District Plan. The bulk, location, site coverage and assessment criteria sufficiently address the likely impacts on amenity values while providing for a range of housing typologies. The submitter seeks the deletion of the multi-unit development urban design guidelines from the Proposed District Plan, including any reference to such guidelines in a rule or policy approach.	Reject	48

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			such as passive solar principles; (vi) Amenity values for occupants and neighbours in respect of outlook, privacy, noise, light spill, access to sunlight, living court orientation, site design and layout; ... AND Amend the Proposed District Plan as consequential or additional relief as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission as necessary.			
FS1371.28	Lakeside Development Limited	Support	Lakeside Development Limited seek that the amendment to Rule 17.1.3(a), (v), (vii), minimum dimensions for bedrooms and matters of discretion which relate to Rule 17.1.3 be allowed.	Will allow for increased residential intensity through amendments to the subdivision standards relating to residential development within Business zones to promote the development of compact urban forms. Will promote the sustainable management of resources and will achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991. Will enable the well-being of the community. Will meet the reasonably foreseeable need of future generations. Will enable the efficient use and development of the district's assets. Will represent the most appropriate means of exercising the Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means.	Reject	48
FS1387.1046	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	48
749.128	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.2.2 PI Servicing and hours of operation as follows: The loading and unloading of vehicles and the receiving of customers and deliveries associated with a commercial activity on a site <u>adjoining a residential activity</u> and/or the Residential and Village Zones may occur between 6.30am and 7.30pm. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan as consequential or	The submitter seeks that reference to dwelling should be included in addition to the zones listed. 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 a business zone activity does not comply with Rule 17.2.2 PI.	Reject	52

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			additional relief as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission as necessary.			
<b>749.129</b>	<b>Housing New Zealand Corporation</b>	Not Stated	Amend Rule 17.3.1.1 Height - Building General as follows: PI The maximum height of any building must not exceed <del>12m+10m</del> . <del>RD1-D1</del> (a) Any building that does not comply with Rule 17.3.1.1 PI. (b) Council's discretion shall be restricted to any of the following matters: (i) Height of the building; (ii) Design and location of the building; (iii) Extent of shading on adjacent sites; and (iv) Privacy on adjoining sites. 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 generally opposes the proposed permitted height and activity status. Amendments are required to the provision to provide for design flexibility as well as to better enable the delivery of centre intensification at a variety of different scales and typologies. The submitter proposes changes are necessary to establish triggers for consent and matters of discretion.	Accept	59
FS1193.20	Van Den Brink Group	Support	The submission is allowed.	VDB support an increased height for buildings and a reduced activity status for infringements.	Accept	59
<b>749.130</b>	<b>Housing New Zealand Corporation</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.3.2 PI Daylight admission as follows: (a) Any building must not protrude through a height control plane rising at an angle of <del>37</del> 45 degrees commencing at an elevation of <del>2.5m</del> <del>3m</del> above ground level at the site...	The submitter generally opposes the daylight admission and seeks a change to the height control plane. Amendments are sought to the provision to provide for design flexibility as well as to enable the delivery of centre intensification at a variety of different scales and typologies.	Reject Accept	60
<b>749.131</b>	<b>Housing New Zealand Corporation</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.4.1 General subdivision as follows: (a) Subdivision of land must comply with all of the following conditions: (i) Proposed <del>vacant</del> lots must have a minimum size of <del>200m<sup>2</sup></del> <del>225m<sup>2</sup></del> -net site area with the exception of access or utility allotments or reserves to vest. (ii) Proposed <del>vacant</del> lots must be connected to public-reticulated water supply and wastewater. (b) The Council's discretion shall be... <del>CI</del> (a) Any subdivision in accordance with an approved land use resource consent must comply with that resource consent. (b) Council's control shall be reserved to any of the following matters: (i) The effect of the design and layout of the proposed sites created; (ii) Provision of infrastructure. <del>DI</del> Subdivision that does not comply with Rule 17.4.1 <del>RD1</del> or <del>CI</del> . 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 generally opposes the subdivision provisions. These provisions are restrictive and discourage the desired urban uplift sought in the district. Amendments are required to the subdivision provisions as a means of better enabling and incentivising development in the district.	Reject	65
FS1387.1047	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	Accept	65

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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>		
FS1114.30	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Not Stated	Support in part.	<p>FENZ support in part the amendment sought but consider for the sake of clarity that the wording be amended as follows, to avoid lots containing existing buildings being excluded from the effect of the rule: (ii) Proposed lots (including vacant lots) must be connected to public-reticulated water supply and wastewater.</p>	Reject	65
749.132	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Neutral/Amend	<p>Amend Rule 17.4.1.1 Subdivision - Multi-unit development as follows: <del>CIRD+</del> (a) Subdivision for multi-unit development must comply with all of the following conditions: (i) An application for land use consent under Rule 17.1.4 (Multi-unit housing development) must either accompany the subdivision or been granted resource consent by Council; (ii) <u>Any subdivision relating to an approved land use consent must comply with that resource consent.</u> (iii) (ii) Be connected to public wastewater and water reticulation; and (iv) (iii) Where a residential unit is being created in accordance with the Unit Titles Act 2010, it meets the following minimum unit size: ... Studio unit or 1 bedroom unit <u>60m<sup>2</sup>-30m<sup>2</sup> 2 bedroom or more residential unit 80m<sup>2</sup> 45m<sup>2</sup> 3-or-more residential unit 100m<sup>2</sup></u> (b) The Council's discretion shall be limited to <u>any of</u> the following matters: ... (ii) <del>Provision of common areas for shared spaces, access and services;</del> (iii) ... (vi) Compliance with the approved land use consent. (vi) <del>Consistency with the matters contained, and outcomes sought, in Appendix 3.4 (Multi-unit development guideline); (vii) Consistency with any relevant structure plan or master plan, including the provision of neighbourhood parks, reserves and neighbourhood centres; (viii) Vehicle, pedestrian and cycle networks; (ix) Safety, function and efficiency of road network and any internal roads or accessways.</del> D1 Subdivision that does not</p>	<p>The submitter generally opposes the minimum residential unit size in multi-unit development. The provisions for multi-unit residential development subdivision are restrictive and discourage the desired urban uplift sought in the district. It is found that any type of infill housing development or multi-unit development will trigger a consent requirement. Subdivision consent will be required first in order to construct an in-fill dwelling or multi-unit development. The submitter considers that the minimum residential unit size to be high and will discourage any new residential development to occur. The provision does not encourage sufficient housing choice and variety in residential built form to support changing demographics, lifestyles, rising housing costs, future housing demands and population growth in the district. Amendments are required to enable and incentivise residential development in the district. Reducing the minimum residential unit size will enable more units to be accommodated within a development. The submitter seeks the deletion of the multi-unit development urban design guidelines from the Proposed District Plan, including any reference to such guidelines in</p>	Accept	66

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			comply with Rule 17.4.1.1 <u>CI RD1</u> . AND Amend the Proposed District Plan as consequential or additional relief as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission as necessary.	a rule or policy approach.		
FS1193.19	Van Den Brink Group	Support	The submission is allowed.	VDB support a reduction in minimum dwelling/unit size for multi-unit developments.	Accept	66
FS1202.81	New Zealand Transport Agency	Oppose	Oppose submission point 749.132.	The Transport Agency supports Council's discretion (ix) safety, function and efficiency of road network and any internal roads or access ways. Deletion of this matter of discretion is not supported as it will not allow for the effects upon the transport network be addressed adequately.	Reject	66
FS1387.1048	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	66
749.133	<b>Housing New Zealand Corporation</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.4.1.2 D1 Subdivision - Boundary adjustments as follows: <del>D1 RD1</del> (a) Boundary adjustments that does not comply with Rule 17.4.1.2 C. (b) Council's discretion shall be restricted to any of the following matters: (i) Subdivision layout; (ii) Shape of titles and variation in lot sizes. 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 generally opposes the activity status for this rule, and seeks the discretionary activity is changes to a restricted discretionary activity with matters of discretion.	Accept	67
FS1387.1049	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure.	Reject	67

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>		
<b>749.134</b>	<b>Housing New Zealand Corporation</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.1.2 P2 Permitted Activities as follows: P2 Residential activity Nil Located above ground floor level 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 generally opposes activity-specific conditions attached to permitted activities listed in 18.1.2.	Reject	75
<i>FS1387.1050</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>75</i>
<i>FS1078.44</i>	<i>Hugh Green Limited</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Generally consistent with relief sought by HGL</i>	<i>The submission is allowed if the alternative relief by HGL (392.9) is disallowed</i>	<i>Reject</i>	<i>75</i>
<b>749.135</b>	<b>Housing New Zealand Corporation</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.1.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities as follows: Activity RD1 (a) A multi-unit development that meets all of the following conditions: ... (b) The multi-unit development must be located above the ground floor; (c)... (d) Each residential unit must be designed and constructed to achieve the internal design sound levels specified in Appendix 1 (Acoustic Insulation), Table 14; (e)... (f) Living court areas are provided above ground floor level to meet the following minimum requirements for each residential unit: Residential Unit Minimum Living Court Minimum Dimensions Studio unit or 1 bedroom 10m2 <del>2m</del> 1.5m 2 or more	The submitter generally opposes and seeks amendments to Rule 18.1.3 RD1. The submitter considers a minimum density requirement for multi-unit development is not required and seeks a deletion of such rule in the Proposed District Plan and seeks the deletion of the requirement that a multi-unit development must be located above ground floor level. The bulk, location, site coverage and assessment criteria sufficiently address the likely impacts on amenity values while providing for a range of housing typologies. It may also be appropriate in some locations to have a multi-unit	Reject	76

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			bedrooms 15m2 <del>2m-1.5m</del> The Council's discretion shall be limited to <del>and of the following matters:</del> (a) <del>The extent to which the development is consistent with the Town Centre Guidelines contained in Appendix 3.3;</del> (b) <del>The extent to which the development is consistent with the Multi-unit design guidelines contained in Appendix 3.4;</del> (c) The extent to which the development contributes to and engages with adjacent streets and public open space; (d) <del>The extent to which the development creates visual quality and interest through the separation of buildings, variety in built form and architectural detailing, glazing, and materials;</del> (e) The extent to which the design of the development incorporates energy efficiency measures such as passive solar principles; (f) Amenity values for occupants and neighbours in respect of outlook, privacy, noise, light spill, access to sunlight, living court orientation, <del>site design and layout;</del> (g) The extent to which staging is necessary to ensure that development is carried out in a coordinated and timely manner; (h) Avoidance or mitigation of natural hazards; (i) Geotechnical suitability for building; (j) Adequacy of the communal service court for the intended purpose.	development from ground floor level and above. The orientation and design of such development can support commercial activity in certain locations. The submitter seeks a maximum height of 11m is introduced into the Proposed District Plan to enable multi-unit development up to 3 storeys in height. The submission seeks the deletion of the multi-unit development and town centre urban design guidelines from the Proposed District Plan, including any reference to such guidelines in a rule or policy approach.		
FS1387.1051	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	76
749.136	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Oppose	Delete Rule 18.1.5 NC2 Non-Complying Activities AND Amend the Proposed District Plan as consequential or additional relief as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission as necessary.	To give effect to the submission sought to enable residential activity to be provided on the ground floor within the Business Town Centre Zone requires the deletion of Rule 18.1.5 NC2.	Reject	78
FS1371.42	Lakeside Development Limited	Support	Lakeside Development Limited seeks that the amendment of Rule 18.15 NC2- Subdivision contained within the submission	Will allow for increased residential intensity through amendments to the subdivision standards relating to	Reject	78

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<i>point be allowed.</i>	<i>residential development within Business zones to promote the development of compact urban forms. Will encourage design innovation in providing a variety of housing typologies within areas marked for intensification. Will enable consistency and clarity across the plan. Will promote the sustainable management of resources and will achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991. Will meet the reasonably foreseeable need of future generations. Will enable the efficient use and development of the district's assets. Will represent the most appropriate means of exercising the Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means.</i>		
FS1387.1052	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	78
FS1078.45	Hugh Green Limited	Support	Generally consistent with relief sought by HGL	The submission is allowed if the alternative relief by HGL (392.9 and .14) is disallowed	Reject	78
749.137	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Oppose	Delete Rule 18.1.5 NC3 Non-Complying Activity AND Amend the Proposed District Plan as consequential or additional relief as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission as necessary.	To give effect to the submission sought to enable residential activity to be provided on the ground floor within the Business Town Centre Zone requires the deletion of Rule 18.1.5 NC3.	Reject	78
FS1387.1053	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	Accept	78

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>		
749.138	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.2.2 PI Servicing and hours of operation as follows: The loading and unloading of vehicles and the receiving of customers and deliveries associated with a commercial activity on a site adjoining <u>a residential activity and/or</u> the Residential and Village Zones must only occur between 6.30am and 7.30pm. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan as consequential or additional relief as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission as necessary.		Reject	80
749.139	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.2.4.1 RDI (b) Earthworks - General as follows: The Council's discretion shall be restricted to <u>any of the following matters:</u> ...	The submitter generally opposes the matters of discretion listed for Rule 18.2.4.1 RDI and seeks that the wording "any of" be inserted. This will ensure that the list is not seen as an inclusive list to which all matters need to be met. It could be that one or more matters may be relevant instead of all matters listed when the activity is triggers for a consent.	Accept	82
749.140	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.3.1.1 Height - Building general as follows: PI The maximum height of any building must not exceed <u>12m +0m. D+RDI</u> (a) Any building that does not comply with Rule 18.3.1.1 PI. (b) <u>Council's discretion shall be restricted to any of the following matters: (i) Height of the building; (ii) Design and location of the building; (iii) Extent of shading on adjacent sites; and (iv) Privacy on adjoining sites</u> 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 generally opposes the proposed permitted height and activity status. Amendments to the building height standard within the Business Town Centre Zone should be amended to better provide for design flexibility as well as to better enable the delivery of centre intensification at a variety of different scales and typologies. The submitter perceives these amendments as necessary to ensure appropriate triggers for consent and matters of discretion are incorporated into the Proposed District Plan.	Accept	85
749.141	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.3.2 PI Daylight admission as follows: (a) Any building must not protrude through a height control plane rising at an angle of <u>37-45</u> degrees commencing at an	The submitter generally opposes the daylight admission and seeks a change to the height control plane. The amendments sought will	Reject	86

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			elevation of <del>2.5m</del> 3m above ground level at the site boundary where it adjoins a: .... OR Amend Rule 18.3.2 PI Daylight admission to consider an alternative height in relation to the boundary standard in the Business Town Centre Zone. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan as consequential or additional relief as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission as necessary.	better provide for design flexibility and enable the delivery of centre intensification at a variety of different scales and typologies. Consideration should also be made to an alternative height in relation to boundary control within the Business Town Centre Zone.		
749.142	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Oppose	Add a new clause to Rule 18.3.4 PI Display windows and building facades as follows: (a) Any new building facade, or alteration of an existing building facade, must comply with the following conditions: (i) Not be set back from the road boundary; and (ii) Provide display windows comprising at least 50% of the building facade. (b) Rule 18.3.4 PI(a) does not apply to multi-unit development. 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 generally opposes Rule 18.3.4 Display windows and building facades.	Accept	88
749.143	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.3.8 Dwelling as follows: PI (a) <del>One Any dwelling within a lot must comply with all of the following conditions: (i) The dwelling must not be located at ground level; (ii) The dwelling must achieve the internal design sound levels specified in Appendix I (Acoustic Insulation), Table I4.</del> (b) Rule 18.3.8 PI (a) does not apply to multi-unit development (refer to Rule 18.1.3 RDI (Multi-Unit Development). <del>RDI Any dwelling that does not comply with Rule 18.3.8 PI (a)(ii).</del> <del>NCI Any dwelling that does not comply with Rule 18.3.8(a)(i).</del> AND Amend the Proposed District Plan as consequential or additional relief as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission as necessary.	To give effect to the submission, a consequential amendment allowing residential activity to be provided on the ground floor in the Business Town Centre Zone requires the deletion of Rule 18.3.8 PI (a)(i).	Reject	92
FS1387.1054	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	Accept	92

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>		
749.144	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.3.9 Living Court as follows: PI (a) A living court must be provided for each dwelling that meets all of the following conditions: (i)... (iii) It is located on a balcony containing at least <del>10m<sup>2</sup></del> <del>15m<sup>2</sup></del> and a circle with a diameter of at least <del>1.5m</del> <del>2.4m</del> . RD1 (a) A living court that does not comply with Rule 18.3.9 PI. (b) Council's discretion shall <u>be restricted to any of the following matters: (i) Design and location of the building; (ii) Provision for outdoor living space including access to sunlight and open space and the usability and accessibility of the outdoor living space proposed. (iii) Privacy on adjoining sites; and (iv) The proximity of the site to communal or public open space that has the potential to mitigate any lack of private outdoor living space.</u> 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 generally opposes the proposed living court provisions. The submitter seeks the minimum living court is reduced to enable the better utilisation of the site for residential development. The submitter proposes changes which are necessary to triggers for consent and matters of discretion.	Reject	93
FS1387.1055	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Accept	93
749.145	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.4.1 RD1 (a) General subdivision as follows: RD1 (a) Subdivision of land must comply with all of the following conditions: (i) Proposed <del>vacant</del> lots must have a minimum size of <del>200m<sup>2</sup></del> <del>225m<sup>2</sup></del> -net site area with the	The submitter generally opposes the subdivision provisions. The provisions are restrictive and discourage the desired urban uplift sought in the district. Amendments	Reject	95

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p>exception of access or utility allotments or reserves to vest; (ii) Proposed <u>vacant</u> lots must be connected to public-reticulated water supply and wastewater.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Add a new controlled activity to Rule 18.4.1 Subdivision-General as follows: <u>C1 (a) Any subdivision in accordance with an approved land use resource consent must comply with that resource consent. (b) Council's control shall be reserved to any of the following matters: (i) The effect of the design and layout of the proposed sites created; (ii) Provision of infrastructure. ...</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend the Proposed District Plan as consequential or additional relief as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission as necessary.</p>	sought will enable and incentivise development in the district.		
FS1371.41	Lakeside Development Limited	Support	Lakeside Development Limited seek that the amendment of Rule 18.4- RD1 (a)(i) Subdivision contained within the submission point be allowed.	<p>Will allow for increased residential intensity through amendments to the subdivision standards relating to residential development within Business zones to promote the development of compact urban forms. Will encourage design innovation in providing a variety of housing typologies within areas marked for intensification. Will enable consistency and clarity across the plan. Will promote the sustainable management of resources and will achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991. Will meet the reasonably foreseeable need of future generations. Will enable the efficient use and development of the district's assets. Will represent the most appropriate means of exercising the Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means.</p>	Reject	95
FS1387.1056	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</p>	Accept	95

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
FS1114.32	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Not Stated	Support in part.	FENZ support in part the amendment sought but consider for that sake of clarity that the wording be amended as follows, to avoid lots containing existing buildings being excluded from the effect of the rule: (ii) Proposed lots (including vacant lots) must be connected to public-reticulated water supply and wastewater.	Reject	95
749.146	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.4.2 RD1 Subdivision - Multi-Unit subdivision as follows: <u>C1 RD1</u> (a) Subdivision for multi-unit development shall comply with all of the following conditions: (i)... (ii) <u>Any subdivision relating to an approved land use consent must comply with that resource consent;</u> (iii)(iii) Be connected to public wastewater and water reticulation; (iii)(iv) Where a residential unit is being created in accordance with the Unit Titles Act 2010, it meets the following minimum unit size: ... Studio unit or 1 bedroom 60m <sup>2</sup> 30m <sup>2</sup> 2 bedroom or more residential unit 2 bedroom unit 80m <sup>2</sup> 45m <sup>2</sup> 3 or more bedroom unit 100m <sup>2</sup> (b) The Council's control discretion shall be limited to <u>any of the following matters:</u> (i)... (ii) <u>Provision of common areas for shared spaces, access and services;</u> (iii)(ii) Avoidance or mitigation of natural hazards; (iv)(iii) Geotechnical suitability of site for buildings; (v)(iv) Amenity values and streetscape; (v) <u>Compliance with an approved land use consent.</u> (vi) <u>Consistency with the matters contained, and outcomes sought, in Appendix 3.4 (Multi-unit development guideline);</u> (vii) <u>Consistency with any relevant structure plan or master plan, including the provision of neighbourhood parks, reserves and neighbourhood centres;</u> (viii) <u>Vehicle, pedestrian and cycle networks;</u> (ix) <u>Safety, function and efficiency of road network and any internal roads or accessways.</u> 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 generally opposes the minimum residential unit size in Multi-unit development. The multi-unit subdivision provision is restrictive and discourages the desired urban uplift sought in the district. The submitter found that any type of in-fill housing development or multi-unit development will trigger a reason for consent. Subdivision consent will be required first in order to construct an in-fill dwelling or multi-unit development. The submitter considers the minimum residential unit size to be high and will discourage any new residential development to occur. The provision does not encourage sufficient housing choice and variety in residential built form to support changing demographics, lifestyles, rising housing costs, future housing demands and population growth within the district. Amendments are required to enable and incentivise residential development in the district. Reducing the minimum residential unit size will enable more units to be accommodated in a development and better utilisation of the site. The submitter seeks the deletion of the multi-unit development urban design guidelines from the Proposed District Plan., including any references to such guidelines in a rule or policy approach.	Accept	96
FS1387.1057	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure.</i>	Reject	96

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>		
749.147	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.4.3 D1 Subdivision - Boundary adjustments as follows: <u>R</u> D1 (a) Boundary adjustments that does not comply with Rule 18.4.3 C1. (b) <u>C</u> ouncil's discretion shall be restricted to the following matters: (i) Purpose of the boundary adjustment; (ii) Effects on existing buildings. 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 generally opposes the activity status for this rule, and seeks the discretionary activity is changed to a restricted discretionary activity with matters of discretion inserted.	Accept	97
FS1387.1058	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	97
749.152	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Oppose	Delete Appendix 10 Town Centre Character Statements; AND Delete all references to Character Statements in the Proposed District Plan as a consequential amendment. OR If the desired outcomes are sought, add new specific policies into Chapter 4 Urban Environment of the Proposed District Plan that reflect the guidelines within Appendix 10 Town Centre Character Statements or as specific matters of discretion or rules with the appropriate activity and zone. AND	The submitter opposes the inclusion of Town Centre Character Statements in the Proposed District Plan. The Town Centre Character Statements help to inform design and development in existing town centres, the outcomes sought and guidelines within these town centre character statements read as desired requirements and rules that a Consent Holder must follow. The submitter opposes any policy or rule approach which would require development proposals to comply with such character statements in the Proposed District	Reject	119

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			Amend the Proposed District Plan as consequential or additional relief as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission as necessary.	Plan. If the guidelines and outcomes are sought, it should be written as specific policies within Chapter 4 of the Proposed District Plan as specific matters of discretion or rules within the appropriate activity and zone. The submitter seeks the deletion of all Town Centre Character Statements from the Proposed District Plan. These non-statutory documents inform design and development and should not be included in the Proposed District Plan.		
FS1387.1059	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	119
749.158	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Oppose	Amend Rule 18.1.3 RD2 Restricted Discretionary Activities as follows: RD2 (a) The construction of any new building that meets all of the following conditions: (i) The Land Use-Effects in Rule 18.2; (ii) The Land Use- Building in Rule 18.3 except; A. Rule 18.3.9 (Dwellings) does not apply; B. Rule 18.3.10 (Living court) does not apply; The Council's discretion shall be limited to any of the following matters: (i) The extent to which the building is consistent with the following matters listed in Appendix 3.3 (Town Centre Design Guidelines) including: A. A site and contextual analysis that identifies and addresses the matters listed in section 3.3; B. A connectivity and movement network analysis that addresses the matters listed in section 4.3; C. A neighbourhood character assessment that identifies and addresses the elements listed in section 5; D. Detailed design illustrating how the building will promote these character elements of the respective town to achieve the outcomes sought in section 5.2 of the design guide; (ii) Consistency with the relevant Town Centre Character Statement contained within Appendix 10.1-10.6 (Town	The submitter generally opposes and seeks amendments to Rule 18.1.3 RD1. The submission seeks the deletion of the multi-unit development and town centre urban design guidelines from the Proposed District Plan, including any reference to such guidelines in a rule or policy approach.	Reject	76

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			Character Statements). AND Amend the Proposed District Plan as consequential or additional relief as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission as necessary.			
FS1387.1063	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	76
923.114	Waikato District Health Board	Neutral/Amend	Retain Appendix 3.3- Town Centre Guidelines as notified.	Submitter supports the good urban design outcomes embodied in these guidelines (Appendix 3.3 Town Centre Guidelines). This includes reference to the NZ Urban Design Protocol of which Crime Prevention through Environmental Design, Universal Access Design, Energy Efficiency, and Street trees are part; as it commits the signatories to specific urban design initiatives intended to raise the quality of urban design within the town/city thereby increasing opportunities for optimal health and wellbeing.	Accept	119
FS1387.1527	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	Reject	119

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
923.148	Waikato District Health Board	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 17.1.3 RD1- Multi Unit Development as notified.	Submitter supports the provision for multi-unit development in the Business Zone to encourage this type of development to locate within 400m walking distance of public transport. Compact urban forms that are well connected to community and commercial facilities are to be encouraged, given the public health and well-being benefits that accrue.	Accept	48
FS1387.1544	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	48
923.149	Waikato District Health Board	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.2.1.1 P2, P3, P4 and D1- 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 Business Zone must not exceed: (ii)A. 65dB LAeq(15min) dB (LAeq), 7am to 11pm every day; and (iii)B: 55B dB LAeq(15min) dB (LAeq) and 85dB (LAmax), 11pm to 7am the following day; (iv)85dB LAFmax, 11pm to 7am the following day; (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 75dB (LAmax), 10pm to 7am the following day. — P3 (a) Noise measured within any site in any zone other than the Business Zone, Residential Zone or Village 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	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, - Incomplete noise limits are specified for sound received in adjoining zones. A consistent approach has not been adopted for sound between zones.	Accept	51

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			Sound." (b) Noise levels must be assessed in accordance with the requirements of NZS 6802:2008 "Acoustics Environmental Noise." D1 (a) Sound that is outside the scope of NZS 6802:2008 or a permitted activity standard; and (b) Sound Noise that does not comply with Rule 17.2.1.1 P1 or P2, P3 or P4.			
923.150	Waikato District Health Board	Support	Retain Rule 18.1.3 RD1 - A Multi-Unit Development as notified.	Submitter supports the provisions for multi-unit development in the Business Town centre to be located with 400m walking distance of public transport. Compact urban forms that are well connected to community and commercial facilities are to be encouraged given the public health and wellbeing benefits that accrue.	Accept	76
FS1307.1	New Zealand Walking Access Commission	Support	WAC is supportive of the retention of this rule relating achieving compact, walkable urban forms and yielding the health and wellbeing benefits for the community.		Accept	76
923.151	Waikato District Health Board	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.2.1.1 P2, P3, P4 and D1 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 Business Town Centre Zone must not exceed: (i)(ii)A. 65 dB LAeq(15min) dB (LAeq), 7am to 11pm every day; and (ii)(iii)B. 55dB LAeq(15min) dB (LAeq) and 85dB (LAmax), 11pm to 7am the following day; (iii)(iv)85 dB LAFmax, 11pm to 7am the following day; (b)The permitted activity noise limits for the zone of any other site where sound is received. (i)In the Residential and Village Zone must not exceed: 55dB (LAeq), 7am to 7pm; 50Db (LAeq), 7pm to 10pm; 45 dB (LAeq) and 65dB (LAmax), 10pm to 7am the following day. P3 (a) Noise measured within any site in any zone other than the Business Town Centre Zone, Residential Zone or Village 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. D1 (a)Sound that is outside the scope of NZS 6802:2008 or a permitted activity standard; and (b) Sound Noise that does not comply with Rules 18.2.1.1 P1 or P2, P3 and P4.	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.	Accept	79

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
923.152	Waikato District Health Board	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 19.2.1.1 P2, P3, P4 and D1- 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 within the following noise limits at any point within any other site in the Business Zone Tamahere must not exceed: (i) 65dB LAeq(15min) dB (LAeq), 7am to 11pm every day; and (ii) 55dB LAeq(15min) dB (LAeq), 11pm Friday to 1am Saturday; and (iii) 55dB LAeq(15min) dB (LAeq), 11pm Saturday to 1am Sunday; and (iv) 45dB LAeq(15min), Sunday to Thursday 11pm to 1am the following day; (v) 45dB LAeq(15min) dB (LAeq), 1am to 7am every day; and (vi) 75dB LAeq(15min) dB (LAeq), 11pm to 7am the following every day; (b) The permitted activity noise limits for the zone of any other site where sound is received. P3 (a) Noise measured at the notional boundary within any site in the Country Living Zone must not exceed: (i) 50 dB (LAeq), 7am to 7pm every day; (ii) 45 dB (LAeq), 7pm to 10pm every day; and (iii) 40 dB (LAeq), and 65dB (LAmax), 10pm to 7am every day. P4 (a) Noise levels must be measured in accordance with the requirements of NZS 6801:2008 'Acoustics Measurement of Environmental Sound' and (b) Noise levels must be assessed in accordance with the requirements of NZS 6802:2008 'Acoustic Environmental Noise.' D1 (a) Sound that is outside the scope of NZS 6802:2008 or a permitted activity standard; and (b) Sound Noise that does not comply with Rule 19.2.1.1 P1 or P2, P3 or P4.	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. - There is a gap in the noise limits for Sundays to Thursday between 11pm and 1am the next day.	Accept	108
986.100	Pam Butler on behalf of KiwiRail Holdings Limited (KiwiRail)	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.2.5.1 PI(a) Earthworks General as follows (or similar amendments to achieve the requested relief): (i) Be located more than 1.5m from infrastructure, including a public sewer, open drain, overland flow path or other service pipe 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.	Accept	55
FS1176.313	Watercare Services Ltd	Support	Null	Watercare supports the approach in principle, however is seeking additional changes to protect existing infrastructure.	Accept	55
986.101	Pam Butler on behalf of KiwiRail Holdings Limited (KiwiRail)	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.2.4.1 PI(a) Earthworks General as follows (or similar amendments to achieve the requested relief): (i) Be located more than 1.5m from infrastructure, including a	KiwiRail supports that earthworks are required to be setback from services and network systems. The rail track itself is most susceptible	Accept	82

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			public sewer, open drain, overland flow path or other service pipe AND Any consequential amendments to link and/or accommodate the requested changes	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.		
FS1176.314	Watercare Services Ltd	Support	Null	Watercare supports the approach in principle, however is seeking additional changes to protect existing infrastructure.	Accept	82
986.102	Pam Butler on behalf of KiwiRail Holdings Limited (KiwiRail)	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 19.2.4 PI(a) Earthworks General as follows (or similar amendments to achieve the requested relief): (i) Be located more than 1.5m from <u>infrastructure, including</u> a public sewer, open drain, overland flow path or other service pipe 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.	Accept	109
FS1176.315	Watercare Services Ltd	Support	Null	Watercare supports the approach in principle, however is seeking additional changes to protect existing infrastructure.	Accept	109
986.107	Pam Butler on behalf of KiwiRail Holdings Limited (KiwiRail)	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.2.5.1 PI (a)(iv) Earthworks general as follows (or similar amendments to achieve the requested relief): (iv) Areas exposed by the earthworks are <u>stabilized to avoid runoff within 1 month of the cessation</u> <del>re-vegetated to achieve 80% ground cover 6 months of the commencement of the earthworks</del> AND Any consequential amendments to link and/or accommodate the requested changes.	KiwiRail also seeks that the rule relating to revegetation in certain zones be amended to include other available methods to stabilise the ground to prevent runoff, including building or hard cover development. As notified, these rules are ambiguous.	Accept	55
986.108	Pam Butler on behalf of KiwiRail Holdings Limited (KiwiRail)	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 18.2.4.1 PI (a) (iv) Earthworks general as follows (or similar amendments to achieve the requested relief): (iv) Areas exposed by the earthworks are stabilized to avoid runoff within 1 month of the cessation re-vegetated to achieve 80% ground cover 6 months of the commencement of the earthworks 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	82
986.109	Pam Butler on behalf of	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 19.2.4 PI(a)(iv) Earthworks general as follows	KiwiRail also seeks that the rule relating to	Accept	109

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
	<b>KiwiRail Holdings Limited (KiwiRail)</b>		(or similar amendments to achieve the requested relief): (iv) Areas exposed by the earthworks are <u>stabilized to avoid runoff within 1 month of the cessation</u> re-vegetated to achieve <u>80% ground cover 6 months of the commencement</u> of the earthworks AND Any consequential amendments to link and/or accommodate the requested changes	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		
<b>559.269</b>	<b>Sherry Reynolds on behalf of Heritage New Zealand Lower Northern Office</b>	Support	Retain Rule 22.4.3 NCI Title boundaries – Significant Natural Areas, Heritage items, Maaori sites of significance and Maaori areas of Significance, except for the amendments sought below. AND Amend Rule 22.4.3 NCI Title boundaries - Significant Natural Areas, Heritage items, Maaori sites of significance and Maaori areas of Significance to be consistent with other zone chapters, including the retention of heritage items.	The submitter supports Rule 22.4.3 NCI Title boundaries – Significant Natural Areas, Maaori sites and Maaori areas of Significance. This rule and the more stringent activity status will give effect to Part 2, section 6 Matters of national importance, in particular s6(e) and 6(f).	Awaiting recommendation	
<b>724.22</b>	<b>Sue Robertson for Tamahere Community Committee</b>	Support	Retain the provisions in Chapter 19 containing the provisions for the Business Zone at Tamahere which are altered to be consistent with the approved resource consent for the new development.	No reasons provided.	Accept	104
<b>742.26</b>	<b>Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 4.5.37(a) as follows: (i) The location, colour, content, and appearance of signs directed at <u>or visible to road users</u> <del>traffic</del> are controlled to ensure <u>they do not distract confuse or obstruct motorists, pedestrians and other road users adversely affect safety of road users...</u> ; (ii) Signs that generate adverse effects from illumination, light spill, flashing, <u>moving</u> , or reflection are <u>avoided</u> ; and .... AND Request any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the submission.	The submitter supports the recognition in Policy 4.5.37 of the potential adverse effects of signs on people using the land transport system but seeks minor amendments.	Accept	41
<i>FS1089.13</i>	<i>Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Limited and Mobil Oil NZ Limited for 'Oil Companies'</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose submission point 742.26 in part.</i>	<i>The Oil Companies sought the retention of Policy 4.5.37 without further modification (785.37) on the basis that the intent of the policy framework signage within the Business Zone and the Business Town Centre Zone was appropriate, as proposed. The Oil Companies oppose, in part the amendments to Policy 4.5.37(a) insofar as setting the basis for control of signage as 'visibility,' as proposed by the submitter (742.26). If a sign is visible from a</i>	<i>Reject</i>	<i>41</i>

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>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 control of all signs 'visible' from State Highways- irrespective of whether the sign and/or signs in question are orientated towards the State Highway, illuminated, digital or their dimensions. Therefore, the Oil Companies oppose, in part the amendment to Policy 10.1.3 to set the basis for control as 'visibility' and continue to seek the retention of the proposed policy as sought through the Oil Companies' primary submissions.</i>		
742.27	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Retain Policy 4.5.38 Artificial outdoor lighting as notified.	The submitter supports Policy 4.5.38 (a)(iii).	Accept	42
746.53	The Surveying Company	Support	Add a new permitted activity (P19) to Rule 17.1.2 Permitted Activities, as follows: <u>P19 Multi-unit development of up to five units complying with the conditions</u> AND Add the conditions from Rule 17.1.3 RDI to the new rule.	The submitter supports the provision for multi-unit housing as it gives effect to the strategic direction outlined in Section A and Chapter B 4.1. The provision for multi-unit development supports variety in the future housing stock to help achieve policies 4.1.2, 4.1.5, 4.2.16 and 4.2.17. Multi-unit development of up to five units should be a Permitted Activity. This will allow for infill development and avoid unnecessary Resource Consent costs and time delays where and effects can be managed through permitted standards. Provision for low rise apartments close to town centre gives effect to the directive in Policy 4.2.17(a) Enable a variety of housing types in the Residential Zone where it is connected to public reticulation, including: (i) Integrated residential development such as low-rise apartments and multi-unit development; (ii) Retirement villages.	Reject	47
FS1202.79	New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Support submission point 746.53	<i>Increased density and mixed-use developments support multi-modal transport options, help achieve a change in urban form, and support liveable communities. The Transport Agency supports the proposed change however notes that the Transport Agency has requested amendments to 17.1.3 RDI that require consideration of the transport network and the requested new activity specific standards should also be included in these amendments.</i>	Reject	47
FS1387.931	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither</i>	Accept	47

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
<b>746.54</b>	<b>The Surveying Company</b>	Support	Delete Rule 17.1.5 NCI- Non-Complying Activities and amend to discretionary activity as captured by Rule 17.1.4 D3 Discretionary Activities OR Amend Rule 17.1.3 RD1- Restricted Discretionary Activities to allow residential development at the ground floor on sites that adjoin a residential zone.	Provision for low rise apartments close to town centre gives effect to the directive in Policy 4.2.17(a) Enable a variety of housing types in the Residential Zone where it is connected to public reticulation, including: (i)Integrated residential development such as low-rise apartments and multi-unit development; (ii)Retirement villages. Residential development at ground floor level may be an appropriate design response to the context of the site and surrounding area. Where buildings adjoin the residential zone, residential ground floor activities may be an appropriate design response.	Reject	48
<i>FS1078.39</i>	<i>Hugh Green Limited</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Generally consistent with relief sought by HGL.</i>	<i>The submission is allowed if the alternative relief by HGL (392.4 and .5) is disallowed</i>	<i>Reject</i>	<i>48</i>
<i>FS1387.932</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</i>	<i>Accept</i>	<i>48</i>

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>appropriate.</i>		
<b>746.55</b>	<b>The Surveying Company</b>	Oppose	Delete Rule 17.1.5 NC2-Non-Complying Activities, and amend to a discretionary activity status as set out below AND Add a new discretionary activity (D4) to Rule 17.14 as follows: <u>Residential activity that does not comply with an activity specific condition for a permitted activity under Rule 17.1.2 P4.</u>	The non-complying activity status is too restrictive and does not provide for innovation in design or development concepts which may promote good outcomes for the zone. Residential activities are seen as being appropriate for a residential zone and therefore the non-complying status does not enable this. Residential development at ground floor level may be an appropriate design response to the context of the site and surrounding area. Where buildings adjoin the residential zone, residential ground floor activities may be an appropriate design response.	Reject	50
FS1387.933	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Accept	50
<b>746.56</b>	<b>The Surveying Company</b>	Oppose	Amend Rule 17.3.1.1 P1- Height- Building General as follows: The maximum height of any building must not exceed <del>10m</del> <u>15m</u> .	The building height should be increased to allow for 4 storeys. This will ensure development and re-development (especially of smaller sites) is economically viable for developers and allow for a range of uses making residential development viable on upper floors.	Reject	59
<b>746.57</b>	<b>The Surveying Company</b>	Oppose	Amend Rule 17.3.2 P2 Daylight admission as follows: Buildings must not protrude through a height control plane rising at an angle of <del>37</del> <u>45</u> degrees commencing at an elevation of 2.5m above ground level at every point of the site boundary.	It is inconsistent with previous planning documents which are less restrictive. it is too restrictive for urban areas. Adequate amenity and daylight for adjoining sites can be achieved with a less restrictive control plane. The 37 degree angle is difficult to calculate.	Reject Accept	60

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
<b>746.58</b>	<b>The Surveying Company</b>	Support	Add a new permitted activity (P19) to Rule 18.1.2 (Permitted Activities) as follows: <u>P19 Multi-unit development of up to five units complying with the conditions</u> AND Add the conditions in Rule 18.1.3 RD1 as activity specific conditions to the new P19.	The submitter supports the provision for multi-unit housing as it gives effect to the strategic direction outlined in Section A and Chapter B 4.1. The provision for multi-unit development supports variety in the future housing stock to help achieve policies 4.1.2, 4.1.5, 4.2.16 and 4.2.17. Multi-unit development of up to five units should be a Permitted Activity to allow for infill development and avoid unnecessary Resource Consent costs and time delays where and effects can be managed through permitted standards.	Reject	75
FS1387.934	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Accept	75
<b>746.59</b>	<b>The Surveying Company</b>	Support	Delete Rule 18.1.5 NC3- Non-Complying Activities and amend to a discretionary activity as captured by Rule 18.1.4 D2 Discretionary Activities OR Amend Rule 18.1.3 RD1 Restricted Discretionary Activities to allow residential development of the ground floor where the site adjoins a Residential Zone	Provision for low rise apartments close to town centre gives effect to the directive in Policy 4.2.17(a) Enable a variety of housing types in the Residential Zone where it is connected to public reticulation, including: (i)Integrated residential development such as low-rise apartments and multi-unit development; (ii)Retirement villages. Residential development at ground floor level may be an appropriate design response to the context of the site and surrounding area. Where buildings adjoin the residential zone, residential ground floor activities may be an appropriate design response.	Reject	78
FS1078.41	Hugh Green Limited	Support	Generally consistent with relief sought by HGL.	The submission is allowed if the alternative relief by HGL (392.13 and .15) is disallowed.	Reject	78
FS1387.935	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither</i>	Accept	78

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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>		
986.117	Pam Butler on behalf of KiwiRail Holdings Limited (KiwiRail)	Neutral/Amend	<p>Amend Rule 17.2.7.2 PI Signs – Effects on traffic as follows (or similar amendments to achieve the requested relief): (a) Any sign directed at road land transport users must: ... (iii)Not obstruct sight lines of drivers turning into or out of a site entrance and intersections or at a level crossing; AND Any consequential amendments to link and/or accommodate the requested changes.</p>	<p>• 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.</p>	Accept	56
986.118	Pam Butler on behalf of KiwiRail Holdings Limited (KiwiRail)	Neutral/Amend	<p>Amend Rule 18.2.7.2 PI Signs – Effects on traffic as follows (or similar amendments to achieve the requested relief): (a) Any sign directed at road land transport users must: ... (iii)Not obstruct sight lines of drivers turning into or out of a site entrance and intersections or at a level crossing; AND Any consequential amendments to link and/or accommodate the requested changes.</p>	<p>• 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</p>	Accept	83

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				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.		