

Further Submission Form

In support of, or in opposition to, submission/s on notified:

| ECM Project: PDP2022V003-04 |
|-----------------------------|
| ECM # |
| FS # |
| Customer # |
| Property # |
| |

Enabling Housing Supply Variation 3 to the Proposed Waikato District Plan

Clause 8 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991

Closing date for further submissions: 19 December 2022

To submit electronically please email: districtplan@waidc.govt.nz

| I. Further Submitter details: (mandatory information | in) | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Full name of individual/organisation making further submission: | | | | | | | |
| Contact person (if different from above) | | | | | | | |
| Email address for service | | | | | | | |
| Postal address for service | | | | | | | |
| | Postcode: 1024 | | | | | | |
| Preferred method of contact | Email Post | | | | | | |
| Phone numbers | Daytime: | | | | | | |
| | Mobile: | | | | | | |
| Correspondence to | Submitter Contact person Both | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| 2. Eligibility to make a further submission (for in | nformation on this section go to RMA Schedule 1, clause 8) | | | | | | |
| A person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest; In this case, also specify below the grounds for saying that you come within this category; or A person who has an interest in the proposal greater than the interest that the general public has. In this case, also specify below the grounds for saying that you come within this category; or A local authority itself. In this case, also specify below the grounds for saying that you come within this category; or | | | | | | | |
| My reasons for selecting the category ticked above are: | | | | | | | |
| 3. Request to be heard at a hearing | | | | | | | |
| Yes, I wish to be heard at the hearing in support of my further submission; or | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| No, I do not wish to be heard at the hearing in support of my further submission | | | | | | | |

| 4. Joint submission |
|--|
| If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing |
| yes no |
| |
| 5. Checklist for further submission being made |
| I have filled in the table on the next page with details of my further submission. |
| I have added further pages/sheets that form part of my further submission. |
| I understand that I am responsible for serving a copy of my further submission on the original submitter(s) within 5 working days after it is served on Council. |
| |
| 6. Signature of further submitter (a signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means) |
| Signature of further submitter (or person authorised to sign on their behalf) |
| A.C. II. AARIII. |
| Signature: Marika Williams Date: |
| (type name if submitting electronically) |
| 7. Between this forms we letter them 10 December 2022 how |
| 7. Return this form no later than 19 December 2022 by: |
| Delivery to any Waikato District Council office or library |
| Post to Waikato District Council, Private Bag 544, Ngaruawahia 3742 |
| Email to districtplan@waidc.govt.nz |

8. Important notes to person making a further submission:

A. Content of further submission

A further submission must be limited to a matter in support of, or in opposition to, an original submission.

A further submission cannot introduce new matters that were not raised in original submissions.

Please note that your further submission (or part of your further submission) may be struck out if the authority is satisfied that at least one of the following applies to the further submission (or part of the further submission):

- it is frivolous or vexatious
- it discloses no reasonable or relevant case
- it would be an abuse of the hearing process to allow the further submission (or the part) to be taken further
- it contains offensive language
- it is supported only by material that purports to be independent expert evidence, but has been prepared by a person who is not independent or who does not have sufficient specialised knowledge or skill to give expert advice on the matter.

B. Serving a copy of your further submission

A copy of your further submission must be served on the original submitter within 5 working days after it is served on Council.

C. Privacy Information

Council will make all further submissions, including name and contact details, publicly available on Council's website. Personal information will also be used for the administration of the submission process and will be made public.

| The specific su | The specific submission(s) on Variation 3 to the Proposed Waikato District Plan that this further submission relates to: | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|--|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Name of original submitter | Address of original submitter | Original Submitter number | Original submission point number/s | Support or Oppose | Reasons for my support or opposition are | I seek that the whole (or part [describe part]) of the submission be allowed (or disallowed) Give precise details | | |
| <u>Example</u> | <u>Example</u> | <u>Example</u> | <u>Example</u> | <u>Example</u> | <u>Example</u> | <u>Example</u> | | |
| John Smith | 15 Galileo St Ngaruawahia | 200 | 200.1 | Support | It is important that | I seek that the whole of the submission be allowed. | | |
| Please see attached submission. | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |



Form 6

Clause 8 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991

19 December 2022

To Waikato District Council (Council)

Further submitter details:

Ryman Healthcare Limited (*Ryman*)

Ryman made a submission on Council's proposed amendments to the Decisions Version of the Proposed Waikato District Plan (*Proposed Plan*) Variation 3 – Enabling Housing Supply (*Variation 3*).

Introduction

1 This is a further submission on Variation 3.

Interest in the submissions

- 2 Ryman represents a relevant aspect of the public interest and has an interest in Variation 3 greater than the general public for a number of reasons, including (without limitation):
 - a. Ryman has a significant interest in how the Proposed Plan, including the amendments proposed by Variation 3, provides for retirement village and aged care provision in the Waikato District, given the existing and predicted demand for such accommodation in the region.
 - b. Ryman wishes to ensure that the District Plan, and the amendments proposed by Variation 3, appropriately provide for retirement villages and all related activities so that the Proposed Plan enables proportionate, flexible, efficient and effective consenting processes.
 - c. Retirement villages make a substantial contribution to housing and healthcare for older people in the region, providing for the social and economic wellbeing of communities. Ryman's ability to provide villages that contribute to the social and economic wellbeing of the Waikato District will depend on the reasonableness and appropriateness of the Proposed Plan provisions, including amendments proposed by Variation 3.
 - d. Given Ryman's history, operations and current activities, Ryman has specialist experience and expertise relevant to determining the merits of the Proposed Plan provisions, including amendments proposed by Variation 3.

e. Ryman made a submission on Variation 3.

Decisions sought

- The decisions sought are detailed in the table **attached** to this form as **Appendix 1**.
- 4 Ryman has not referenced all original submissions it supports or opposes on the basis that its own submission is clear as to what Ryman seeks for retirement villages in the region. To the extent that other submissions seek relief which "challenges the relief sought" in Ryman's primary submission (i.e. new or amended provisions that are inconsistent with or in conflict with Ryman's submission), Ryman generally opposes those submissions. To the extent that other submissions seek relief which aligns with Ryman's primary submission, Ryman supports those submissions.

Request to be heard in support of further submission

- 5 Ryman wishes to be heard in support of its further submission.
- 6 If others make a similar submission, Ryman will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing.

Matthew Brown

NZ Development Manager Ryman Healthcare Limited matthew.brown@rymanhealthcare.com

Address for service of submitter: Ryman Healthcare Limited c/- Luke Hinchey Chapman Tripp Level 34 15 Customs Street West PO Box 2206 Auckland 1140

Email address: luke.hinchey@chapmantripp.com / marika.williams@chapmantripp.com

APPENDIX 1 - FURTHER SUBMISSION ON BEHALF OF RYMAN

| Name of original submitter | Address of original submitter | Original Submitter number | Original submission point number/s | Support or Oppose | Reasons for my support or opposition are | I seek that the whole (or part [describe part]) of the submission be allowed (or disallowed) Give precise details |
|-------------------------------|--|---------------------------------|--|----------------------|--|--|
| Waikato Regional Council | Katrina. Andrews@ waikatoregion.govt. nz | 42 | 42.4 | Support in part | The submitter seeks to strengthen the objectives and policies to address transportation matters, such as enabling and prioritising walking, cycling, micro-mobility and public transport and integration with land use to reduce the need to travel. Ryman does not oppose this submission point in principle, but due to the age and frequency of mobility constraints amongst retirement village residents, Ryman considers that the relief sought should not apply to retirement villages. | Allow submission point, subject to excluding retirement villages from the application of any new provisions. |
| KiwiRail | michelle.grinlinton- hancock@kiwirail.c o.nz | 54 | 54.2 | Oppose | The submitter seeks to include a new provision for a vibration performance standard. Ryman acknowledges that acoustic insulation for the purpose of noise and vibration controls may be appropriate in some areas located within or adjacent to a railway boundary with a purpose of providing protection / amenity to residents in such areas. Ryman considers however that such requirements need to be determined on a case-by-case basis, with consideration given to the distance of noise sensitive activities, rather than from the boundaries. | Disallow submission point. |

| KiwiRail | michelle.grinlinton- hancock@kiwirail.c o.nz | 54 | 54.8, 54.10 | Oppose | The submitter seeks to amend MRZ2-O6 and MRZ2-P11 to include managing the design of buildings, including the use of acoustic insulation, ventilation and vibration measures. Ryman acknowledges that acoustic insulation for the purpose of noise and vibration controls may be appropriate in some areas located within or adjacent to a railway boundary with a purpose of providing protection / amenity to residents in such areas. Ryman considers however that such requirements need to be determined on a case-by-case basis, with consideration given to the distance of noise sensitive activities, rather than from the boundaries. | Disallow submission point. |
|---------------------------|--|----|----------------|-----------------|--|---|
| Ministry of Education | danielle.rogers@bec a.com | 60 | 60.4, 60.11 | Support in part | The submitter seeks to include a new objective that residential development is supported by educational facilities. Ryman does not oppose the relief in principle but seeks for retirement villages to be excluded from this provision, which is not relevant to retirement villages. | Allow submission point subject to excluding retirement villages from the application of this provision. |
| Classic Group Holdings | libby.gosling@classic developments.co.nz | 62 | 62.1 | Support | The submitter seeks to amend the definition of "landscaped area" to ensure consistency with the MDRS. Ryman supports the relief sought as it will aid clarity in the Plan. | Allow submission point. |
| J and A Whetu | james@whetugroup. co.nz | 70 | 70.1 | Oppose | The submitter seeks to amend the Medium Residential Zone 2 to include a new objective, policy and rule that protects the privacy and amenity of properties located adjacent to new developments. Ryman opposes the relief sought as it is inconsistent with the NPSUD and Enabling Housing Act. | Disallow submission point. |
| Jodie Bell | jodibell824@icloud.co m | 71 | 71.2, 71.3 | Oppose | The submitter seeks to include a new rule which removes the ability to create common walls between housing unless they adjoin non-habitable garaging at ground level. Ryman opposes the relief sought as it is inconsistent with the MDRS. | Disallow submission point. |

| Laura Kellaway and Bryan Windeatt | laurakellaway121@gmail.com | 75 | 75.4, 75.9 | Oppose | The submitter seeks to include urban design rules, including the MFE urban design guides and restricted discretionary rules to include design and character. Ryman opposes the relief sought, noting that the MFE Design Guidelines do not provide for / recognise the unique functional and operational needs of retirement villages, which are different to that of other residential developments. The relief sought is inconsistent with the purpose of the Enabling Housing Act and NPSUD. | Disallow submission point. |
|---|--------------------------------|----|------------|--------|---|----------------------------|
| Laura Kellaway and Bryan Windeatt | laurakellaway121@gmail.com | 75 | 75.5 | Oppose | The submitter seeks to include a buffer adjacent to historic heritage and potential historic areas of the 4 towns as a qualifying matter. Ryman opposes the relief sought as qualifying matters relating to historic heritage are adequately addressed in Variation 3. | Disallow submission point. |
| Laura Kellaway and Bryan Windeatt | laurakellaway121@gmail.com | 75 | 75.7 | Oppose | The submitter seeks to include new rules in the residential zone relating to amenity, including privacy, shadowing, car parking, setbacks and landscaping. Ryman opposes the relief sought as it is inconsistent with the Enabling Housing Act. | Disallow submission point. |
| Laura Kellaway and Bryan Windeatt | laurakellaway121@gmail.com | 75 | 75.11 | Oppose | The submitter seeks to include a new rule that if more than 10% of a street is under redevelopment, there should be a neighbourhood infrastructure plan in place. Ryman opposes the relief sought as it is inconsistent with the purpose of the Enabling Housing Act, and other provisions of the Proposed Plan adequately deal with infrastructure matters. | Disallow submission point. |
| Laura Kellaway and Bryan Windeatt | laurakellaway121@ gmail.com | 75 | 75.14 | Oppose | The submitter seeks to add a cumulative assessment rule when 3x3 proposals exceed 20% of the street. Ryman opposes the relief sought as it is inconsistent with the Enabling Housing Act. | Disallow submission point. |

| Waikato District Council | keri.davis- miller@waidc.govt. nz | 76 | 76.2 | Oppose | The submitter seeks to amend Variation 3 to give greater consideration to the urban design outcomes of development and growth enabled by Variation 3. While it is unclear what relief is sought, Ryman opposes any relief that is inconsistent with the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD, or that does not recognise and provide for the functional and operational needs of retirement villages. | Disallow submission point. |
|-----------------------------|---|----|-------|--------|---|----------------------------|
| Ngāti Naho Trust | haydn@ngatinaho.c om | 83 | 83.5 | Oppose | The submitter seeks to apply a 1.2km buffer zone along the Waikato River, Lake Waikare, and the Whangamarino and Mangatawhiri wetlands that excludes any medium or high-density housing. Ryman opposes the relief sought as restrictions on housing development should only be to the extent necessary to accommodate a qualifying matter. | Disallow submission point. |
| Ngāti Naho Trust | haydn@ngatinaho.c om | 83 | 83.12 | Oppose | The submitter seeks to increase the requirement for green spaces on a property and increase the distance and buffer zone between neighbour's boundaries. Ryman opposes the relief sought as it is inconsistent with the Enabling Housing Act. | Disallow submission point. |
| Ngāti Naho Trust | haydn@ngatinaho.c om | 83 | 83.12 | Oppose | The submitter seeks to include the prevention of multi- storey dwellings being constructed close to boundaries and the implementation of low impact design builds. Ryman opposes the relief sought as it is inconsistent with the Enabling Housing Act. | Disallow submission point. |
| Ngāti Naho Trust | haydn@ngatinaho.c om | 83 | 83.16 | Oppose | The submitter seeks to include principles of fairness and equity provisions including to prevent the devaluation of properties, the change in character and the loss of lifestyle, outlook and surrounds. Ryman opposes the relief sought as it is inconsistent with the NPSUD and Enabling Housing Act. | Disallow submission point. |

| Ngāti Naho Trust | haydn@ngatinaho.c om | 83 | 83.20 | Oppose | The submitter seeks to add a setback from wind and solar plants of 3km to 5km from medium density housing. Ryman opposes the relief sought as restrictions on housing development should only be to the extent necessary to accommodate a qualifying matter. | Disallow submission point. |
|--|--|-----|---------------|-----------------|--|---|
| Waikato Community Lands Trust & Others | thomas@gibbonsla w.co.nz jennifer.palmer@per ry.co.nz whi@waikatohousin ginitiative.org nic.greene@habitat. org.nz kelvyn@momentum waikato.nz | 93 | 93.1 | Oppose | The submitter seeks to amend Variation 3 to include new plan provisions on inclusionary zoning and financial contributions. Ryman oppose the relief sought as it is inconsistent with the financial contributions regime under the RMA. | Disallow submission point. |
| Kāinga Ora | developmentplannin g@kaingaora.govt.n Z | 106 | 106.2 | Support in part | The submitter seeks to have only one Medium Density Residential Zone in Variation 3. Ryman does not oppose the relief sought but seeks that the retirement village-specific framework sought in its primary submission for MRZ2 be applied in any new MRZ. | Allow submission point, subject to the relief sought in Ryman's primary submission. |
| Kāinga Ora | developmentplannin g@kaingaora.govt.n z | 106 | 106.4 | Support in part | The submitter seeks to add a new High Density Residential Zone chapter. Ryman supports the relief sought subject to the relief sought in Ryman's primary submission, i.e. that a retirement village-specific planning framework be applied in any new High Density Residential Zone. | Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought in Ryman's primary submission. |
| Kāinga Ora | developmentplannin g@kaingaora.govt.n z | 106 | 106.9 | Support | The submitter seeks to add a height variation control over the Huntly and Ngāruawāhia centres to enable a proportionate height of buildings to that sought within the High Density Residential Zone. Ryman supports the submission point as it is consistent with the NPSUD. | Allow submission point. |
| Waikato Tainui | kahurimu.flavell@ta inui.co.nz | 114 | 114.10-114.12 | Oppose | The submitter seeks to amend the matters of discretion for MRZ2-S1, MRZ2-S2 and MRZ2-S3 to include effects on cultural values. Ryman oppose the relief sought as restrictions on housing development should only be to the extent necessary to accommodate a qualifying matter. | Disallow the submission point. |