

APPENDIX 1 – SUMMARY OF DECISIONS REQUESTED AND RECOMMENDATIONS BY TOPIC

SUMMARY OF DECISIONS REQUESTED AND RECOMMENDATIONS BY TOPIC

Table 1 - All of Plan Change

Submission Point	Submitter name	District Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose / In Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
1/1	T M West	Not Specified	Oppose	Should council be funding a plan change submitted by a private developer, who will likely benefit from the proposed plan?	I would like answers or responses to the issues raised above. At this stage no specific wording is required as overall justification for the proposal is not evident.	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.2.2 to 4.2.5.
FS2/1	Fonterra Ltd	Not Specified	Neutral	Plan Change 14 preparation has been solely funded by Fonterra Limited. Fonterra Limited is also paying for costs associated with the processing of Plan Change 14 by Waipā District Council.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by West, Terence Maxfield (Submitter 1) and accepts the decision sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept Refer to paragraph 4.2.2 to 4.2.5.
1/2	T M West	Not Specified	Oppose	There does not appear to have been any independent assessment or report on the proposal. Council has simply relied on information and reports provided by the plan change. Given rate payers are funding the proposed change I would like to see the justification for this, and the benefits rate payers will receive from it.	I would like answers or responses to the issues raised above. At this stage no specific wording is required as overall justification for the proposal is not evident.	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.2.2 to 4.2.3 and 4.2.6.
FS2/2	Fonterra Ltd	Not Specified	Neutral	Plan Change 14 preparation has been solely funded by Fonterra Limited. Fonterra Limited is also paying for costs associated with the processing of Plan Change 14 by Waipā District Council. A comprehensive range of detailed technical reports were submitted to support Plan Change 14 including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Landscape Assessment (Appendix C) ▪ Integrated Traffic Assessment (Appendix H) ▪ Economic Assessment (Appendix I) 	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by West, Terence Maxfield (Submitter 1) and accepts the decision sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept Refer to paragraph 4.2.2 to 4.2.3 and 4.2.6.
1/3	T M West	Not Specified	Oppose	Being an area of not insignificant size, there are likely to be significant effects on the local environment. These could range from traffic volumes and flow, noise, light pollution. I don't believe it is acceptable to leave these considerations until a specific consent request is received. They need to be covered off at the outset.	I would like answers or responses to the issues raised above. At this stage no specific wording is required as overall justification for the proposal is not evident.	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.2.2 to 4.2.3 and 4.2.7.
FS2/3	Fonterra Ltd	Not Specified	Neutral	A comprehensive range of detailed technical reports were submitted to support Plan Change 14 including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Landscape Assessment (Appendix C) ▪ Integrated Traffic Assessment (Appendix H) ▪ Economic Assessment (Appendix I) 	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by West, Terence Maxfield (Submitter 1) and accepts the decision sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept Refer to paragraph 4.2.2 to 4.2.3 and 4.2.7.
1/4	T M West	Not Specified	Oppose	What is the justification for the change. Given there has been a large area of industrial land between the expressway and Hautapu Rd on the market for several years, there is hardly a shortage of this zoning.	I would like answers or responses to the issues raised above. At this stage no specific wording is required as overall justification for the proposal is not evident.	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.2.2 to 4.2.3 and 4.2.8.
FS1/1	Henmar Trust	Not Specified	Oppose	The proposed Plan Change area is located within the C10 Industrial Growth Cell and is an anticipated form of development. The rezoning of the land is not the issue, but ensuring that any actual or potential adverse environmental effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated so they are no more than minor.	Disallow submission.	Accept Refer to paragraph 4.2.2 to 4.2.3 and 4.2.8.
FS2/4	Fonterra Ltd	Not Specified	Neutral	A comprehensive range of detailed technical reports were submitted to support Plan Change 14 including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Landscape Assessment (Appendix C) ▪ Integrated Traffic Assessment (Appendix H) ▪ Economic Assessment (Appendix I) 	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by West, Terence Maxfield (Submitter 1) and accepts the decision sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept Refer to paragraph 4.2.2 to 4.2.3 and 4.2.8.
5/1	Fonterra	Not Specified	Support	Fonterra supports PC14 to ensure that sufficient supply of industrial land is available to the market. The proposed Mangaone Precinct is	Approve PC14 as notified	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.2.9.

Submission Point	Submitter name	District Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose / In Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
				located immediately adjacent to the emerging Hautapu Industrial Area within the C10 Industrial Growth Cell. As such, PC14 represents a logical addition to the industrial zoned land in the Cambridge / Hautapu area that cannot be easily duplicated elsewhere. While PC14 brings forward the anticipated timing of the land being rezoned for industrial purposes, Fonterra considers that this allows for the planning framework to be put in place without unnecessary delay. The rezoning of Mangaone Precinct from Rural Zone to Industrial Zone is supported by Fonterra. PC14 will add approximately 79.2 ha (47.6 ha net) of additional industrial capacity to the Cambridge/Hautapu market in the medium-term.		
FS1/2	Henmar Trust	Not Specified	Support in Part / Oppose in Part	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support the rezoning of Lot 2 DP 529042 comprised in RT: 856574; 2. Oppose the lack of connectivity of the proposed Plan Change with the Henmar Trust property located within C10 Industrial Growth Cell. 3. Oppose lack of consideration of any actual or potential adverse environmental effects on adjoining properties and on the adjoining Rural Zone. 4. Oppose the rezoning of Section 4, 7 Survey Office Plan 499872 comprised in Record of Title 811702 and Section 1 Survey Office Plan 499872 comprised in Record of Title 805561, known as the Kiwifruit Block. 5. The proposed plan change in its current form is considered to be contrary to the objectives and policies of the Waipa District Plan. 6. The proposed Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area and the Bardowie Industrial Precinct Area are considered to be located in a sensitive location, therefore careful and detailed consideration needs to be given to the activities that the District Plan should enable to establish and operate in the proposed Industrial Precinct. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the proposed Mangaone Precinct and the Bardowie Industrial Precinct provide traffic and service connectivity to the Henmar Trust property located within the C10 Growth Cell. 2. The Proposed Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan provides roading and service connections to the Henmar Trust property. 3. That Section 4, 7 Survey Office Plan 499872 comprised in Record of Title 811702 and Section 1 Survey Office Plan 499872 comprised in Record of Title 805561 (the Kiwifruit Block) be excluded from the Plan Change, or Technical Reports updated to include. 4. Provisions are included to address potential adverse effects on the Henmar Trust property. 5. Council alters the existing Rules and Performance Standards regarding setback, height, height in relation to boundary, noise, stormwater to ensure effects are less than minor. 6. Council accept relief sought by Henmar Trust including consequential amendments. 	Accept in Part Refer to Section 4.
6/1	Kama Trust	Not Specified	Support in Part	Conditional Support Subject to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Transport effects (construction and operation) being properly mitigated 2. Incorporation of plan provisions which protect against adverse effects on Kama Trust land 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Only approve PC14 subject to matters in the submission being satisfactorily addressed through specific plan provisions. 2. Unless issues are satisfactorily addressed, decline PC14. 	Accept in Part Refer to Section 4.2.9.
FS2/19	Fonterra Ltd	Not Specified	Oppose	Fonterra opposes the submission point 6/1 by Kama Trust. Fonterra notes that the Kama Trust property is some distance from the site subject to Plan Change 14. Plan Change 14 is supported by a comprehensive range of detailed technical reports that sufficiently assess the effects of proposed Plan Change 14 on the environment and outline mitigation measures which have been included in the proposed policies, objectives and rules for the Mangaone Precinct.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Kama Trust (Submitter 6), noting that it is not specific in any event, and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to Section 4.2.9.
6/3	Kama Trust	Not Specified	Support in Part	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Impact on C9 Growth Cell if development enabled under PC14 is able to progress before roading infrastructure upgrades have been completed. 2. Impact on C9 Growth Cell if development is enabled to occur under PC14 prior to electricity network upgrades occurring. 	Add staging provisions to ensure that: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the necessary infrastructure is in place prior to any development enabled by PC14 commencing; and 2. that this infrastructure has adequate capacity available to service that development. 	Accept in Part Refer to paragraphs 4.2.10 to 4.2.13.
FS1/4	Henmar Trust	Not Specified	Oppose	Consider this submission to be based on trade competition. The Kama Trust property that has recently been rezoned to Industrial from Rural,	Dismiss submission.	Reject Kama Trust has raised

Submission Point	Submitter name	District Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose / In Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
				was not located within any future Industrial (or other) growth cell, warranting the need for staging provisions. The proposed Plan Change area is located within the C10 Industrial Growth Cell and is an anticipated form of development. The rezoning of the land is not the issue but ensuring that any actual or potential adverse environmental effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated so they are less than minor. The provision of services is an issue for the developer and Council as part of any future development agreement.		legitimate concerns regarding potential adverse effects on the environment relating to amenity, transport and stormwater, and therefore their submission is not considered to be 'trade competition'.
FS2/21	Fonterra Ltd	Not Specified	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 6/3 by the Kama Trust seeking to add staging provision to Plan Change 14. Plan Change 14 is supported by a comprehensive range of detailed technical reports. The findings of these technical reports do not require staging considerations of other to manage environment effects including traffic and infrastructure demand. These technical reports sufficiently assess the effects of proposed Plan Change 14 on the environment and outline mitigation measures which have been included in the proposed policies, objectives and rules for the Mangaone Precinct.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Kama Trust (Submitter 6) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraphs 4.2.10 to 4.2.13.
6/6	Kama Trust	Not Specified	Support in Part	Concerned about adverse amenity effects on Kama Trust land arising under PC14.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Appropriate provisions to mitigate any adverse amenity effects arising under PC14. 2. Any such consequential relief necessary to give effect to this submission. 	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.2.14.
FS2/24	Fonterra Ltd	Not Specified	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 6/6 by the Kama Trust. The relief sought to address amenity concerns is vague. Plan Change 14 is supported by a comprehensive range of detailed technical reports that sufficiently assess the effects of proposed Plan Change 14 on the environment including amenity effects and outline mitigation measures which have been included in the proposed policies, objectives and rules for the Mangaone Precinct.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Kama Trust (Submitter 6) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept Refer to paragraph 4.2.14.
7/1	Bardowie Investments Ltd	Not Specified	Support in Part	Support subject to incorporating plan provisions which protect against adverse effects on BIL land, including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Adverse amenity effects are appropriately mitigated, including in relation to dust, noise, odour and urban design 2. Adverse effects on transport network are appropriately mitigated. 	Approve PC14 subject to the above matters being satisfactorily addressed through plan provisions.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.2.9.
FS1/7	Henmar Trust	Not Specified	Oppose	Oppose the rezoning of Kiwifruit Block.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Dismiss submission; or 2. If the Kiwifruit Block were to be rezoned require that; <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (i) It would need to be assessed by the Technical Reports and these would need to be notified for public submission, including stormwater. (ii) It would need transport connectivity to the Mangaone Industrial Precinct. Traffic within the C10 Industrial Growth Cell should be able to move freely between the Industrial Precincts, not a series of rabbit warrens restricted by property/ownership boundaries. (iii) It would need to share the heavy vehicle access off Swayne Road that it currently enjoys sole access to, with the other Industrial Precincts within the C10 Industrial Growth Cell. 3. Accept the relief sought by Henmar Trust. 4. Make amendments to any other provisions within the Waipa District Plan and/or proposed Plan Change 14 linked to the relief sought by the 	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.2.9.

Submission Point	Submitter name	District Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose / In Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
					submitter, Henmar Trust, including any cross references in other chapters, be undertaken. 5. Undertake any further relief that is considered necessary to give effect to the relief sought by the submitter, Henmar Trust, be undertaken.	
FS2/25	Fonterra Ltd	Not Specified	Neutral	Fonterra notes the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A comprehensive range of detailed technical reports were submitted to support Plan Change 14. These technical reports sufficiently assess the effects of proposed Plan Change 14 on the environment including amenity effects and outline mitigation measures which have been included in the proposed policies, objectives and rules for the Mangaone Precinct. Existing noise regulations are contained within the Waipā District Plan and Plan Change 14 does not modify these other than amending the first sentence of Rule 7.4.2.20 (specifying noise limits) Any activities which require an air discharge permit from Waikato Regional Council is required to obtain a land use consent from Waipā District Council, as required by the proposed amendment to Rule 7.4.1.3(f). 	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Bardowie Investments Ltd (Submitter 7), which is not specific in any event, and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.2.9.
10/1	Waikato Regional Council	Not Specified	Oppose	At the commencement date of the NPS-HPL, the land subject to PC14 did not meet either of the exemptions under Clause 3.5(7)(b). Therefore, the site meets the transitional definition of highly productive land under Clause 3.5(7) and the NPS-HPL applies to the proposed plan change. We acknowledge that the plan change application does, for completeness, include an assessment of the NPS-HPL. However, we consider the application does not currently provide sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the proposed plan change gives effect to Clause 3.6 of the NPS-HPL relating to urban rezoning.	Ensure PC14 is adequately assessed against the NPS-HPL, due to the plan change site meeting the transitional definition for highly productive land under Clause 3.5(7).	Reject Refer to paragraphs 4.2.15 to 4.2.19.
FS2/73	Fonterra Ltd	Not Specified	Oppose	Fonterra opposes the submission point 10/1 by Waikato Regional Council. Plan Change 14 is supported by a comprehensive range of detailed technical reports that sufficiently assess the effects of proposed Plan Change 14 on the environment and outline mitigation measures which have been included in the proposed policies, objectives and rules for the Mangaone Precinct.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Waikato Regional Council (Submitter 10) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraphs 4.2.15 to 4.2.19.
10/23	Waikato Regional Council	Not Specified	Neutral	It appears that a number of the farm drainage canals on the plan change site are piped at their point of entry to the Mangaone Stream. We recommend there is open access from the drains/wetlands to the Mangaone Stream, with no perches (if these are perched) so that fish can freely travel between habitats. Ideally, this would include removing the pipes if possible.	Ensure that the future design of the proposed reserve and stormwater network provides open access from the drains/wetlands to the Mangaone Stream to provide for fish passage.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.2.20.
FS1/17	Henmar Trust	Not Specified	Neutral	The requirement for fish passage should not take precedent over ensuring that there is no downstream flooding and/or contaminants entering the Mangaone Stream.	That Council prioritise the protection of downstream properties, in particular the adjoining Henmar Trust property, from flooding and/or contaminants entering the Mangaone Stream.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.2.20.
FS2/87	Fonterra Ltd	Not Specified	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 10/23 by Waikato Regional Council. Fonterra considers that the proposed stormwater system is appropriate for the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan as it is supported by:	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Waikato Regional Council (Submitter 10) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.2.20.

Submission Point	Submitter name	District Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose / In Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ecological Values and Effects Assessment including Bats (Appendix D1) Civil Infrastructure Assessment (Appendix F) Stormwater Management Plan (Appendix G) 		
13/2	Geoffrey and Beverly Laurent	Not Specified	Further Assessment	We are concerned that there has been no consideration given to staging of development within PC14 as part of the proposal, with respect to the transport infrastructure upgrades required, the proposal appears to be assessed on a 2041 future with full development in place. This leaves significant uncertainty as to what road network and intersection upgrades will be needed, when, and how that might affect established businesses at that time. This matter is of particular concern in relation to Laurent Road which currently provides access to our land and businesses already established on it.	Caveats to when development can occur based on transportation requirements.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraphs 4.2.10 to 4.2.12.
FS1/24	Henmar Trust	Not Specified	Oppose	<p>The submitter's property is located within the Industrial Zone and forms part of Industrial Growth Cell C10. The submitters supported proposed PC11 which rezoned their property and reinstated the Industrial Growth Cell.</p> <p>The proposed Plan Change Area is part of the C10 Industrial Growth Cell, and the proposed Plan Change is an anticipated form of development, including the associated traffic effects.</p> <p>It is anticipated that Council will ensure that any existing business will continue to have access while enabling the continued development of the C10 Industrial Growth Cell.</p> <p>The development of the C10 Industrial Growth Cell cannot be restricted to cater for this existing business, as this could be seen as Trade Competition.</p> <p>Provided the transport network enables connectivity within the C10 Growth Cell, and is well designed, future development within the C10 Industrial Growth Cell would have minimal/if any effect on the local and wider transport network due its ideal location next to the Waikato Expressway and the Hautapu Interchange.</p>	Dismiss submission	Reject Refer to paragraphs 4.2.10 to 4.2.12.
FS2/114	Fonterra Ltd	Not Specified	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission points 13/1 and 13/2 by Laurent Property Co, Geoffrey and Beverly Laurent. As a detailed Integrated Traffic Assessment (ITA) (Appendix H) was submitted with Plan Change 14. It's also noted that New Zealand Transport Agency Waka Kotahi has reviewed and accepted this report. Fonterra considers that there is no need for further traffic effects assessment or restriction of development.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Laurent Property Co, Geoffrey and Beverly Laurent (Submitter 13) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraphs 4.2.10 to 4.2.12.
14/1	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Not Specified	In Part	It is critical for Fire and Emergency that water supply infrastructure is in place prior to any development commencing and that this water supply has adequate capacity and pressures available to service the future developments. In the urban areas of the district water is supplied via the reticulated water supply network. As outlined in Section 4.3 of the application, PPC14 proposes that the Cambridge Urban Limits Boundary which denotes the 'urban limit' area within the Waipā District Plan, is extended to encompass the PPC14 area. Fire and Emergency support the extension of the urban limit to include the PPC14 area, as this will ensure that the existing firefighting water supply provisions within Section 15 – Infrastructure, Hazards, Development and	<p>1. Council accepts the extension of the 'urban limit' within the planning maps to include the PPC14 area.</p> <p>If this component of PPC14 is not accepted, a new policy framework for the provision of firefighting water supply in accordance with SNZ PAS 4509:2008 and specific to the PPC14 area is requested.</p>	Accept Refer to paragraph 4.2.21.

Submission Point	Submitter name	District Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose / In Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
				Subdivision of the Waipā District Plan apply to the PPC14 area.		
FS1/25	Henmar Trust	Not Specified	Support	Agree with the submission.	Accept submission.	Accept Refer to paragraph 4.2.21.
FS2/115	Fonterra Ltd	Not Specified	Support	Fonterra supports submission point 14/1 by Fire and Emergency New Zealand as Plan Change 14 is the rezoning of land from rural to industrial which pushes out the urban boundary limit.	That the Council adopts relief point 1 sought by Fire and Emergency New Zealand (Submitter 14) being: <i>“Council accepts the extension of the ‘urban limit’ within the planning maps to include the PPC14 area.”</i>	Accept Refer to paragraph 4.2.21.

Table 2 - Bats

Submission Point	Submitter name	District Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose / In Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
10/10	Waikato Regional Council	Appendix S27	Support	We support the proposed creation of the Mangaone Stream Reserve to protect the riparian margins of the Mangaone Stream and protect and enhance identified bat habitat on the plan change site. We highlight the importance of retaining the proposed size of the reserve and buffer around the identified High Value Bat Habitat Area to maintain the functionality of the reserve area as habitat for long-tailed bats given the proposed development of the remainder of the plan change site for industrial activities.	Retain the proposed extent of the Mangaone Stream Reserve on the structure plan, including the buffer around the identified High Value Bat Habitat Area.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.3.2.
10/11	Waikato Regional Council	Appendix S27	In Part	We support the identification of the High Value Bat Habitat Area on the proposed Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan. We note this area is referred to in the proposed provisions (e.g. Assessment criteria 21.1.1.20), however the structure plan does not provide an explanation/definition of this area. To aid in the assessment of future resource consent applications, we consider it would be useful for Appendix S27 to provide a description of the High Value Bat Habitat Area and its purpose/function.	Add a description of the High Value Bat Habitat Area and its purpose/function to Appendix S27 - Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan.	Accept Refer to paragraph 4.3.3.
FS2/79	Fonterra Ltd	Appendix S27	Support	Fonterra supports submission point 10/11 by Waikato Regional Council for the reasons set out in their primary submission.	That the Council adopts the relief sought by Waikato Regional Council (Submitter 10) in relation to 10/11.	Accept Refer to paragraph 4.3.3.
10/12	Waikato Regional Council	7.3	In Part	Given that the plan change proposes a number of rules to manage adverse effects on long-tailed bats, as recommended by Bluewattle Ecology, we consider an objective and policy relating to the protection and enhancement of long-tailed bats and their habitat should also be added for the Mangaone Precinct.	Add an objective relating to the protection and enhancement of long-tailed bats and their habitat within the Mangaone Precinct.	Accept Refer to paragraphs 4.3.4 to 4.3.6.
FS2/80	Fonterra Ltd	7.3	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 10/12 by Waikato Regional Council. There are existing provisions within the Waipā District Plan that already cover off Flora and Fauna outcomes. Fonterra does not consider it essential to provide objectives and policies for each individual species as it may lead to a planning document requiring provisions for every specific Flora and Fauna within the Waipā District. The proposed is unnecessary granularity, to the exclusion of other species which are also important.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Waikato Regional Council (Submitter 10) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Reject Refer to paragraphs 4.3.4 to 4.3.6.
10/13	Waikato Regional Council	7.3	In Part	We suggest the policy should include reference to the measures recommended by Bluewattle Ecology to address adverse effects on long-tailed bats, including minimising light intensity and spill.	Add a policy relating to the protection and enhancement of long-tailed bats and their habitat within the Mangaone Precinct.	Accept Refer to paragraphs 4.3.4 to 4.3.6.
10/20	Waikato	21.1.1.20	In Part	We support proposed Assessment criteria 21.1.1.20 relating to adverse	Retain Assessment criteria 21.1.1.20.	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter name	District Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose / In Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
	Regional Council			effects on the ecological values of the High Value Bat Habitat Area from light intensity and light spill.		
10/21	Waikato Regional Council	21.1.1	In Part	We recommend considering whether any other assessment criteria are required to ensure adverse effects on long-tailed bats and their habitat are appropriately considered in the assessment of resource consent applications within the Mangaone Precinct.	Consider whether any further assessment criteria are required in relation to long-tailed bats and their habitat.	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.3.11.
FS2/85	Fonterra Ltd	21.1.1	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 10/21 by Waikato Regional Council. There are two comprehensive ecological assessments that include bats supporting Plan Change 14 being: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ecological Values and Effects Assessment including Bats) (Appendix D1) Bat Management Provisions (Appendix D2) Particularly, the advice provided by Gerry Kessels of Bluewattle Ecology includes learnings from other plan changes within the Waikato region which identified bats habitats.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Waikato Regional Council (Submitter 10) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.3.11.
10/22	Waikato Regional Council	21.2.7.1	In Part	We generally support the proposed information requirements for the Mangaone Stream Reserve Management Plan, including the specific assessment criteria in relation to the High Value Bat Habitat Area. In regard to proposed clause a., as stated in point 22 [10/10] above, we seek to ensure that the extent of the Mangaone Reserve remains consistent with that shown on the proposed Structure Plan, given that this is based on one of the recommendations of Bluewattle Ecology to address adverse effects on long-tailed bats and their habitat.	Retain but amend a. to ensure the area and extent of the reserve is in accordance with that shown on the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.3.2.
FS2/86	Fonterra Ltd	21.2.7.1	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 10/22 by Waikato Regional Council. The proposed changes to Rule 15.4.2.69 already requires that any subdivision or development (as relevant) is in general accordance with the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan in Appendix S27. Fonterra considers that it is not practical to require any subdivision or development (as relevant) be “in accordance” as being 1mm out would technically mean that the proposed activity does not meet the requirement resulting in unnecessary future consenting issues.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Waikato Regional Council (Submitter 10) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to Paragraph 4.3.2.
12/1	Director-General of Conservation	Appendix S27	Support	Long-tailed bats are New Zealand’s only native mammal. They have the highest threat classification of Threatened - Nationally Critical based on the New Zealand Threat Classification System (NZTCS). Long-tailed bats are Absolutely Protected under the Wildlife Act 1953. The Ecological Values and Effects Assessment and bio-acoustic bat surveys undertaken by Bluewattle Ecology identify that long-tailed bats are using the PC14 site as foraging or commuting habitat and that the site contains potential bat roost habitat. I support the proposed creation of the Mangaone Stream Reserve to protect the riparian margins of the Mangaone Stream and protect and enhance identified bat habitat within the PC14 site.	Retain the proposed extent of the Mangaone Stream Reserve as depicted on the structure plan and described in the supporting documentation, including the buffer around the identified High Value Bat Habitat Area.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.3.2.
FS3/1	Forest & Bird	Appendix S27	Support	Forest & Bird supports all parts of the submission that support identification, management and monitoring of High Value Bat Habitat Areas, the mitigation and avoidance of impacts on bats, and the contribution to better outcomes for indigenous biodiversity.	The whole of the submission be allowed.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.3.2.
12/2	Director-General of	Appendix S27	In Part	PC14 provides for a “High Value Bat Habitat Area” and several rules to manage effects on long-tailed bats and their habitat, as recommended in the memorandum prepared by Blue Wattle Ecology (Appendix D2).	Add a description of the High Value Bat Habitat Area and its purpose/function to Appendix S27 - Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan.	Accept Refer to paragraph 4.3.3.

Submission Point	Submitter name	District Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose / In Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
	Conservation			I consider amendment to Issue 7.2.11 or a new Resource Management Issue should be added to address effects on ecology and bat habitat values. This issue should also be addressed in Objective 7.3.4 and either by a new policy or by amendment to policy 7.3.4.11 to require protection and enhancement of long-tailed bat habitat values. It is noted activities breaching the rules intended to mitigate effects on bats will require consent for discretionary or non-complying activity. Assessment of these activities would therefore benefit from appropriate policy direction on bats and ecology.		
FS2/103	Fonterra Ltd	Appendix S27	Support	Fonterra supports submission point 12/2 by Director-General of Conservation.	That the Council adopts the relief sought by Director-General of Conservation (Submitter 12) for submission point 12/2.	Accept Refer to paragraph 4.3.3.
FS3/2	Forest & Bird	Appendix S27	Support	Forest & Bird supports all parts of the submission that support identification, management and monitoring of High Value Bat Habitat Areas, the mitigation and avoidance of impacts on bats, and the contribution to better outcomes for indigenous biodiversity.	The whole of the submission be allowed.	Accept Refer to paragraph 4.3.3.
12/3	Director-General of Conservation	7.2	In Part	PC14 provides for a “High Value Bat Habitat Area” and several rules to manage effects on long-tailed bats and their habitat, as recommended in the memorandum prepared by Blue Wattle Ecology (Appendix D2). I consider amendment to Issue 7.2.11 or a new Resource Management Issue should be added to address effects on ecology and bat habitat values. This issue should also be addressed in Objective 7.3.4 and either by a new policy or by amendment to policy 7.3.4.11 to require protection and enhancement of long-tailed bat habitat values. It is noted activities breaching the rules intended to mitigate effects on bats will require consent for discretionary or non-complying activity. Assessment of these activities would therefore benefit from appropriate policy direction on bats and ecology.	Add a resource management issue that addresses ecology to provide for protection and enhancement of long-tailed bat habitat values.	Accept Refer to paragraph 4.3.7.
FS2/104	Fonterra Ltd	7.2	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission points 12/3, 12/4 and 12/5 by Director-General of Conservation. There are existing provisions within the Waipā District Plan that already cover off Flora and Fauna outcomes. Fonterra does not consider it essential to provide objectives and policies for each individual species as it may lead to a planning document requiring provisions for every specific Flora and Fauna within the Waipā District. The proposed is unnecessary granularity, to the exclusion of other species which are also important.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Director-General of Conservation (Submitter 12) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.3.7.
FS3/3	Forest & Bird	7.2	Support	Forest & Bird supports all parts of the submission that support identification, management and monitoring of High Value Bat Habitat Areas, the mitigation and avoidance of impacts on bats, and the contribution to better outcomes for indigenous biodiversity.	The whole of the submission be allowed.	Accept Refer to paragraph 4.3.7.
12/4	Director-General of Conservation	7.3	In Part	PC14 provides for a “High Value Bat Habitat Area” and several rules to manage effects on long-tailed bats and their habitat, as recommended in the memorandum prepared by Blue Wattle Ecology (Appendix D2). I consider amendment to Issue 7.2.11 or a new Resource Management Issue should be added to address effects on ecology and bat habitat values. This issue should also be addressed in Objective 7.3.4 and either by a new policy or by amendment to policy 7.3.4.11 to require protection and enhancement of long-tailed bat habitat values. It is noted activities breaching the rules intended to mitigate effects on bats will require consent for discretionary or non-complying activity.	Add an objective to provide for protection and enhancement of long-tailed bat habitat values.	Accept Refer to paragraphs 4.3.4 to 4.3.6.

Submission Point	Submitter name	District Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose / In Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
				Assessment of these activities would therefore benefit from appropriate policy direction on bats and ecology.		
FS2/105	Fonterra Ltd	7.3	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission points 12/3, 12/4 and 12/5 by Director-General of Conservation. There are existing provisions within the Waipā District Plan that already cover off Flora and Fauna outcomes. Fonterra does not consider it essential to provide objectives and policies for each individual species as it may lead to a planning document requiring provisions for every specific Flora and Fauna within the Waipā District. The proposed is unnecessary granularity, to the exclusion of other species which are also important.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Director-General of Conservation (Submitter 12) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Reject Refer to paragraphs 4.3.4 to 4.3.6.
FS3/4	Forest & Bird	7.3	Support	Forest & Bird supports all parts of the submission that support identification, management and monitoring of High Value Bat Habitat Areas, the mitigation and avoidance of impacts on bats, and the contribution to better outcomes for indigenous biodiversity.	The whole of the submission be allowed.	Accept Refer to paragraphs 4.3.4 to 4.3.6.
12/5	Director-General of Conservation	7.3	In Part	PC14 provides for a “High Value Bat Habitat Area” and several rules to manage effects on long-tailed bats and their habitat, as recommended in the memorandum prepared by Blue Wattle Ecology (Appendix D2). I consider amendment to Issue 7.2.11 or a new Resource Management Issue should be added to address effects on ecology and bat habitat values. This issue should also be addressed in Objective 7.3.4 and either by a new policy or by amendment to policy 7.3.4.11 to require protection and enhancement of long-tailed bat habitat values. It is noted activities breaching the rules intended to mitigate effects on bats will require consent for discretionary or non-complying activity. Assessment of these activities would therefore benefit from appropriate policy direction on bats and ecology.	Add a policy to provide for protection and enhancement of long-tailed bat habitat values.	Accept Refer to paragraphs 4.3.4 to 4.3.6.
FS2/106	Fonterra Ltd	7.3	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission points 12/3, 12/4 and 12/5 by Director-General of Conservation. There are existing provisions within the Waipā District Plan that already cover off Flora and Fauna outcomes. Fonterra does not consider it essential to provide objectives and policies for each individual species as it may lead to a planning document requiring provisions for every specific Flora and Fauna within the Waipā District. The proposed is unnecessary granularity, to the exclusion of other species which are also important.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Director-General of Conservation (Submitter 12) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Reject Refer to paragraphs 4.3.4 to 4.3.6.
FS3/5	Forest & Bird	7.3	Support	Forest & Bird supports all parts of the submission that support identification, management and monitoring of High Value Bat Habitat Areas, the mitigation and avoidance of impacts on bats, and the contribution to better outcomes for indigenous biodiversity.	The whole of the submission be allowed.	Accept Refer to paragraphs 4.3.4 to 4.3.6.
12/7	Director-General of Conservation	7.4.2.36	In Part	I support the requirement to enter into a Development Agreement between the Council and the Developer prior to development occurring, in particular to secure the vesting and management of the Mangaone Reserve and the High Value Bat Habitat Area located therein. The drafting of this rule should provide more certainty that the extent of the reserve to be vested in Waipā District Council will be consistent with that currently shown on proposed Structure Plan map. This will avoid an outcome where the extent of the reserve is lessened as a result of the Development Agreement, potentially reducing its ecology and bat habitat value.	Amend Rule 7.4.2.36(c) to read: (c) <u>For the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area, detail how the extent and purpose of reserve land to be vested in Council will be consistent with Appendix S27 and its depiction on the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Map (Figure S27.B), and the manner that the reserve contribution will be offset against the reserve land to be vested.</u> (d) <u>For the other areas subject to this rule detail the extent of reserve land to be vested in Council and the manner that the reserve contribution will be offset against the reserve land to be vested.</u> And any further or alternative relief to like effect.	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.3.8.

Submission Point	Submitter name	District Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose / In Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
FS2/107	Fonterra Ltd	7.4.2.36	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 12/2 by Director-General of Conservation. Fonterra considers that this matter is for Waipā District Council to consider under various processes such as the Reserves Act and it is inappropriate for Plan Change 14 to predetermine the outcome.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Director-General of Conservation (Submitter 12) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.3.8.
FS3/7	Forest & Bird	7.4.2.36	Support	Forest & Bird supports all parts of the submission that support identification, management and monitoring of High Value Bat Habitat Areas, the mitigation and avoidance of impacts on bats, and the contribution to better outcomes for indigenous biodiversity.	The whole of the submission be allowed.	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.3.8.
12/8	Director-General of Conservation	7.4.2.42	Support	I support this proposed rule to mitigate adverse lighting effects on long-tailed bats within the Mangaone Precinct.	Retain	Accept Refer to paragraph 4.3.13.
FS3/8	Forest & Bird	7.4.2.42	Support	Forest & Bird supports all parts of the submission that support identification, management and monitoring of High Value Bat Habitat Areas, the mitigation and avoidance of impacts on bats, and the contribution to better outcomes for indigenous biodiversity.	The whole of the submission be allowed.	Accept Refer to paragraph 4.3.13.
12/9	Director-General of Conservation	15.4.2.91A	In Part	I support the requirement to prepare a Mangaone Stream Reserve Management Plan as part of the first subdivision or land use consent within the PC14 site to mitigate adverse lighting effects on long-tailed bats, as recommended in by Bluewattle Ecology in Appendix D2 to the suite PC14 supporting documents. Specifying “for industrial purposes” in clause d is unnecessary. The reserve should be provided as part of the first consent application within the PC14 site.	Amend Rule 15.4.2.91A(d) by deleting the words “for industrial purpose” as follows: (d) The first subdivision or land use consent application of the Mangaone Precinct for industrial purposes , shall include: ...	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.3.9.
FS2/108	Fonterra Ltd	15.4.2.91A	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 12/9 by Director-General of Conservation. Rule 15.4.2.91A(d) specifically includes “for industrial purposes” to avoid an unrelated subdivision such as a boundary adjustment triggering the need for the reserve management plan in advance of industrial development. The industrial development and use of the Managone Precinct is what triggers the creation of a reserve management plan.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Director-General of Conservation (Submitter 12) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.3.9.
FS3/9	Forest & Bird	15.4.2.91A	Support	Forest & Bird supports all parts of the submission that support identification, management and monitoring of High Value Bat Habitat Areas, the mitigation and avoidance of impacts on bats, and the contribution to better outcomes for indigenous biodiversity.	The whole of the submission be allowed.	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.3.9.
12/10	Director-General of Conservation	15.4.2.91A	In Part	The actions required in clause (g) should be in accordance with the Mangaone Reserve Management Plan. I request that this rule continue to apply when the reserve is vested in Waipā District Council.	Amend Rule 15.4.2.91A(g) as follows: (g) The Mangaone Stream Reserve is planted and fenced, and pedestrian / cycle paths are constructed as part of the first subdivision consent, <u>in accordance with the Mangaone Reserve Management Plan...</u>	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.3.10.
FS2/109	Fonterra Ltd	15.4.2.91A	Support	Fonterra supports submission point 12/10 by Director-General of Conservation.	That the Council adopts the relief sought by Director-General of Conservation (Submitter 12) for submission point 12/10.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.3.10.
FS3/10	Forest & Bird	15.4.2.91A	Support	Forest & Bird supports all parts of the submission that support identification, management and monitoring of High Value Bat Habitat Areas, the mitigation and avoidance of impacts on bats, and the contribution to better outcomes for indigenous biodiversity.	The whole of the submission be allowed	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.3.10.
12/11	Director-	21.1.7.19	Support	I support the requirement to assess activities not otherwise permitted	Retain 21.1.7.19(iv).	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter name	District Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose / In Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
	General of Conservation			in the Central Focal Area the extent to which bat habitat values associated with the Mangaone Stream Reserve will be avoided.		Refer to paragraph 4.3.13.
FS3/11	Forest & Bird	21.1.7.19	Support	Forest & Bird supports all parts of the submission that support identification, management and monitoring of High Value Bat Habitat Areas, the mitigation and avoidance of impacts on bats, and the contribution to better outcomes for indigenous biodiversity.	The whole of the submission be allowed	Accept Refer to paragraph 4.3.13.
12/12	Director-General of Conservation	21.1.1.20	Support	I support the requirement to assess the extent to which light intensity and light spill from external lighting will adversely affect the ecological values of the High Value Bat Habitat Area.	Retain	Accept Refer to paragraph 4.3.13.
FS3/12	Forest & Bird	21.1.1.20	Support	Forest & Bird supports all parts of the submission that support identification, management and monitoring of High Value Bat Habitat Areas, the mitigation and avoidance of impacts on bats, and the contribution to better outcomes for indigenous biodiversity.	The whole of the submission be allowed	Accept Refer to paragraph 4.3.13.
12/14	Director-General of Conservation	21.2.7.1	In Part	It is understood that the Mangaone Stream, which crosses the PC14 site is currently managed by the Waikato Regional Council (WRC) as part of the region's land drainage scheme. This may require WRC to access the proposed Mangaone Stream Reserve and High Value Bat Habitat Area and carry out maintenance activities such as vegetation removal and erosion control or other works requiring excavation. I am concerned that provision for this activity has potential to undermine the ecological function of the reserve and High Value Bat Habitat Area. The extent to which these activities minimise their effects on ecology values should be considered when assessing the Mangaone Reserve Management Plan. PC14 will need to give effect to the NPS-IB in this respect, including by ensuring such activities apply the effects management hierarchy where appropriate.	Amend 21.2.7.1 – Assessment Criteria by: Adding a new matter to assess the extent to which WRC and/or Waipā District Council land drainage activities minimise adverse effects on long-tailed bat habitat values and the ecological function of the Mangaone Stream and reserve.	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.3.12.
FS2/111	Fonterra Ltd	21.2.7.1	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 12/14 by Director-General of Conservation as it is unnecessary to compromise infrastructure outcomes. It is noted that there are two comprehensive ecological assessments which support the proposed stormwater design being: o Ecological Values and Effects Assessment including Bats) (Appendix D1) o Bat Management Provisions (Appendix D2)	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Director-General of Conservation (Submitter 12) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.3.12.
FS3/14	Forest & Bird	21.2.7.1	Support	Forest & Bird supports all parts of the submission that support identification, management and monitoring of High Value Bat Habitat Areas, the mitigation and avoidance of impacts on bats, and the contribution to better outcomes for indigenous biodiversity.	The whole of the submission be allowed.	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.3.12.
12/15	Director-General of Conservation	21.2.7.1(ee)	In Part	The wording in clause 21.2.7.1(ee) should be tightened so that the DOC 'Protocols for Minimising the Risk of Felling Bat Roosts' are always required to be followed.	Amend 21.2.7.1(ee) to read: e. ... The planned works should <u>must</u> employ the Department of Conservation 'Protocols for Minimising the Risk of Felling Bat Roosts' where potential roosting trees for long-tailed bats are being removed and/or for trees with a diameter at breast height (DBH) of 15cm or greater for trees being removed as part of an application.	Accept Refer to paragraph 4.3.13.
FS2/112	Fonterra Ltd	21.2.7.1(ee)	Support	Fonterra supports submission point 12/15 by Director-General of Conservation.	That the Council adopts the relief sought by Director-General of Conservation (Submitter 12) for submission point 12/15.	Accept Refer to paragraph 4.3.13.

Submission Point	Submitter name	District Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose / In Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
FS3/15	Forest & Bird	21.2.7.1(ee)	Support	Forest & Bird supports all parts of the submission that support identification, management and monitoring of High Value Bat Habitat Areas, the mitigation and avoidance of impacts on bats, and the contribution to better outcomes for indigenous biodiversity.	The whole of the submission be allowed	Accept Refer to paragraph 4.3.13.

Table 3 - Economics

Submission Point	Submitter name	District Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose / In Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
6/2	Kama Trust	Not Specified	Support in Part	Enabling an additional 79ha of industrial zoned land to be developed could have a significant impact on stakeholders in the C9 Growth cell if industrial land supply exceeds demand.	Add staging provisions which control any risk of adverse economic effects arising from an oversupply of industrial zoned land.	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.4.3 and 4.4.4.
FS1/3	Henmar Trust	Not Specified	Oppose	Consider this submission to be based on trade competition. The Kama Trust property that has recently been rezoned to Industrial from Rural, was not located within any future Industrial (or other) growth cell, warranting the need for staging provisions. The proposed Plan Change area is located within the C10 Industrial Growth Cell and is an anticipated form of development. The rezoning of the land is not the issue but ensuring that any actual or potential adverse environmental effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated so they are less than minor.	Dismiss submission.	Reject Kama Trust has raised legitimate concerns regarding potential adverse effects on the environment relating to amenity, transport and stormwater, and therefore their submission is not considered to be 'trade competition'.
FS2/20	Fonterra Ltd	Not Specified	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 6/2 by the Kama Trust seeking to add staging provisions to Plan Change 14 due to "oversupply of industrial zoned land". The effect of rezoning Mangaone Precinct from rural to industrial is sufficiently assessed in the Economic Assessment (Appendix I). Specifically, Section 4.1, outlines the existing Cambridge industrial land provisions and the likely timings these areas will come to market. Fonterra also notes that the entire land holding is 79ha, however, this is inclusive of the proposed reserve area (approximately 16ha) along Mangaone Stream and roads. The net area for industrial activities is approximately 47.6ha.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Kama Trust (Submitter 6) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.4.3 and 4.4.4.
8/1	Lesley Dredge	Not Specified	Oppose	Underpinning the creation of an industrial zone, is the requirement to prove without any uncertainty that there is a need for that industrial land. This is the objective of the NPS-UD, giving councils direction as to where and when development capacity should be provided. As a partner of Future Proof, Waipa District Council relies upon the Business Capability and Development Assessments released every 2 years to inform planning decisions, as directed by the NPS-UD. Importantly, planning for the long term should take priority since the consequences of making poor decisions in the short term will have lasting detrimental social, and economic effects which may not be resolved and/or become a future cost burden on communities. There is provision for 132ha of industrial land available until 2041 in the Cambridge Hautapu area. There is no evidence of 'inappropriate' capacity modelling approaches. To use differences in values from	A supplementary Business Capacity and Development Assessment to be prepared by Future Proof for the Cambridge-Karapiro locality and Waipa District for the period 2022 to 2024 to ascertain industrial land sufficiency. This independent assessment should provide an up to date forecast for the short, medium and long-term enabling an informed decision to be made. (Future Proof is the choice of providers for this assessment given that it has proven local, district and regional knowledge and competence). This assessment be presented as a submission. If the supplementary Business Capacity and Development Assessment (as sought for relief, above) forecasts industrial land sufficiency for the medium and long term, the 79.2 ha of the C10 Growth Cell, identified in PC14, be rezoned Deferred Industrial Zone, with the deferred status being uplifted by a revised plan change once 'Area 7' of the Hautapu	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.4.5.

Submission Point	Submitter name	District Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose / In Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
				<p>different forecasts over different time periods is a manipulation of data which has no substance. There is no evidence of capacity estimates being overstated. BCDA 2023 provides full explanations of potential industrial land capacity in greenfield areas and adjusts these areas accordingly.</p> <p>BCDA 2023 has developed a model using adjusted sector employment data to predict demand for land and space. Without a complete understanding of this model, any critique of it relies upon the outcomes produced. These outcomes have been compared with population data to show an 'unusual' equality in percentage changes, which may be coincidental given that sector employment data may well track a similar path as population data, but inaccuracies occur if calculations are rounded, as shown in Section 4.3. This is not indicative of the model's inherent failure. The test of a predictive model is its past performance. No evidence is provided on past performance. Confusion arises over the meaning of 'labour force', but in statistical terms its meaning is precise, and it is not equivalent to sector employment data, used by BDCA 2023. There is no evidence to prove that forecasted industrial land demand is understated in the Cambridge-Karapiro area or the Waipa District sub-region.</p> <p>The Economics Assessment produced by Property Economics on behalf of Fonterra fails to provide evidence of a lack of industrial land sufficiency in the Cambridge and the Waipa District sub-region.</p>	Industrial Structure Plan has reached 80% development (i.e. 80% of the developable land area is the subject of s224 certificates) or by 31 March 2035, whichever is the sooner.	
FS1/15	Henmar Trust	Not Specified	Oppose	The proposed Plan Change Area is located within Industrial Growth Cell C10 and is an anticipated form of development. Anticipated development should not be constrained for NIMBY (not in my back yard) reasons. Understand that submitter (8) did not put forward the same argument regarding Plan Change 17 – Hautapu Industrial Zones.	Dismiss submission.	Accept Refer to paragraph 4.4.5.
FS2/26	Fonterra Ltd	Not Specified	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 8/1 by Lesley Dredge. A comprehensive and detailed Economic Assessment (Appendix I) was submitted to support Plan Change 14. Section 4 of the Economic Assessment specifically addresses the Cambridge Local Existing Industrial Land Provisions and the likely timings these will come to market, and the Future Proof Business Development Capacity Assessment (BDCA) 2023 Modelling Outcomes. Fonterra also notes that the entire land holding is 79ha, however, this is inclusive of the proposed reserve area (approximately 16ha) along Mangaone Stream and roads. The net area for industrial activities is approximately 47.6ha.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Lesley Dredge (Submitter 8) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept Refer to paragraph 4.4.5.
10/2	Waikato Regional Council	Not Specified	Further Assessment	In order to demonstrate that the proposed plan change gives effect to Clause 3.6(1)(a), we consider the economic assessment should clearly quantify the expected shortfall in industrial land capacity and the timeframe for this shortfall. This is also required in order to complete an assessment against Method UFD-M49 and APP13 Criteria A of Proposed WRPS Change 1 – Decisions version. This assessment should take into account any recent rezoning which provides for industrial activities, such as Plan Changes 17 and 20 to the Waipā District Plan.	Provide a more robust assessment to demonstrate that the proposed plan change gives effect to Clause 3.6(1)(a) of the NPS-HPL.	Reject Refer to paragraphs 4.4.6 to 4.4.10.

Submission Point	Submitter name	District Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose / In Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
FS2/74	Fonterra Ltd	Not Specified	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission points 10/2,10/3, 10/4, 10/5, 10/6 and 10/7 by Waikato Regional Council as Fonterra considers that the Economic Assessment (Appendix I) submitted to support Plan Change 14 is robust and sufficiently assesses the economic effects as required. The planning assessment report titled “Plan Change 14 to the Waipā District Plan Mangaone Precinct C10 Industrial Growth Cell- Hautapu” and the Section 32 Evaluation Report (Appendix O) also provides assessments of the economic effects of the plan change against relevant National, Regional and District policies and objectives throughout numerous sections of the report.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Waikato Regional Council (Submitter 10) and accept the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraphs 4.4.6 to 4.4.10.
10/3	Waikato Regional Council	Not Specified	Further Assessment	We consider the assessment in Section 8.5 of the Economic Assessment that “[t]he entirety of the PPC site has been identified suitable for future industrial development” is not sufficient to demonstrate that the proposed plan change gives effect to this clause.	Provide a more robust assessment to demonstrate that the proposed plan change gives effect to Clause 3.6(5) of the NPS-HPL.	Reject Refer to paragraphs 4.4.6 to 4.4.10.
FS2/75	Fonterra Ltd	Not Specified	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission points 10/2,10/3, 10/4, 10/5, 10/6 and 10/7 by Waikato Regional Council as Fonterra considers that the Economic Assessment (Appendix I) submitted to support Plan Change 14 is robust and sufficiently assesses the economic effects as required. The planning assessment report titled “Plan Change 14 to the Waipā District Plan Mangaone Precinct C10 Industrial Growth Cell- Hautapu” and the Section 32 Evaluation Report (Appendix O) also provides assessments of the economic effects of the plan change against relevant National, Regional and District policies and objectives throughout numerous sections of the report.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Waikato Regional Council (Submitter 10) and accept the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraphs 4.4.6 to 4.4.10.
10/4	Waikato Regional Council	Not Specified	Further Assessment	Section 7.9 of the plan change application provides an assessment against the WRPS and Proposed WRPS Change 1 – Decisions version. This section includes an assessment against relevant provisions of the Integrated management (IM) and Urban form and development (UFD) chapters. However, we note there are other provisions of the WRPS and Proposed WRPS Change 1 – Decisions version that are also relevant to PC14, which have not been assessed in the plan change application. We particularly recommend that the following provisions be assessed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The relevant objectives, polices and methods of the Land and freshwater (LF) chapter, particularly given that the Mangaone Stream flows through the plan change site. ▪ The relevant objectives, polices and methods of the Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity (ECO) chapter. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We note that the Ecological Assessment identifies that the plan change site contains long-tailed bat habitat and includes areas of significant indigenous vegetation along the Mangaone Stream. ○ Objective ECO-O1, Policies ECO-P1 and ECO-P2 and Methods ECO-M1, ECO-M2, ECO-M3, ECO-M13 and ECO-M14 are therefore particularly relevant to the proposed plan change. ▪ Policies UFD-P1, UFD-P2, UFD-P11 and UFD-P13. ▪ Methods UFD-M1, UFD-M7, UFD-M8 and UFD-M11. 	Ensure the proposed plan change is assessed against all relevant objectives, policies and methods of the WRPS and Proposed WRPS Change 1 – Decisions version.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraphs 4.4.6 to 4.4.10.
FS2/75	Fonterra Ltd	Not Specified	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission points 10/2,10/3, 10/4, 10/5, 10/6 and 10/7 by Waikato Regional Council as Fonterra considers that the	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Waikato Regional Council (Submitter 10) and accept the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraphs 4.4.6 to 4.4.10.

Submission Point	Submitter name	District Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose / In Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
				Economic Assessment (Appendix I) submitted to support Plan Change 14 is robust and sufficiently assesses the economic effects as required. The planning assessment report titled “Plan Change 14 to the Waipā District Plan Mangaone Precinct C10 Industrial Growth Cell- Hautapu” and the Section 32 Evaluation Report (Appendix O) also provides assessments of the economic effects of the plan change against relevant National, Regional and District policies and objectives throughout numerous sections of the report.		
10/5	Waikato Regional Council	Not Specified	Further Assessment	We have some concerns about the robustness of the Economic Assessment provided with the plan change application. Our key concern is that while the assessment analyses the Future Proof Business Development Capacity Assessment 2023 (BDCA) and presents a conclusion about the accuracy of this assessment (i.e. that the BDCA industrial land demand forecasts are underestimated and unreliable for decision-making), the report does not quantify what the industrial development capacity/sufficiency is (or therefore the expected shortfall of industrial land) within the relevant locality and market over the NPS-UD timeframes. Without this, we consider the report does not provide sufficient evidence to determine whether the proposed plan change meets the relevant provisions of the NPS-HPL or WRPS.	That a more detailed and robust economic assessment of PC14 be undertaken, in order to demonstrate that the proposed plan change gives effect to Clause 3.6 of the NPS-HPL and aligns with the relevant provisions of the WRPS and Proposed WRPS Change 1 – Decisions version.	Reject Refer to paragraphs 4.4.6 to 4.4.10.
FS2/76	Fonterra Ltd	Not Specified	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission points 10/2,10/3, 10/4, 10/5, 10/6 and 10/7 by Waikato Regional Council as Fonterra considers that the Economic Assessment (Appendix I) submitted to support Plan Change 14 is robust and sufficiently assesses the economic effects as required. The planning assessment report titled “Plan Change 14 to the Waipā District Plan Mangaone Precinct C10 Industrial Growth Cell- Hautapu” and the Section 32 Evaluation Report (Appendix O) also provides assessments of the economic effects of the plan change against relevant National, Regional and District policies and objectives throughout numerous sections of the report.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Waikato Regional Council (Submitter 10) and accept the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept Refer to paragraphs 4.4.6 to 4.4.10.
10/6	Waikato Regional Council	Not Specified	Further Assessment	We also have some general concerns about the adequacy and robustness of the Economic Assessment.	That a more robust economic assessment be undertaken to support the proposed plan change.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraphs 4.4.6 to 4.4.10.
FS2/77	Fonterra Ltd	Not Specified	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission points 10/2,10/3, 10/4, 10/5, 10/6 and 10/7 by Waikato Regional Council as Fonterra considers that the Economic Assessment (Appendix I) submitted to support Plan Change 14 is robust and sufficiently assesses the economic effects as required. The planning assessment report titled “Plan Change 14 to the Waipā District Plan Mangaone Precinct C10 Industrial Growth Cell- Hautapu” and the Section 32 Evaluation Report (Appendix O) also provides assessments of the economic effects of the plan change against relevant National, Regional and District policies and objectives throughout numerous sections of the report.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Waikato Regional Council (Submitter 10) and accept the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraphs 4.4.6 to 4.4.10.
10/7	Waikato Regional Council	Not Specified	Further Assessment	Given the recent rezoning of industrial land within the Hautapu Industrial Structure Plan Area (partially to support the relocation of industrial activities from Carter’s Flat), we consider that in order for the rezoning of Carter’s Flat to be treated as a justification for PC14, further analysis should be provided to quantify the likely extent of additional land required for these relocations.	If the rezoning of Carter’s Flat is to be considered as a justification for PC14, provide further analysis to quantify the likely extent of additional land requirements for the relocation of industrial activities from Carter’s Flat, taking into account the recent rezoning of land at Hautapu through PC17.	Reject Refer to paragraphs 4.4.6 to 4.4.10.

Submission Point	Submitter name	District Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose / In Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
FS2/78	Fonterra Ltd	Not Specified	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission points 10/2,10/3, 10/4, 10/5, 10/6 and 10/7 by Waikato Regional Council as Fonterra considers that the Economic Assessment (Appendix I) submitted to support Plan Change 14 is robust and sufficiently assesses the economic effects as required. The planning assessment report titled "Plan Change 14 to the Waipā District Plan Mangaone Precinct C10 Industrial Growth Cell- Hautapu" and the Section 32 Evaluation Report (Appendix O) also provides assessments of the economic effects of the plan change against relevant National, Regional and District policies and objectives throughout numerous sections of the report.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Waikato Regional Council (Submitter 10) and accept the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraphs 4.4.6 to 4.4.10.

Table 4 - Industrial Zone Activities

Submission Point	Submitter name	District Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose / In Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
7/5	Bardowie Investments Ltd	7.4.1.1(a)	Support	Support proposed amendments to rules that introduce controls on industrial activities within the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area	Retain	Accept in Part Refer paragraph 4.5.2.
FS1/11	Henmar Trust	7.4.1.1(a)	Oppose	Industrial activities specifically excluded activities to do with Mineral Extraction. Altering this rule provides for Mineral Extraction Activities within the Bardowie Industrial Precinct and Mangaone Precinct Areas as a permitted activity, under the definition of DRY INDUSTRY. These areas are considered to be more sensitive than the Hautapu Industrial Structure Plan Area, due to their location and being adjacent to the Rural and Residential Zones, potentially affecting the living and working quality of these adjoining environments. Specifically, the adjoining Henmar Trust property to the south and north of Zig Zag Road is used for primary food production.	(i) Dismiss submission. (ii) Reject the proposed amendment and leave Rule 7.4.1.1(a) as currently exists in the District Plan. (iii) Amend Rule 7.4.1.1(m) to read as follows; "Relocated buildings, except for those listed in Appendix N1 and except within the Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan Area <u>and the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area</u> "	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.5.3 and 4.5.4.
7/6	Bardowie Investments Ltd	7.4.1.1(w)	Support	Support proposed amendments to rules that introduce controls on industrial activities within the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area	Retain	Accept in Part Refer paragraph 4.5.2.
FS1/12	Henmar Trust	7.4.1.1(w)	Oppose	Proposed Dry Industries involving extremely high temperatures, on sites with limited water use may provide a potential fire hazard and create adverse environmental effects, such as dust, particulate and odour. Dry Industries is very broad and could include anything, including activities to do with Mineral Extraction.	(i) Dismiss submission. (ii) Reject the proposed amendment and leave Rule 7.4.1.1(w) as it currently exists in the District Plan. (iii) Reject the proposed new/replacement Permitted Activity Rule.	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.5.3 and 4.5.4.
7/7	Bardowie Investments Ltd	7.4.1.3(f)	Support	Support proposed amendments to rules that introduce controls on industrial activities within the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area	Retain	Accept in Part Refer paragraph 4.5.2.
FS1/13	Henmar Trust	7.4.1.3(f)	Oppose	The location of the Bardowie Industrial Precinct and the Mangaone Industrial Precinct in close proximity of Residential homes, and adjoining Rural Zone land, means that the effects of activities requiring an air discharge consent needs to include an assessment of any actual or potential effects on the local environment, adjoining properties and adjoining zones, with particular reference to noise, dust, particulate and odour. Activities requiring air discharge consents can have adverse health	(i) Dismiss submission. (ii) Amend Rule 7.4.1.3(f) to read as follows: "Any activities, <u>in the areas listed below, within the Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan Area and the Hautapu Industrial Structure Plan Area</u> that requires an air discharge permit from the Waikato Regional Council; (i) <u>Hautapu Industrial Structure Plan Area;</u> (ii) <u>Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan Area; and</u>	Reject Refer paragraph 4.5.5.

Submission Point	Submitter name	District Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose / In Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
				effects that must be considered, with potentially affected parties having the opportunity to be party to the process that affects the air quality of their home and/or work place.	<p>(iii) <u>Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area.</u>” Assessment will be restricted to the following matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>Any actual or potential adverse effects on the local environment, adjoining properties, and adjoining zones, with particular reference to noise, dust, particulate and odour.</u> ▪ Adverse effect on the Hautapu Dairy Manufacturing Site due to the discharge of contaminants to air. <p>These matters will be considered in accordance with the assessment criteria in Section 21. Advice Note: This rule addresses the potential effects on <u>the local environment, adjoining properties and adjoining zones, as well as</u> the food safety implications of discharges to air associated with the ongoing operation of the Hautapu Dairy Manufacturing Site.</p>	
7/8	Bardowie Investments Ltd	7.4.1.5(j)	Support	Support proposed amendments to rules that introduce controls on industrial activities within the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area	Retain	Accept in Part Refer paragraph 4.5.2.
7/9	Bardowie Investments Ltd	7.4.1.5(l)	Support	Support proposed amendments to rules that introduce controls on industrial activities within the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area	Retain	Accept in Part Refer paragraph 4.5.2.
7/10	Bardowie Investments Ltd	7.4.1.5(p)	Support	Support proposed amendments to rules that introduce controls on industrial activities within the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area	Retain	Accept in Part Refer paragraph 4.5.2.
FS1/14	Henmar Trust	7.4.1.5(p)	Not Stated	The proposed Bardowie Industrial Precinct and Mangaone Structure Plan Areas are considered to be located in a sensitive location. Industrial Activity is a very broad term encompassing many activities that are not considered to be compatible with the highly visible and prominent location of the Industrial Precincts, and the surrounding existing sensitive land uses, careful and detailed consideration needs to be given to the activities that the District Plan should enable to establish and operate in the Industrial Precincts.	<p>(i) Dismiss submission. (ii) Amend the following aspects of Rule 7.4.1.5 to read: “j. In the Hautapu Industrial Structure Plan Area, and the Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan Area <u>and the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area</u>; any sign/s located, anchored, erected, attached to or painted on or above rooftops or rooflines.... l. Activities (except for farming activities), in the Hautapu Industrial Structure Plan Area, the Bond Road North Industrial Structure Plan Area, and the Bardowie Industrial Structure Plan Area <u>and the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area</u> that fail to comply with Rules 7.4.2.36, 7.4.2.37 and 7.4.2.38.... p. Notwithstanding Rule 7.4.1.3.f., the following activities are non-complying activities within the Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan Area, and Hautapu Industrial Structure Plan Area <u>and the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area</u>: a. Bitumen plants; b. Incineration activities; c. Concrete batching plants; and d. Relocated buildings; and e. <u>Within the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area and Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan Area, outdoor storage and handling of fertiliser or other dry bulk materials;</u> f. <u>Within the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area, to the north of the Mangaone Stream, and within the Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan Area, within 100 metres of the Henmar Trust property</u></p>	Reject Refer to paragraphs 4.5.6 and 4.5.7.

Submission Point	Submitter name	District Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose / In Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
					<u>boundary, Glass Manufacturing and associated industries.</u> <u>g. Demolition yards;</u> <u>h. Recycling depots/facilities;</u> <u>i. Use, creation or storage of radioactive materials;</u> <u>j. Hazardous facility;</u> <u>k. Chemical Manufacturing;</u> <u>l. The storage and/or use of trade waste;</u> <u>m. Smelting Industries;</u> <u>n. Melting Industries;</u> <u>o. Power generation activities;</u> <u>p. Waste to Energy Plants; and</u> <u>q. Heavy industrial activities.</u>	
9/18	Henmar Trust	Innovation and Advanced Technology Activities	In Part	See no logical reason as to why the definition of Innovation and Advanced Technology Activities should be limited to the Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan Area and the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area. Provides confusion within the plan having specific definitions for specific areas. Should be one definition that applies to the whole District Plan.	<p>Amend to read as follows: Innovation and Advanced Technology Activities means all activities involved in the research, development, manufacture and commercial application of advanced technology including, but not limited to, information technology, energy technology, manufacturing technology, materials technology, software development, telecommunications, data storage, data management and processing, infrastructure systems and management.</p> <p>Note: The definition of Innovation and Advanced Technology Activities only applies to the Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan Area and the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area.</p>	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.5.8.
FS2/45	Fonterra Ltd	Innovation and Advanced Technology Activities	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 9/18 by Henmar Trust. Fonterra notes that the term "Innovation and Advanced Technology Activities" is currently only referred to in the Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan Area and Plan Change 14 is seeking to include the definition for the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.5.8.
9/19	Henmar Trust	Gymnasium	In Part	Provides confusion within the plan having specific definitions for specific areas.	Should be one definition that applies to the whole District Plan.	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.5.8.
FS2/46	Fonterra Ltd	Gymnasium	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 9/19 by Henmar Trust. Fonterra notes that the specific definition for Gymnasium is proposed to restrict the permitted activity within the Central Focal Area of the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept Refer to paragraph 4.5.8.
9/22	Henmar Trust	7.3.4.10	Oppose	Proposed Dry Industries involving extremely high temperatures, on sites with limited water use may provide a potential fire hazard. Dry Industries is very broad and could include anything, including activities to do with Mineral Extraction.	Remove objective.	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.5.3 and 4.5.4.
FS2/49	Fonterra Ltd	7.3.4.10	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 9/22 by Henmar Trust for the reasons set out in Fonterra's primary submission.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.5.3 and 4.5.4.
9/24	Henmar Trust	7.4.1.1(a)	Oppose	Industrial activities specifically excluded activities to do with Mineral Extraction. Altering this rule provides for Mineral Extraction Activities within the Bardowie Industrial Precinct and Mangaone Precinct Areas as a permitted activity, under the definition of DRY INDUSTRY. These areas are considered to be more sensitive than the Hautapu Industrial Structure Plan Area, due to their location and being adjacent to the Rural and Residential Zones, potentially affecting the living and	<p>(i) Reject the proposed amendment and leave Rule 7.4.1.1(a) as currently exists in the District Plan.</p> <p>(ii) Amend Rule 7.4.1.1(m) to read as follows; "Relocated buildings, except for those listed in Appendix N1 and except within the Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan Area and the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area"</p>	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.5.3 and 4.5.4.

Submission Point	Submitter name	District Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose / In Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
				working quality of these adjoining environments. Specifically, the adjoining Henmar Trust property to the south and north of Zig Zag Road is used for primary production.		
FS2/51	Fonterra Ltd	7.4.1.1(a)	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 9/24 by Henmar Trust for the reasons set out in Fonterra's primary submission.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.5.3 and 4.5.4.
9/25	Henmar Trust	7.4.1.1(w)	Oppose	Proposed Dry Industries involving extremely high temperatures, on sites with limited water use may provide a potential fire hazard. Dry Industries is very broad and could include anything, including activities to do with Mineral Extraction.	Reject the proposed amendment and leave Rule 7.4.1.1(w) as it currently exists in the District Plan.	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.5.3 and 4.5.4.
FS2/52	Fonterra Ltd	7.4.1.1(w)	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 9/25 by Henmar Trust for the reasons set out in Fonterra's primary submission.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.5.3 and 4.5.4.
9/26	Henmar Trust	7.4.1.1(y)	Oppose	Advanced Technology is an open-ended term with no limit. It provides no clarity on the limit of uses that would be provided for as a permitted activity and no clarity on the limit of the actual or potential effects may be. An open-ended activity such as this would be more suited to a discretionary or non-complying activity status where Council would have the opportunity to consider the actual or potential effects once they are known and have been identified.	Reject proposed new Rule 7.4.1.1(y).	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.5.8.
FS2/53	Fonterra Ltd	7.4.1.1(y)	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 9/26 by Henmar Trust for the reasons set out in Fonterra's primary submission.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.5.8.
9/27	Henmar Trust	7.4.1.1(u)	Oppose	Advanced Technology is an open-ended term with no limit. It provides no clarity on the limit of uses that would be provided for as a permitted activity and no clarity on the limit of the actual or potential effects may be. An open-ended activity such as this would be more suited to a discretionary or non-complying activity status where Council would have the opportunity to consider the actual or potential effects once they are known and have been identified.	Amend Rule 7.4.1.1(u) to read as follows; "Within the Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan Area the following activities are also permitted: i. Stormwater ponds and/or facilities; ii. Farming activities; iii. Spray Irrigation of dairy factory wastewater until 31 March 2024; iv. Innovation and Advanced Technology Activities (as defined in the Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan); and	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.5.9.
FS2/54	Fonterra Ltd	7.4.1.1(u)	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 9/27 by Henmar Trust for the reasons set out in Fonterra's primary submission.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.5.9.
9/29	Henmar Trust	7.4.1.5	In Part	The proposed Bardowie Industrial Precinct and Mangaone Structure Plan Areas are considered to be located in a sensitive location and 'Industrial Activity' is a very broad term encompassing many activities that are not considered to be compatible with the highly visible and prominent location of the Industrial Precincts, and the surrounding existing sensitive land uses, careful and detailed consideration needs to be given to the activities that the District Plan should enable to establish and operate in the Industrial Precincts.	Amend 7.4.1.5(p) as follows: d. Relocated buildings; and e. Within the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area <u>and Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan Area</u> , outdoor storage and handling of fertiliser or other dry bulk materials; f. <u>Within the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area, to the north of the Mangaone Stream, Glass Manufacturing;</u> g. <u>Demolition yards;</u> h. <u>Recycling depots/facilities;</u> i. <u>Use, creation or storage of radioactive materials;</u> j. <u>Hazardous facility;</u>	Reject Refer to paragraphs 4.5.6 and 4.5.7.

Submission Point	Submitter name	District Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose / In Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
					<u>k. Chemical Manufacturing;</u> <u>l. The storage and/or use of trade waste;</u> <u>m. Smelting Industries;</u> <u>n. Melting Industries;</u> <u>o. Power generation activities;</u> <u>p. Waste to Energy Plants; and</u> <u>q. Heavy industrial activities.”</u>	
FS2/56	Fonterra Ltd	7.4.1.5	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 9/29 by Henmar Trust. The only changes sought to the Bardowie Industrial Precinct are three consequential changes needed to enable Plan Change 14. Fonterra considers that the relief sought is outside the scope of the Plan Change 14 process as this is not intended to include a full review of the Bardowie Industrial Precinct.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraphs 4.5.6 and 4.5.7.
10/8	Waikato Regional Council	7.4.1.1(x)	Support	We support limiting the Central Focal Area for the Mangaone Precinct to providing for small-scale retail and service activities that will service the day-to-day needs of industrial businesses in the surrounding area. We highlight the importance of ensuring the Central Focal Area is of a size and function that will not undermine the vitality or viability of the Cambridge town centre or create an inefficient use of industrially zoned land, in accordance with Policy UFD-P13 of the WRPS.	Retain the limited range of activities proposed to be permitted within the Central Focal Area under Rule 7.4.1.1(x).	Accept Refer to paragraph 4.5.10.
10/9	Waikato Regional Council	21.1.1.7.19	Support	We support limiting the Central Focal Area for the Mangaone Precinct to providing for small-scale retail and service activities that will service the day-to-day needs of industrial businesses in the surrounding area. We highlight the importance of ensuring the Central Focal Area is of a size and function that will not undermine the vitality or viability of the Cambridge town centre or create an inefficient use of industrially zoned land, in accordance with Policy UFD-P13 of the WRPS.	Retain Assessment criteria 21.1.1.7.19.	Accept Refer to paragraph 4.5.10.
10/16	Waikato Regional Council	15.4.2.91A	In Part	We support the requirement under proposed Rule 15.4.2.91A(d) for the preparation of a Mangaone Stream Reserve Management Plan as part of the first subdivision or land use consent application for the PC14 site. However, we query whether the words “for industrial purposes” are appropriate within this rule, particularly given that development of the PC14 site for industrial purposes is not proposed to commence until at least 2028.	Retain Rule 15.4.2.91A(d) but consider deleting the words “for industrial purposes”.	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.3.9.
FS2/81	Fonterra Ltd	15.4.2.91A	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 10/16 by Waikato Regional Council. Rule 15.4.2.91A(d) specifically includes “for industrial purposes” to avoid an unrelated subdivision such as a boundary adjustment triggering the need for the reserve management plan in advance of industrial development. The industrial development and use of the Mangaone Precinct is what triggers the creation of a reserve management plan.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Waikato Regional Council (Submitter 10) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.3.9.

Table 5 - Infrastructure Capacity

Submission Point	Submitter name	District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
6/4	Kama Trust	Not Specified	Support in Part	Concerned that the manner in which stormwater is proposed to be managed could have adverse effects on land downstream and may	1. Appropriate provisions to mitigate adverse stormwater effects arising under PC14.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter name	District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
				result in flooding.	2. Any such consequential relief necessary to give effect to this submission.	Refer to paragraphs 4.6.2 and 4.6.3.
FS1/5	Henmar Trust	Not Specified	Support	The Henmar Trust property is the adjoining downstream property and agree that stormwater must be mitigated within the Plan Change Area and not have any flooding effects on the adjoining downstream property owned by Henmar Trust.	Require the necessary provisions are incorporated into the District Plan as part of the proposed plan change to ensure that any actual or potential stormwater effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated within the Plan Change area and will not create any downstream flooding on the Henmar Trust property. Stormwater within the Mangaone Industrial Precinct and Bardowie Industrial Precinct should be restricted to 80% peak pre-development runoff levels to provide for extreme weather events. This is necessary due to the contour of the proposed Industrial Precincts and the fact that there is no physical barrier to keep their stormwater within their property boundaries in extreme weather events, potentially having severe adverse flooding effects on the downstream Henmar Trust property.	Reject Refer to paragraphs 4.6.2 and 4.6.3.
FS2/22	Fonterra Ltd	Not Specified	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 6/4 by the Kama Trust. The relief sought to address stormwater concerns is vague. Fonterra also notes that stormwater is assessed in detail in the following technical reports that support Plan Change 14: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Civil Infrastructure Assessment (Appendix F) ▪ Stormwater Management Plan (Appendix G) ▪ Hydrogeological Assessment (Appendix L) These technical reports sufficiently assess the effects of stormwater from the proposed Plan Change 14 area. Furthermore, any stormwater discharge will need to comply with existing Waikato Regional Council regulations.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Kama Trust (Submitter 6) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraphs 4.6.2 and 4.6.3.
9/10	Henmar Trust	Not Specified	Oppose	The proposed plan change as presented increases flooding hazard on the Henmar Trust property. This is without including the additional stormwater effects of the development of the Kiwifruit Block (which was excluded from the Technical Reports and is believed to contain contaminated soils). The runoff quality and quantity must be assessed at the time of subdivision and development, to ensure that the downstream network can remain as the status quo without increased flooding. Stormwater should be controlled to 80% of pre-development peak flows.	Council alters the existing Rules and Performance Standards to ensure that any adverse effects on the Henmar Trust property are less than minor. In particular rules requiring specific stormwater rules to address both the runoff quality and quantity at the time of subdivision and development, to ensure that the downstream network can remain as the status quo without increased flooding. Stormwater should be managed at all times so it does not exceed 80% of predevelopment peak flows.	Reject Refer to paragraphs 4.6.2 and 4.6.3.
FS2/37	Fonterra Ltd	Not Specified	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 9/10 by Henmar Trust. Plan Change 14 as proposed is consistent with the Master Plan which has been prepared by Waipā District Council and accommodates the Henmar Trust Property.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraphs 4.6.2 and 4.6.3.
9/13	Henmar Trust	Appendix S27	Oppose	Due to the topography of the C10 Growth Cell and Victoria Road culvert being designed to flood the Henmar Trust property in the case of a major event, to protect downstream properties, future development on the Mangaone Precinct must be restricted to a maximum 80% predevelopment as there are no natural or manmade physical barriers to protect the Henmar Trust property from upstream flooding during major events.	Future development on the Mangaone Precinct must be restricted to a maximum 80% predevelopment.	Reject Refer to paragraphs 4.6.2 and 4.6.3.
FS2/40	Fonterra Ltd	Appendix S27	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 9/13 by Henmar Trust. Plan Change 14 is supported by a comprehensive range of detailed technical reports including:	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraphs 4.6.2 and 4.6.3.

Submission Point	Submitter name	District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Civil Infrastructure Assessment (Appendix F) o Stormwater Management Plan (Appendix G) o Hydrogeological Assessment (Appendix L) <p>These technical reports sufficiently assess the effects of stormwater from the proposed Plan Change 14 area. The Stormwater Management Plan (Appendix G) proposes constructed wetlands to manage of the site runoff up to 100-year average return interval storm event. The outlets of the constructed wetlands have been designed to attenuate the flow down to approximately 50% of the pre-development peak flows. Furthermore, any stormwater discharge will need to comply with existing Waikato Regional Council regulations.</p>		
9/40	Henmar Trust	15.4.2.91A	In Part	The rules should include the Note on the Existing and Proposed Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan area that requires roading and service connections to be provided to the boundary of the Henmar Trust property located to the North that is within the C10 Industrial Growth Cell. This provides clarity for those assessing future applications.	Amend proposed new Rule 15.4.2.91A to also related to the Bardowie Industrial Precinct.	Reject Refer to paragraphs 4.6.4 and 4.6.5.
FS2/67	Fonterra Ltd	15.4.2.91A	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission points 9/39 and 9/40 by Henmar Trust for the reasons set out in Fonterra's primary submission. Additionally, the only changes sought to the Bardowie Industrial Precinct are three consequential changes needed to enable Plan Change 14. Fonterra considers that the relief sought is outside the scope of the Plan Change 14 process as this is not intended to completely review the Bardowie Industrial Precinct.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraphs 4.6.4 and 4.6.5.
9/41	Henmar Trust	15.4.2.91A	In Part	The rules should include the Note on the Existing and Proposed Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan area that requires roading and service connections to be provided to the boundary of the Henmar Trust property located to the North that is within the C10 Industrial Growth Cell. This provides clarity for those assessing future applications.	Amend proposed new Rule 15.4.2.91A(d) to include the following rules; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The first subdivision or land use consent application within the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area, to the north of the Mangaone Stream, shall include the provision of roading and services to boundary of the Henmar Trust property within the C10 Industrial Growth Cell. ▪ The first subdivision or land use consent application within Node 3 of the Bardowie Industrial Precinct, shall include roading and service connections to be provided to the adjoining boundary of the Henmar Trust property located to the north that is within the C10 Industrial Growth Cell. 	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.6.6 and 4.6.7.
FS2/68	Fonterra Ltd	15.4.2.91A	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 9/41 by Henmar Trust. Fonterra opposes requiring Mangaone Precinct to provide traffic and service connectivity to the adjoining property owned by Henmar Trust. The Henmar Trust property has existing frontage onto established public roads where future services can be designed and connected too. There is little rationale for physically connecting the northern part of the Henmar Trust property to Mangaone Precinct. Plan Change 14 is supported by a comprehensive range of detailed technical reports that sufficiently assess the effects of proposed Plan Change 14 on the environment, justifies the location of specific infrastructure and outlines mitigation measures which have been included in the proposed policies, objectives and rules for the Mangaone Precinct.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.6.6 and 4.6.7.

Submission Point	Submitter name	District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
10/24	Waikato Regional Council	Not Specified	Further Assessment	In Table 1 within Section 3.0 of the Stormwater Management Plan, the assessment has mixed up volume retention versus detention. The proposed stormwater wetlands will not provide volume retention, only detention (attenuation of peak flows).	Clarify how the proposal will comply with the Waikato Stormwater Management Guideline 2020 to address volume retention.	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.6.8.
FS1/17	Henmar Trust	Not Specified	Support	If this is correct it needs to be clarified to ensure an accurate assessment of actual or potential adverse environmental effects, in particular stormwater retention.	Support the request for further assessment.	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.6.8.
FS2/88	Fonterra Ltd	Not Specified	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission points 10/24, 10/25 and 10/26 by Waikato Regional Council. Any discharge to the Mangaone Stream will be the subject of a discharge permit as such this is a consenting matter. The points raised in 10/24, 10/25 and 10/26 will be matters of assessment that the Waikato Regional Council can consider.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Waikato Regional Council (Submitter 10) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.6.8.
10/25	Waikato Regional Council	Not Specified	Neutral	The Mangaone Stream forms part of WRC's Waikato Central Land Drainage Scheme. We note that the stream is not managed to accommodate urban runoff flows, therefore it will be imperative to manage stormwater volume flows.	Ensure the stormwater management approach appropriately manages volume flows to the Mangaone Stream.	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.6.8.
FS1/18	Henmar Trust	Not Specified	Support	Important that stormwater is managed in a manner that will not adversely affect downstream properties.	Stormwater must be managed in a manner that will not adversely affect downstream properties. Stormwater should be restricted to 80% predevelopment peak runoff levels to cater for extreme weather events.	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.6.8.
FS2/89	Fonterra Ltd	Not Specified	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission points 10/24, 10/25 and 10/26 by Waikato Regional Council. Any discharge to the Mangaone Stream will be the subject of a discharge permit as such this is a consenting matter. The points raised in 10/24, 10/25 and 10/26 will be matters of assessment that the Waikato Regional Council can consider.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Waikato Regional Council (Submitter 10) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept Refer to paragraph 4.6.8.
10/26	Waikato Regional Council	Not Specified	Neutral	The plan change proposes to manage peak flows by attenuating to the 2, 10 and 100 year ARI events in the stormwater wetlands. However, given the Mangaone Stream is in a floodplain, it will be difficult for the wetlands to effectively attenuate the peak flows if they are inundated by flood flows.	Ensure the constructed stormwater wetlands will be outside of the 100-year flood extent, to ensure these properly function as intended.	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.6.8.
FS1/19	Henmar Trust	Not Specified	Support	Agree that the management of peak flows is very important and that the proposed Plan Change must demonstrate that it will not create flooding effects on the Henmar Trust property, including in extreme weather events.	1. Accept submission point. 2. Require that the entire Plan Change 14 Area (including the Kiwifruit Block) is assessed, and that development and stormwater attenuation will not create flooding on the Henmar Trust property, including during extreme weather events. 3. Accept the relief sought by Henmar Trust. 4. Make amendments to any other provisions within the Waipa District Plan and/or proposed Plan Change 14 linked to the relief sought by the submitter, Henmar Trust, including any cross references in other chapters, be undertaken. 5. Undertake any further relief that is considered necessary to give effect to the relief sought by the submitter, Henmar Trust, be undertaken.	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.6.8.
FS2/90	Fonterra Ltd	Not Specified	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission points 10/24, 10/25 and 10/26 by Waikato Regional Council. Any discharge to the Mangaone Stream will be the subject of a discharge permit as such this is a consenting matter. The points raised in 10/24, 10/25 and 10/26 will be matters of assessment that the Waikato Regional Council can consider.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Waikato Regional Council (Submitter 10) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept Refer to paragraph 4.6.8.
10/27	Waikato	Not Specified	Neutral	To assist with understanding the proposed stormwater management	Clarify whether Waipā District Council proposes to seek stormwater	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter name	District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
	Regional Council			approach, we query whether Waipā District Council will seek stormwater discharge consent for the entire PC14 area and manage all the stormwater discharges from private developments, or whether it is intended that private developers within the PC14 area will seek their own stormwater discharge consents.	discharge consent for the entire PC14 area and manage all the stormwater discharges from private developments.	Refer to paragraph 4.6.8.
FS1/20	Henmar Trust	Not Specified	Support	We consider this a valid question.	Accept submission.	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.6.8.
10/28	Waikato Regional Council	Not Specified	Further Assessment	Section 4.0 (and Appendix 1) of the Stormwater Management Plan describes and provides the results of hydraulic modelling undertaken to assess the impact of future development of the PC14 area on the flood behaviour of the Mangaone Stream. We request further detail and clarification in order to understand the modelling and its outputs.	Provide further detail and clarification in relation to the hydraulic modelling, to enable a full assessment of the potential flood hazard effects of the proposed plan change.	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.6.8.
FS1/21	Henmar Trust	Not Specified	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept submission.	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.6.8.
FS2/91	Fonterra Ltd	Not Specified	Neutral	Fonterra considers that details being requested under submission point 10/28 are matters of consent where more detailed stormwater modelling can occur with the post-development ground levels and other impervious surfaces are defined. Fonterra notes the Stormwater Management Plan included in Appendix G.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Waikato Regional Council (Submitter 10) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept Refer to paragraph 4.6.8.
10/29	Waikato Regional Council	Appendix S27	In Part	As part of its land drainage responsibilities, WRC regularly undertakes site inspections, weed spraying and cleaning of the stream. WRC requires vehicle access to undertake this work which should be formalised by an easement to ensure land drainage is protected in the future. With the proposed vesting of the Mangaone Stream Reserve in Waipā District Council, future management of the stream will require a collaborative approach with WRC's Integrated Catchment Management Directorate, which considers the stream in the context of the wider catchment.	That Waipā District Council works with WRC's Integrated Catchment Management Directorate to ensure that the design of the Mangaone Stream Reserve allows WRC's land drainage activities to co-exist with the ecological, cultural and recreational functions of the proposed reserve, and that the land drainage level of service to properties up and down stream of the plan change site can be maintained.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.6.9.

Table 6 - Kiwifruit Block

Submission Point	Submitter name	District Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose / In Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
7/2	Bardowie Investments Ltd	Planning Maps	Support	1. Support rezoning of Kiwifruit Block to Industrial 2. Any changes to notified objectives, policies, rules and methods applying to Kiwifruit Block opposed	Retain	Accept Refer to Section 4.7.
FS1/8	Henmar Trust	Not Specified	Oppose	Oppose the rezoning of Kiwifruit Block	1. Dismiss submission; or 2. If the Kiwifruit Block were to be rezoned require that; (i) It would need to be assessed by the Technical Reports and these would need to be notified for public submission, including stormwater. (ii) It would need transport connectivity to the Mangaone Industrial Precinct. Traffic within the C10 Industrial Growth Cell should be able to move freely between the Industrial Precincts, not a series of rabbit warrens restricted by property/ownership boundaries. (iii) It would need to share the heavy vehicle access off Swayne Road	Reject Refer to paragraphs 4.7.2 and 4.7.3.

Submission Point	Submitter name	District Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose / In Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
					that it currently enjoys sole access to, with the other Industrial Precincts within the C10 Industrial Growth Cell.	
7/3	Bardowie Investments Ltd	Appendix S20	Support	Support extension of Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan to the Kiwifruit Block	Retain	Accept Refer to Section 4.7.
FS1/9	Henmar Trust	Not Specified	Oppose	Oppose the rezoning of Kiwifruit Block.	1. Dismiss submission; or 2. If the Kiwifruit Block were to be rezoned require that; (i) It would need to be assessed by the Technical Reports, and these would need to be notified for public submission, including stormwater. (ii) It would need transport connectivity to the Mangaone Industrial Precinct. Traffic within the C10 Industrial Growth Cell should be able to move freely between the Industrial Precincts, not a series of rabbit warrens restricted by property/ownership boundaries. (iii) It would need to share the heavy vehicle access off Swayne Road that it currently enjoys sole access to, with the other Industrial Precincts within the C10 Industrial Growth Cell.	Reject Refer to paragraphs 4.7.2 and 4.7.3.
8/2	Lesley Dredge	Not Specified	Oppose	The Kiwifruit Block has been omitted from a number of the Plan Change 14 reports. There are inconsistencies in the reports as to what the reference area is - the Mangaone Structure Plan land area or the proposed Industrial Zoned land area. Although a recent consent for industrial activity was granted on this site (LU/0212/23), there was no notification opportunity, despite PC14 being a special circumstance for this land.	Include the Kiwifruit Block in all documentation relating to the Proposed Mangaone Structure Plan.	Reject Refer to paragraphs 4.7.2 and 4.7.3.
FS1/16	Henmar Trust	Not Specified	Support	Agree that the Kiwifruit Block should be included in the Technical Assessment if it is to be included in the proposed Plan Change.	Exclude the Kiwifruit Block from the proposed Plan Change; or Include the Kiwifruit Block within the proposed Plan Change and provided that; (i) It would need to be assessed by the Technical Reports, and these would need to be notified for public submission. (ii) It would need transport connectivity to the Mangaone Industrial Precinct. Traffic within the C10 Industrial Growth Cell should be able to move freely between the Industrial Precincts, not a series of rabbit warrens restricted by property/ownership boundaries. (iii) It would need to share the heavy vehicle access off Swayne Road that it currently enjoys sole access to, with the other Industrial Precincts within the C10 Industrial Growth Cell. (iv) Council accepts the relief sought by Henmar Trust. (v) Amendments to any other provisions within the Waipa District Plan and/or proposed Plan Change 14 linked to the relief sort by the submitter, Henmar Trust, including any cross references in other chapters, be undertaken. (vi) Any further relief that is considered necessary to give effect to the relief sort by the submitter, Henmar Trust, be undertaken.	Reject Refer to paragraphs 4.7.2 and 4.7.3.
FS2/27	Fonterra Ltd	Not Specified	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 8/2 by Lesley Dredge. Fonterra considers that the "Kiwifruit Block" has already been subject to Council approved technical studies. Site investigations in relation to the Kiwifruit Block (undertaken by BIL) have included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A Preliminary Site Investigation (re Contaminated Land) ▪ An integrated Transportation Assessment; 	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Lesley Dredge (Submitter 8) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraphs 4.7.2 and 4.7.3.

Submission Point	Submitter name	District Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose / In Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessments in relation to cultural effects, construction effects, archaeological effects, stormwater management, noise effects, and effects on character amenity and landscape values; and Confirmation from Heritage New Zealand that no Authority is required. <p>These supported the resource consents that enabled the development on the “Kiwifruit Block”. There is no reasonable need to repeat technical assessments.</p>		
9/5	Henmar Trust	Not Specified	Oppose	<p>The technical reports provided with this Private Plan change cannot be accurate if they have excluded this area of land (the Kiwifruit Block) and cannot be relied upon as a true indication of actual or potential effects. The proposed Plan Change as it stands seeks to rezone the Kiwifruit Block with no assessment of the impact of this land being used for the permitted Industrial Activities within the Bardowie Industrial Precinct. There is no restriction on the Kiwifruit Block stating that it can only be used for the activities for which it has resource consent. Once it is rezoned it will be entitled to undertake any of the activities provided for in the Industrial Zone, yet no assessment of the effects of these activities has been provided for in this Plan Change or in Plan Change 11.</p> <p>Furthermore, understand that the “Kiwifruit Block” contains contaminated soils. The existing resource consents are specific to the consented activities, and we assume have appropriate conditions to avoid, remedy or mitigate any actual or potential adverse effects. Consider that the rezoning of the “Kiwifruit Block”, without it being assessed by any Technical Reports fails to comply with Section 32(2). The proposed Bardowie Industrial Structure Plan shows this area as Industrial Node 1A, not stormwater reserve. Additionally, PC14 does not restrict the access of heavy vehicles to and from the Kiwifruit Block.</p>	That Section 4, 7 Survey Office Plan 499872 comprised in Record of Title 811702 and Section 1 Survey Office Plan 499872 comprised in Record of Title 805561 (the Kiwifruit Block) be excluded from the Plan Change, or the Technical Reports be updated to include the future Industrial Development of the “Kiwifruit Block”, with submitters having a further opportunity to submit on this aspect of the proposed plan change.	Reject Refer to paragraphs 4.7.2 and 4.7.3.
FS2/32	Fonterra Ltd	Not Specified	Oppose	<p>Fonterra opposes submission point 9/5 by Henmar Trust. Fonterra considers that the “Kiwifruit Block” has already been subject to Council approved technical studies. Site investigations in relation to the Kiwifruit Block (undertaken by BIL) have included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A Preliminary Site Investigation (re Contaminated Land) An integrated Transportation Assessment; Assessments in relation to cultural effects, construction effects, archaeological effects, stormwater management, noise effects, and effects on character amenity and landscape values; and Confirmation from Heritage New Zealand that no Authority is required. <p>These supported the resource consents that enabled the development on the “Kiwifruit Block”. There is no reasonable need to repeat technical assessments.</p>	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraphs 4.7.2 and 4.7.3.
9/16	Henmar Trust	Maps	Oppose	<p>Oppose the rezoning of the “Kiwifruit Block” as it has been excluded from the Technical Reports and therefore the actual or potential effects from rezoning this portion of rural land has not been assessed.</p>	That Section 4, 7 Survey Office Plan 499872 comprised in Record of Title 811702 and Section 1 Survey Office Plan 499872 comprised in Record of Title 805561 (the Kiwifruit Block) be excluded from the Plan Change, or the Technical Reports be updated to include the future Industrial Development of the “Kiwifruit Block”, with submitters having a further opportunity to submit on this aspect of the proposed plan change. That	Reject Refer to paragraphs 4.7.2 and 4.7.3.

Submission Point	Submitter name	District Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose / In Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
					is, the “Kiwifruit Block” remain zoned Rural on the Proposed Planning Map, unless it’s rezoning is assessed in the technical reports and these reports publicly notified.	
FS2/43	Fonterra Ltd	Maps	Oppose	<p>Fonterra opposes submission point 9/16 by Henmar Trust. Fonterra considers that the “Kiwifruit Block” has already been subject to Council approved technical studies. Site investigations in relation to the Kiwifruit Block (undertaken by BIL) have included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A Preliminary Site Investigation (re Contaminated Land) ▪ An integrated Transportation Assessment; ▪ Assessments in relation to cultural effects, construction effects, archaeological effects, stormwater management, noise effects, and effects on character amenity and landscape values; and ▪ Confirmation from Heritage New Zealand that no Authority is required. <p>These supported the resource consents that enabled the development on the “Kiwifruit Block”. There is no reasonable need to repeat technical assessments.</p>	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraphs 4.7.2 and 4.7.3.
11/02	Ken Dredge	Appendix S27	Oppose	<p>The Kiwifruit block has been omitted from a number of expert PC14 reports and assessments. The Kiwifruit block is also omitted from the Mangaone Structure Plan, Urban Design Statement. Incorporating the kiwifruit Block into the Mangaone Structure Plan will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ afford Swayne Road users and residents the same level of protection of amenity across the total industrial area to be re zoned. ▪ prevent a fragmented and ad hoc development approach, with continuous application of design elements across the total industrial area to be re zoned. ▪ achieve a well-functioning urban environment with good urban design. 	Incorporate the Kiwifruit block with the Mangaone Structure Plan	Reject Refer paragraph 5.7.4.
FS1/22	Henmar Trust	Appendix S27	Oppose	Oppose the rezoning of Kiwifruit Block	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Exclude the Kiwifruit Block from the proposed Plan Change; or 2. Accept the relief sought by Henmar Trust; and 3. Amendments to any other provisions within the Waipa District Plan and/or proposed Plan Change 14 linked to the relief sort by the submitter, Henmar Trust, including any cross references in other chapters, be undertaken. 4. Any further relief that is considered necessary to give effect to the relief sort by the submitter, Henmar Trust, be undertaken. 5. If include the Kiwifruit Block within the proposed Plan Change, require that; <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (i) It would need to be assessed by the Technical Reports, and these would need to be notified for public submission. (ii) It would need transport connectivity to the Mangaone Industrial Precinct. Traffic within the C10 Industrial Growth Cell should be able to move freely between the Industrial Precincts, not a series of rabbit warrens restricted by property/ownership boundaries. (iii) It would need to share the heavy vehicle access off Swayne Road that it currently enjoys sole access to, with the other Industrial Precincts within the C10 Industrial Growth Cell. 	Reject Refer to paragraphs 4.7.2 and 4.7.3.

Submission Point	Submitter name	District Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose / In Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
FS2/101	Fonterra Ltd	Appendix S27	Oppose	<p>Fonterra opposes submission point 11/2 by Kenneth Dredge. The planning assessment report titled “Plan Change 14 to the Waipā District Plan Mangaone Precinct C10 Industrial Growth Cell- Hautapu” executive summary states:</p> <p><i>“The “Kiwifruit Block” (comprising 7.8 ha) owned by BIL that adjoins the Waikato Expressway and has now been largely developed and/or consented for industrial purposes (i.e. for stormwater management purposes and a maintenance facility) in conjunction with existing and proposed activities within the Bardowie Industrial Precinct which adjoins the Kiwifruit Block to the west. For that reason, the various technical reports supporting Plan Change 14 relate to the undeveloped / unconsented part of the land that is the subject of Plan Change 14 (i.e. the Bardowie Farm).”</i></p> <p>The Kiwifruit Block through this Plan Change 14 process will be incorporated into the Bardowie Industrial Precinct.</p>	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Kenneth Dredge (Submitter 11) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraphs 4.7.2 and 4.7.3.

Table 7 - Mangaone Stream

Submission Point	Submitter name	District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
4/1	Waipā District Council	7.4.2.7	In Part	Rule 7.4.2.7 specifies daylight controls in relation to zone boundaries. In this instance the proposed Mangaone Stream Reserve will be vested as reserve but will not be rezoned to Reserve Zone as part of PC14. While it may be intended that the daylight controls apply to the proposed Mangaone Stream Reserve boundary, the wording of Rule 7.4.2.7 will not achieve this.	Amend Rule 7.4.2.7 as follows: Where a site adjoins a road, <u>a reserve</u> or any zone other than the industrial zone; no building, or stored materials shall penetrate through a recession plane at right angles to a boundary inclined inwards and upwards at an angle of 45° from 2.7m above ground level of the front boundary, side boundary and rear boundary of a site.	Accept Refer to paragraph 4.8.2.
4/2	Waipā District Council	7.4.2.41	In Part	Rule 7.4.2.41 applies lighting controls in respect of adjoining residential dwellings and roads. Given that proposed new Rule 7.4.2.42 seeks to control artificial lighting within the proposed Mangaone Stream Reserve, it is necessary that controls are also placed on artificial light sources on sites adjoining the proposed Mangaone Stream Reserve.	The relief sought is that Rule 7.4.2.41 be amended to read: All external lighting shall be shaded or directed away from any adjoining residential dwellings, <u>reserves</u> or roads, and adjusted and maintained to ensure that direct illuminance from the lighting source shall not exceed...; <u>(c) 4 lux at the boundary of the Mangaone Stream Reserve as identified on the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan.</u> Or other relief as may be appropriate (including the inclusion of a new rule in the Industrial Zone, or the amendment / adaptation of Rule 20.4.2.2 to be specific to light emissions adjacent to reserves and high value bat habitat areas.	Accept Refer to paragraph 4.8.2.
4/3	Waipā District Council	15.4.2.91A	In Part	Rule 15.4.2.91A refer to “Mangaone Stream Reserve Management Plan”. Use of this term may create confusion with respect to requirements for reserve management plans under the Reserves Act 1977.	This term where it appears throughout PC14 should be amended to read: Mangaone Stream Reserve <u>Management Development and Operational Maintenance</u> Plan	Accept Refer to paragraph 4.8.2.
4/4	Waipā District Council	21.2.7.1	In Part	Information Requirement 21.2.7.1 refer to “Mangaone Stream Reserve Management Plan”. Use of this term may create confusion with respect to requirements for reserve management plans under the Reserves Act 1977.	This term where it appears throughout PC14 should be amended to read: Mangaone Stream Reserve <u>Management Development and Operational Maintenance</u> Plan	Accept Refer to paragraph 4.8.2.
4/5	Waipā District	15.4.2.91A	In Part	Rule 15.4.2.91A provides requirements that apply to any subdivision and development within the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan area.	Rule 15.4.2.91A(g) is amended to read: The Mangaone Stream Reserve is planted and fenced, and pedestrian /	Accept Refer to paragraph 4.8.2.

Submission Point	Submitter name	District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
	Council			Rules 15.4.2.91A (d) and (g) require that: - The first subdivision or land use consent for industrial purposes is required to provide a plan for the reserve (including the information requirements set out in Rule 21.2.7.1). - The proposed Mangaone Stream Reserve is planted and fenced, and pedestrian / cycle paths are constructed as part of the first subdivision consent	cycle paths are constructed <u>in accordance with the approved Mangaone Stream Reserve Development and Operational Maintenance Plan</u> as part of the first subdivision consent. Or other relief as may be appropriate (including the inclusion of specific fencing requirements for industrial / reserve boundaries within the Industrial Zone provisions.	
4/6	Waipā District Council	21.2.7.1(i)	In Part	Rule 21.2.7.1(i) provides that the plan for the proposed Mangaone Stream Reserve is to include a planting / fencing implementation programme. It is not clear what actual fencing requirements will apply under the ruleset in relation to the proposed Mangaone Stream Reserve boundary with adjoining industrial properties. This requirement should be clarified in the rules.	Rule 21.2.7.1(i) is amended to read: Planting / Fencing Implementation Programme <u>in accordance with a reserve's agreement forming part of a development agreement under Rule 7.4.2.36.</u> Or other relief as may be appropriate (including the inclusion of specific fencing requirements for industrial / reserve boundaries within the Industrial Zone provisions.	Accept Refer to paragraph 4.8.2.
9/23	Henmar Trust	7.3.4.1	In Part	Agree with maintain and enhancing the cultural, ecological, and amenity values of the Mangaone Stream and its margins within or adjacent to industrial areas.	Council accepts the submitters proposed amendments to Proposed Plan Change 14.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.8.3.
FS2/50	Fonterra Ltd	7.3.4.1	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 9/23 by Henmar Trust for the reasons set out in Fonterra's primary submission.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.8.3.
10/14	Waikato Regional Council	7.4.2.5A	Support	We support this proposed rule requiring buildings to be setback at least 5m from the boundary of the Mangaone Stream Reserve in accordance with the recommendations of Bluewattle Ecology.	Retain	Accept Refer to paragraph 4.8.3.
10/15	Waikato Regional Council	7.4.2.42	Support	We support this proposed rule for the Mangaone Stream Reserve to mitigate adverse lighting effects on long-tailed bats, in accordance with the recommendations of Bluewattle Ecology. We seek to ensure that this rule will continue to apply to the reserve and High Value Bat Habitat Area once the reserve is vested in Waipā District Council.	Retain	Accept Refer to paragraph 4.8.3.
10/17	Waikato Regional Council	15.4.2.91A	In Part	We also recommend that an additional rule be added requiring all future resource consent applications for the Mangaone Precinct to be consistent with the approved management plan.	Add a rule requiring all subsequent subdivision and land use consent applications for the Mangaone Precinct to be consistent with the approved Mangaone Stream Reserve Management Plan.	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.8.4.
FS2/82	Fonterra Ltd	15.4.2.91A	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission points 10/17 and 10/18 by Waikato Regional Council. Fonterra considers it is unnecessary to include an additional rule as this requirement will be imposed as a condition of a land use or subdivision consent in the Mangaone Precinct.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Waikato Regional Council (Submitter 10) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.8.4.
10/18	Waikato Regional Council	15.4.2.91A(f)	In Part	We support the proposed requirement for the Mangaone Stream Reserve to be vested in Waipā District Council as part of the first subdivision consent for the plan change site. This will provide certainty of the future management and protection of the reserve and its ecological values. However, we recommend that proposed Rule 15.4.2.91A(f) be amended to also require that the management of the Mangaone Stream Reserve occurs in accordance with the approved management plan.	Retain Rule 15.4.2.91A(f) but amend to also require the management of the Mangaone Stream Reserve to occur in accordance with the approved Mangaone Stream Reserve Management Plan.	Accept Refer to paragraph 4.8.5.
FS2/83	Fonterra Ltd	15.4.2.91A(f)	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission points 10/17 and 10/18 by Waikato Regional Council. Fonterra considers it is unnecessary to include an additional rule as this requirement will be imposed as a condition of a land use or subdivision consent in the Mangaone Precinct.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Waikato Regional Council (Submitter 10) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.8.5.
10/19	Waikato	15.4.2.91A(g)	In Part	We support the proposed requirement for the Mangaone Stream	Amend Rule 15.4.2.91A(g) to apply to the first subdivision or <u>land use</u>	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter name	District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
	Regional Council			Reserve to be vested in Waipā District Council as part of the first subdivision consent for the plan change site. This will provide certainty of the future management and protection of the reserve and its ecological values. We suggest that Rule 15.4.2.91A(g) be amended to require that the Mangaone Stream Reserve is planted and fenced as part of the first subdivision or land use consent application for the Mangaone Precinct.	<u>consent</u> for the Mangaone Precinct.	Refer to paragraph 4.8.6.
FS2/84	Fonterra Ltd	15.4.2.91A(g)	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 10/19 by Waikato Regional Council. Rule 15.4.2.91A(g) should only be triggered if the consent being sought is to enable the industrial development and use of the Mangaone Precinct. Fonterra does not consider a blanket trigger appropriate.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Waikato Regional Council (Submitter 10) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.8.6.
12/06	Director-General of Conservation	7.4.2.5A	Support	I support proposed rule requiring buildings to be setback at least 5m from the boundary of the Mangaone Stream Reserve in accordance with the recommendations of Bluewattle Ecology (Appendix D2).	Retain	Accept Refer to paragraph 4.8.3.
FS3/6	Forest & Bird	7.4.2.5A	Support	Forest & Bird supports all parts of the submission that support identification, management and monitoring of High Value Bat Habitat Areas, the mitigation and avoidance of impacts on bats, and the contribution to better outcomes for indigenous biodiversity.	The whole of the submission be allowed.	Accept Refer to paragraph 4.8.3.
12/13	Director-General of Conservation	21.2.7.1	In Part	I support the proposed information requirements and assessment criteria for the Mangaone Stream Reserve Management Plan as comprehensive, subject to the amendments I have requested. Regarding, clause (a.) – given the extent and area of the reserve has already been mapped in Appendix S27 and its area and function has been described in the supporting documentation the mapped area should be generally in accordance with the structure plan.	Amend 21.2.7.1(a) to read as follows: (a) Clarification Evidence (by way of mapping) <u>that as to the precise area and extent of the reserve area is generally in accordance with Appendix S27 and Figure S27.B;</u>	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.8.7.
FS2/110	Fonterra Ltd	21.2.7.1	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 12/13 by Director-General of Conservation. The proposed changes to Rule 15.4.2.69 already requires that any subdivision or development (as relevant) is in general accordance with the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan in Appendix S27. If the subdivision or development does not comply with the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan in Appendix S27 it becomes a non-complying activity.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Director-General of Conservation (Submitter 12) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.8.7.
FS3/13	Forest & Bird	21.2.7.1	Support	Forest & Bird supports all parts of the submission that support identification, management and monitoring of High Value Bat Habitat Areas, the mitigation and avoidance of impacts on bats, and the contribution to better outcomes for indigenous biodiversity.	The whole of the submission be allowed.	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.8.7.

Table 8 - National Grid Yard

Submission Point	Submitter name	District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
3/1	Transpower	7.4.2.43	In Part	In term of the specifics of the proposed rule, Transpower understands the rule is derived from the Rural zone. While Transpower accepts the rule when applied to a rural context, it has concerns that a direct duplication of the Rural zone rule into the Industrial zone is not	Amendment to notified Rule 7.4.2.43 to remove reference to farming/rural based activities (to reflect the proposed Industrial zoning of the site), and insertion of a vehicle access clause.	Accept Refer to Section 4.9.

Submission Point	Submitter name	District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
				appropriate in that it will create confusion to plan users by referring to rural/farming related activities., On this basis Transpower considers clauses a), d) and e) are not appropriate given the proposed Industrial zoning, and therefore should be deleted.		
FS2/9	Fonterra	7.4.2.43	Support	Fonterra supports Transpower's entire submission to amend the provisions specified. The points raised within Transpower's submission had been discussed with Fonterra prior to the close of the submission period for Plan Change 14.	That the Council adopts the specified amendments outlined in Transpower's original submission.	Accept Refer to Section 4.9.
3/2	Transpower	7.4.2.43	In Part	This is an essential requirement, particularly for an industrial area, as physical access to transmission lines is required for all maintenance and project work, and when a system fault occurs, the Grid would need to be restored quickly to reduce impacts on businesses and communities throughout the district, and beyond. Restoring supply becomes challenging if transmission lines are difficult to access due to intensive developments that may be constructed under and around them. The NPSET provides clear a policy directive that decision makers must "recognise and provide for the effective operation, maintenance, upgrading and development of the electricity transmission network" (Policy 2) and ensure that "operation, maintenance, upgrading, and development of the electricity transmission network is not compromised" (Policy 10).	A further amendment is sought to include a new clause to ensure vehicle access to support structures is available.	Accept Refer to Section 4.9. Clause (j) has been added to Rule 15.4.2.91A to capture this request.
FS2/10	Fonterra	7.4.2.43	Support	Fonterra supports Transpower's entire submission to amend the provisions specified. The points raised within Transpower's submission had been discussed with Fonterra prior to the close of the submission period for Plan Change 14.	That the Council adopts the specified amendments outlined in Transpower's original submission.	Accept Refer to Section 4.9. Clause (j) has been added to Rule 15.4.2.91A to capture this request.
3/3	Transpower	7.4.2.44	In Part	In term of the specifics of the proposed rule, Transpower understands the rule is derived from the Rural zone. While Transpower accepts the rule when applied to a rural context, it has concerns that a direct duplication of the Rural zone rule into the Industrial zone is not appropriate in that it will create confusion to plan users by referring to rural/farming related activities. On this basis Transpower considers clauses c) are not appropriate given the proposed Industrial zoning, and therefore should be deleted.	Amendment to notified Rule 7.4.2.44 to remove reference to farming/rural based activities (to reflect the proposed Industrial zoning of the site).	Accept Refer to Section 4.9. Rule 7.4.2.44(c) refers to horticultural structures and shall be removed.
FS2/11	Fonterra	7.4.2.43	Support	Fonterra supports Transpower's entire submission to amend the provisions specified. The points raised within Transpower's submission had been discussed with Fonterra prior to the close of the submission period for Plan Change 14.	That the Council adopts the specified amendments outlined in Transpower's original submission.	Accept Refer to Section 4.9. Rule 7.4.2.44(c) refers to horticultural structures and shall be removed.
3/4	Transpower	7.1	Neutral	Given the current WDP zone-based framework, it is appropriate that Introductory text be provided to Section 7 to provide background/contextual information for the notified National Grid specific rules – consistent with the approach in the Rural zone and Residential zone chapters.	Insert the following into Section 7.1 Introduction of Section 7: <u>7.1.8 A number of National Grid transmission lines traverse the Waipā District, including in the industrial zone. The subdivision, use and development of land is controlled within a defined National Grid Corridor to ensure potential adverse effects are appropriately addressed. The greatest level of restriction on landowners is within the National Grid Yard (particularly the support structures) which is the area that is closest to the transmission line and where there is the greatest potential for adverse effects</u>	Accept Refer to Section 4.9.

Submission Point	Submitter name	District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
					<p><u>to occur. The restrictions recognise that the greatest potential effects are generated by sensitive activities and intensive development. Notwithstanding such restrictions, any lawfully established activities within the National Grid Corridor can continue as long as they meet the criteria for existing use rights in the Act or are a permitted activity.</u></p> <p><u>7.1.9 The management of subdivision within the National Grid Corridor is addressed in Section 15 (Infrastructure, Hazards, Development and Subdivision).</u></p>	
FS2/12	Fonterra	7.1	Support	Fonterra supports Transpower's entire submission to amend the provisions specified. The points raised within Transpower's submission had been discussed with Fonterra prior to the close of the submission period for Plan Change 14.	That the Council adopts the specified amendments outlined in Transpower's original submission.	Accept Refer to Section 4.9.
3/5	Transpower	7.2	Neutral	Given the current WDP zoned based framework, it is appropriate a new Issue be inserted into Section 7 to identify the issue of locating activities locating within proximity of the National Grid. The issue would accompany notified National Grid specific rules.	Insert the following into Section 7.2 Resource Management Issues of Section 7: <u>7.2.21 National Grid transmission lines for the conveyance of electricity National Grid transmission lines for the conveyance of electricity are considered to be a resource of national and regional significance that requires protection. The location of activities within National Grid Corridors have the potential to result in adverse effects, including reverse sensitivity effects, on the operation, maintenance, upgrading and future development of the National Grid network and result in sensitive, and other activities locating where they are most vulnerable to the effects, including risks, associated with the line.</u>	Accept Refer to Section 4.9.
FS2/13	Fonterra	7.2	Support	Fonterra supports Transpower's entire submission to amend the provisions specified. The points raised within Transpower's submission had been discussed with Fonterra prior to the close of the submission period for Plan Change 14.	That the Council adopts the specified amendments outlined in Transpower's original submission.	Accept Refer to Section 4.9.
3/6	Transpower	7.3	Neutral	Given the current WDP zone-based framework, it is appropriate a National Grid objective be inserted into Section 7 to provide the policy context for the notified National Grid specific rules. None of the operative or notified Section 7 objectives are sufficiently directive or capture the outcome the National Grid specific objective seeks to achieve.	Insert the following into Section 7.3 Objectives and Policies of Section 7: <u>Objective - National Grid transmission networks</u> <u>7.3.9 To recognise and provide for the ongoing operation, maintenance and development of the National Grid electricity transmission network.</u>	Accept Refer to Section 4.9.
FS2/14	Fonterra	7.3	Support	Fonterra supports Transpower's entire submission to amend the provisions specified. The points raised within Transpower's submission had been discussed with Fonterra prior to the close of the submission period for Plan Change 14.	That the Council adopts the specified amendments outlined in Transpower's original submission.	Accept Refer to Section 4.9.
3/7	Transpower	7.3	Neutral	Given the current WDP zone-based framework, it is appropriate National Grid policies be inserted into Section 7 to provide the policy context for the notified National Grid specific rules. None of the operative or notified Section 7 policies are sufficiently directive or provide the appropriate policy framework in which to consider a non-complying activity should resource consent be required.	Insert the following into Section 7.3 Objectives and Policies of Section 7: <u>Policies – Management of activities within National Grid Corridors</u> <u>7.3.9.1 To recognise the importance of the National Grid network in enabling communities to provide for their economic and social well-being and to provide for the ongoing operation,</u>	Accept Refer to Section 4.9.

Submission Point	Submitter name	District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
					<p><u>maintenance and development of the Grid through the management of activities within identified setbacks and corridors.</u></p> <p><u>7.3.9.2 To ensure safe and efficient use and development of the National Grid and to protect the National Grid from the adverse effects of activities adjacent to it.</u></p> <p><u>7.3.9.3 To avoid inappropriate land use and development within the National Grid Yard to ensure that the operation, maintenance, upgrading and development of the electricity transmission network is not compromised and to minimise the potential for nuisance effects.</u></p> <p><u>7.3.9.4 To avoid the establishment of new sensitive activities and other inappropriate activities within the National Grid Yard in order to minimise adverse effects on and from the National Grid, including adverse effects on health and safety, amenity and nuisance effects, and reverse sensitivity effects.</u></p> <p><u>7.3.9.5 To not foreclose operation or maintenance options or, to the extent practicable, the carrying out of routine and planned upgrade works.</u></p>	
FS2/15	Fonterra	7.3	Support	Fonterra supports Transpower's entire submission to amend the provisions specified. The points raised within Transpower's submission had been discussed with Fonterra prior to the close of the submission period for Plan Change 14.	That the Council adopts the specified amendments outlined in Transpower's original submission.	Accept Refer to Section 4.9.
3/8	Transpower	7.4	Neutral	Given the current WDP zone-based framework, it is appropriate National Grid policies be inserted into Section 7 to provide the policy context for the notified National Grid specific rules. None of the operative or notified Section 7 policies are sufficiently directive or provide the appropriate policy framework in which to consider a non-complying activity should resource consent be required.	<p>Insert the following into Section 7.4 Rules of Section 7: <u>Rules – Earthworks</u></p> <p><u>7.4.2.45 Any earthworks within a National Grid Yard must:</u></p> <p>b) <u>Around National Grid tower support structures:</u></p> <p>i) <u>Be no deeper than 300mm within 6m of the outer visible edge of a National Grid tower; and</u></p> <p>ii) <u>Be no deeper than 3m between 6m to 12m from the outer visible edge of a National Grid tower.</u></p> <p>c) <u>Anywhere within the National Grid Yard</u></p> <p>i) <u>Not create an unstable batter that will affect a transmission support structure; and</u></p> <p>ii) <u>Ensure vehicular access to any National Grid support structure is available; and</u></p> <p>iii) <u>Not result in a reduction in the ground to conductor clearance distances below what is required by Table 4 of NZECP34.</u></p> <p><u>Provided that the following are exempt from Rule 7.4.2.45.a. and b. above:</u></p> <p>i) <u>Earthworks undertaken by a network utility operator.</u></p> <p><u>Activities that fail to comply with this rule will require a resource consent for a non-complying activity.</u></p>	Accept Refer to Section 4.9.
FS2/16	Fonterra	7.4	Support	Fonterra supports Transpower's entire submission to amend the provisions specified. The points raised within Transpower's submission had been discussed with Fonterra prior to the close of the submission period for Plan Change 14.	That the Council adopts the specified amendments outlined in Transpower's original submission.	Accept Refer to Section 4.9.

Submission Point	Submitter name	District Plan Provision	Support / Oppose / In Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
3/9	Transpower	15.4.1.1(aa)	Support	Support for proposed Rule 15.4.1.1(aa), on the basis a new standard is inserted into proposed rule 15.4.2.91A, and the default non-complying activity status is retained.	Retain	Accept Refer to Section 4.9.
FS2/17	Fonterra	15.4.1.1(aa)	Support	Fonterra supports Transpower's entire submission to amend the provisions specified. The points raised within Transpower's submission had been discussed with Fonterra prior to the close of the submission period for Plan Change 14.	That the Council adopts the specified amendments outlined in Transpower's original submission.	Accept Refer to Section 4.9.
3/10	Transpower	15.4.2.91A	In Part	In order to manage the effects, Transpower seeks the insertion of an additional standard into the proposed rule that in part reflects operative rule 15.4.2.29 "All lots shall identify a building platform for the principal dwelling, and any proposed secondary dwelling, outside of the National Grid Yard." but is modified to refer to 'principal buildings' as opposed to 'principal dwelling' on the basis of the Industrial zoning and that residential activities are a non-complying activity in the Industrial zone under rule 7.4.1.5a. For completeness, Transpower accepts the operative National Grid specific objective and policies within Section 15, acknowledging the provisions within Section 15.3.15 are outside the scope of PPC14.	Insert a new standard into proposed rule 15.4.2.91A as follows: ... (b) Only light vehicles are able to use the proposed road connection to Swayne Road..... (i) <u>On all lots, building platforms for the principal buildings can be accommodated outside of the National Grid Yard.</u>	Accept Refer to Section 4.9.
FS2/18	Fonterra	15.4.2.91A	Support	Fonterra supports Transpower's entire submission to amend the provisions specified. The points raised within Transpower's submission had been discussed with Fonterra prior to the close of the submission period for Plan Change 14.	That the Council adopts the specified amendments outlined in Transpower's original submission.	Accept Refer to Section 4.9.

Table 9 - Rezoning

Submission Point	Submitter name	District Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose / In Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
9/1	Henmar Trust	Not Specified	Support	Support the rezoning of Lot 2 DP 529042 comprised in RT: 856574 subject to the relief sought in this submission, in particular; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensuring that any actual or potential adverse effects of the proposal are less than minor. Ensuring that the proposal is in accordance with the objectives and policies of the Waipa District Plan. Ensure that the District Plan Rules are amended to protect the adjoining Rural Zones and the Industrial/Rural Interface. Ensure that the proposal provides traffic and service connectivity to the adjoining property owned by Henmar Trust that is located within the C10 Industrial Growth Cell. Avoid, remedy or mitigate any downstream flooding effects on the Henmar Trust property located within the C10 Industrial Growth Cell by restricting stormwater runoff within the Mangaone Industrial Precinct and Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan Areas to 80% of pre-development peak flows. 	Rezoning Lot 2 DP 529042.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.10.2 and 4.10.3.

Submission Point	Submitter name	District Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose / In Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
FS2/28	Fonterra Ltd	Not Specified	Support in Part / Oppose in Part	Fonterra supports the rezoning of Lot 2 DP 529042 from rural to industrial. Fonterra opposes requiring Mangaone Precinct to provide traffic and service connectivity to the adjoining property owned by Henmar Trust. The Henmar Trust property has existing frontage onto established public roads where future services can be designed and connected to. There is little rationale for physically connecting the northern part of the Henmar Trust property to Mangaone Precinct. Plan Change 14 is supported by a comprehensive range of detailed technical reports that sufficiently assess the effects of proposed Plan Change 14 on the environment and outline mitigation measures which have been included in the proposed policies, objectives and rules for the Mangaone Precinct.	That the Council rezone Lot 2 DP 529042 from rural to industrial and that the Council does not adopt additional requirements proposed by Henmar Trust.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.10.2 and 4.10.3.
9/11	Henmar Trust	Appendix S27	In Part	Support the rezoning of this area of land within C10 Industrial Growth Cell in principle, but not in its current form.	Reject Appendix S27 – Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan as notified.	Reject Refer to paragraph 5.10.3.
FS2/38	Fonterra Ltd	Appendix S27	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 9/11 by Henmar Trust for the reasons set out in Fonterra's primary submission.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 5.10.3.
9/17	Henmar Trust	Maps	Not stated	Support the rezoning of Lot 2 DP 529042 comprised in RT: 856574, Bardowie Farm, subject to the relief sought in this submission.	Support the rezoning of Lot 2 DP 529042 comprised in RT: 856574, Bardowie Farm, and the proposed Mangaone Precinct and the Bardowie Industrial Precinct provide traffic and service connectivity to the Henmar Trust property located within the C10 Industrial Growth Cell.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.10.2 and 4.10.3.
FS2/44	Fonterra Ltd	Maps	Support in Part / Oppose in Part	Fonterra supports the rezoning of Lot 2 DP 529042 from rural to industrial. Fonterra opposes requiring Mangaone Precinct to provide traffic and service connectivity to the adjoining property owned by Henmar Trust. The Henmar Trust property has existing frontage onto established public roads where future services can be designed and connected to. There is little rationale for physically connecting the northern part of the Henmar Trust property to Mangaone Precinct.	That the Council rezone Lot 2 DP 529042 from rural to industrial and that the Council does not adopt additional requirements proposed by Henmar Trust.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.10.2 and 4.10.3.

Table 10 - Rural

Submission Point	Submitter name	District Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose / In Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
2/1	H Wood & O'Sheas Trustees No 8 Ltd	Not Specified	Oppose	There appears to be no rule addressing the noise that will emanate from the development or imposing restrictive working hours. Presently, standing at the entrance gate of 176 Swayne Road, one can distinctly hear the beeping noise from forklifts in the AGP factory at certain times. It is evident that the noise level will significantly increase, thereby disrupting the peace and harmony we currently enjoy.	No decision requested.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.11.2 to 4.11.4.
FS2/5	Fonterra Ltd	Not Specified	Oppose	Existing noise regulations are contained within the Waipā District Plan and Plan Change 14 does not modify these other than amending the first sentence of Rule 7.4.2.20 to include the 'Managone Precinct Structure Plan Area'. These existing noise limits will apply to Plan Change 14.	That the Council does not adopt the relief sought by Hannah Wood and O'Sheas Trustees No. 8 Ltd (Submitter 2) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.11.2 to 4.11.4.

Submission Point	Submitter name	District Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose / In Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
2/4	H Wood & O'Sheas Trustees No 8 Ltd	Not Specified	Oppose	We received a visit from Fonterra Co-operative Group Limited, Dale Arbury Consenting and Policy Project Manager (now National Manager – Environmental Operations), on 27 November 2023. We were told that building setbacks will be 30m from the Swayne Road boundary. After reading Appendix C we wish to record our disappointment that the 30m set has not be taken into account as 30m would limit the impact of buildings facades that will be clearly visible through the landscaping proposals offered. The proposed measures highlighted above will not satisfy the visual impact requirements for occupants classified as “Sensitive Viewers,” as referred to on page 10 of Appendix C.	<p>a) The building setback should be increased to 30 meters, as originally represented.</p> <p>b) A 10-meter landscaped buffer strip should be introduced, featuring a berm that is a minimum of 2 meters high, landscaped with hedges or shrubs that grow to at least 2 meters in height. Between the Swayne Road boundary and the berm, evergreen trees should be planted at 10-meter intervals, reaching a minimum height of 12 meters at maturity, with a post and rail fence to delineate the boundary. This type of buffer zone is exemplified on the Waikato Expressway.</p> <p>c) This will allow the commencement of the building to be set back 20 meters from the landscaped buffer strip, thereby providing a suitable yard area.</p> <p>d) This arrangement will allow for the installation of a building security fence, with a maximum height of 3 meters, at the end of the landscaped buffer strip, thereby eliminating any visual impact on Swayne Road.</p>	Accept in Part Refer to paragraphs 4.11.5 to 4.11.8 regarding parts (a) & (c); Refer to paragraphs 4.11.9 to 4.11.15 regarding part (b); and Part (d) is as proposed in Plan Change.
FS2/8	Fonterra Ltd	Not Specified	Oppose	Fonterra opposes Hannah Wood and O’Sheas Trustees No. 8 Ltd submission point 2/4. A detailed Landscape Assessment (Appendix C) was submitted with Plan Change 14. This report provides a comprehensive assessment on the visual impact of proposed Plan Change 14.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Hannah Wood and O’Sheas Trustees No. 8 Ltd (Submitter 2) and the Council retains the setbacks as notified.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraphs 4.11.5 to 4.11.15.
7/11	Bardowie Investments Ltd	Not Specified	Support	Support proposed amendments requiring fencing and landscape buffers along Swayne Road boundaries	Retain	Accept in Part Refer to Section 4.11.
9/4	Henmar Trust	Not Specified	Oppose	Oppose lack of consideration of any actual or potential adverse environmental effects on adjoining properties and on the adjoining Rural Zone. Any actual or potential adverse effects should be mitigated internally within the proposed Industrial Precinct Areas.	That if Council grants the proposed plan change, they require appropriate provisions and Rules to be included into the District Plan to ensure that any actual or potential adverse effects on the Henmar Trust property are less than minor.	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.11.19.
FS2/31	Fonterra Ltd	Not Specified	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 9/4 by Henmar Trust. Plan Change 14 is supported by a comprehensive range of detailed technical reports including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Landscape Assessment (Appendix C) o Urban Design Statement (Appendix N) These technical reports sufficiently assess the effects of proposed Plan Change 14 on the rural/industrial interface, particularly along Swayne Road and Zig Zag Road. The proposed mitigation measures from these reports have been included in the proposed policies, objectives and rules for the Mangaone Precinct and results in a stronger set of provisions when dealing with this interface compared to the existing Waipā District Plan. Fonterra notes that the Henmar Trust property has not been specifically identified in terms of the rural/industrial interface as its part of the industrial growth cell and it is intended to be zoned Industrial in future.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.11.19.
9/6	Henmar Trust	Not Specified	Oppose	Oppose lack of consideration of any actual or potential adverse environmental effects on adjoining properties and on the adjoining Rural Zone. Any actual or potential adverse effects should be mitigated	Council alters the existing Rules and Performance Standards to ensure that any adverse effects on the Henmar Trust property are less than minor. In particular rules requiring increase yard setback where the site	Reject Refer paragraph 4.11.20.

Submission Point	Submitter name	District Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose / In Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
				internally within the proposed Industrial Precinct Areas.	adjoins the Rural Zone to 25m from the boundary. For example, buildings over 250m ² on the Henmar Trust property in the C10 Growth Cell need to be 25m from the boundary with the proposed Industrial Precincts, and buildings within the C10 Industrial Precincts should have to abide by the same standard where they adjoin the Rural Zone.	
FS2/33	Fonterra Ltd	Not Specified	Oppose	<p>Fonterra opposes submission points 9/6, 9/7, 9/8 and 9/9 by Henmar Trust. Plan Change 14 is supported by a comprehensive range of detailed technical reports that sufficiently assess the effects of proposed Plan Change 14 on the rural/industrial interface, particularly along Swayne Road and Zig Zag Road. The proposed mitigation measures from these reports have been included in the proposed policies, objectives and rules for the Mangaone Precinct and results in a stronger set of provisions when dealing with this interface compared to the existing Waipā District Plan.</p> <p>Fonterra notes that the Henmar Trust property has not been specifically identified in terms of the rural/industrial interface as its part of the industrial growth cell and it is intended to be zoned Industrial in future.</p> <p>Existing noise regulations are contained within the Waipā District Plan and Plan Change 14 does not modify these other than amending the first sentence of Rule 7.4.2.20 (specifying noise limits).</p> <p>Fonterra notes that any activities which require an air discharge permit from Waikato Regional Council is required to obtain a land use consent from Waipā District Council, as required by the proposed amendment to Rule 7.4.1.3(f).</p>	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer paragraph 4.11.20.
9/7	Henmar Trust	Not Specified	Oppose	Oppose lack of consideration of any actual or potential adverse environmental effects on adjoining properties and on the adjoining Rural Zone. Any actual or potential adverse effects should be mitigated internally within the proposed Industrial Precinct Areas.	Council alters the existing Rules and Performance Standards to ensure that any adverse effects on the Henmar Trust property are less than minor. In particular rules requiring reduced height where the site adjoins the Rural Zone to a maximum of 12m. For example, buildings on the Henmar Trust property in the C10 Growth Cell have a maximum height of 12m, and buildings within the C10 Industrial Precincts should have to abide by the same standard where they adjoin the Rural Zone.	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.11.21.
FS2/34	Fonterra Ltd	Not Specified	Oppose	<p>Fonterra opposes submission points 9/6, 9/7, 9/8 and 9/9 by Henmar Trust. Plan Change 14 is supported by a comprehensive range of detailed technical reports that sufficiently assess the effects of proposed Plan Change 14 on the rural/industrial interface, particularly along Swayne Road and Zig Zag Road. The proposed mitigation measures from these reports have been included in the proposed policies, objectives and rules for the Mangaone Precinct and results in a stronger set of provisions when dealing with this interface compared to the existing Waipā District Plan.</p> <p>Fonterra notes that the Henmar Trust property has not been specifically identified in terms of the rural/industrial interface as its part of the industrial growth cell and it is intended to be zoned Industrial in future.</p> <p>Existing noise regulations are contained within the Waipā District Plan and Plan Change 14 does not modify these other than amending the first sentence of Rule 7.4.2.20 (specifying noise limits).</p> <p>Fonterra notes that any activities which require an air discharge permit</p>	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.11.21.

Submission Point	Submitter name	District Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose / In Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
				from Waikato Regional Council is required to obtain a land use consent from Waipā District Council, as required by the proposed amendment to Rule 7.4.1.3(f).		
9/8	Henmar Trust	Not Specified	Oppose	Oppose lack of consideration of any actual or potential adverse environmental effects on adjoining properties and on the adjoining Rural Zone. Any actual or potential adverse effects should be mitigated internally within the proposed Industrial Precinct Areas.	Council alters the existing Rules and Performance Standards to ensure that any adverse effects on the Henmar Trust property are less than minor. In particular rules requiring specific height in relation to boundary standard where the site adjoins the Rural Zone, protecting the amenity of the Rural Zone.	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.11.21.
FS2/35	Fonterra Ltd	Not Specified	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission points 9/6, 9/7, 9/8 and 9/9 by Henmar Trust. Plan Change 14 is supported by a comprehensive range of detailed technical reports that sufficiently assess the effects of proposed Plan Change 14 on the rural/industrial interface, particularly along Swayne Road and Zig Zag Road. The proposed mitigation measures from these reports have been included in the proposed policies, objectives and rules for the Mangaone Precinct and results in a stronger set of provisions when dealing with this interface compared to the existing Waipā District Plan. Fonterra notes that the Henmar Trust property has not been specifically identified in terms of the rural/industrial interface as its part of the industrial growth cell and it is intended to be zoned Industrial in future. Existing noise regulations are contained within the Waipā District Plan and Plan Change 14 does not modify these other than amending the first sentence of Rule 7.4.2.20 (specifying noise limits). Fonterra notes that any activities which require an air discharge permit from Waikato Regional Council is required to obtain a land use consent from Waipā District Council, as required by the proposed amendment to Rule 7.4.1.3(f).	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.11.21.
9/9	Henmar Trust	Not Specified	Oppose	Oppose lack of consideration of any actual or potential adverse environmental effects on adjoining properties and on the adjoining Rural Zone. Any actual or potential adverse effects should be mitigated internally within the proposed Industrial Precinct Areas.	Council alters the existing Rules and Performance Standards to ensure that any adverse effects on the Henmar Trust property are less than minor. In particular rules requiring specific rules relating to noise restrictions and air quality, protecting the amenity of the Rural Zone.	Reject Refer to paragraphs 4.5.5 regarding air discharge, and 4.11.2 to 4.11.4 regarding noise.
FS2/36	Fonterra Ltd	Not Specified	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission points 9/6, 9/7, 9/8 and 9/9 by Henmar Trust. Plan Change 14 is supported by a comprehensive range of detailed technical reports that sufficiently assess the effects of proposed Plan Change 14 on the rural/industrial interface, particularly along Swayne Road and Zig Zag Road. The proposed mitigation measures from these reports have been included in the proposed policies, objectives and rules for the Mangaone Precinct and results in a stronger set of provisions when dealing with this interface compared to the existing Waipā District Plan. Fonterra notes that the Henmar Trust property has not been specifically identified in terms of the rural/industrial interface as its part of the industrial growth cell and it is intended to be zoned Industrial in future. Existing noise regulations are contained within the Waipā District Plan and Plan Change 14 does not modify these other than amending the first sentence of Rule 7.4.2.20 (specifying noise limits).	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraphs 4.5.5 regarding air discharge, and 4.11.2 to 4.11.4 regarding noise.

Submission Point	Submitter name	District Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose / In Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
				Fonterra notes that any activities which require an air discharge permit from Waikato Regional Council is required to obtain a land use consent from Waipā District Council, as required by the proposed amendment to Rule 7.4.1.3(f).		
9/20	Henmar Trust	7.3.4	In Part	<p>Agree that it is essential that development within the Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan Area and Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ is visually attractive and has landscaping that reflects Cambridge’s character; avoids or mitigates any actual or potential adverse effects on surrounding rural properties; and ▪ is co-ordinated with infrastructure provision ensuring connectivity to all land within the C10 Industrial Growth Cell. <p>However, maintain that the requirement to protect and enhance the ecological values of the Mangaone Stream and natural wetlands must apply to development within the Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan Area as well and the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area, as the Mangaone Stream runs through both areas, both areas discharge to the Mangaone Stream and we understand that the “Kiwifruit Block” contains contaminated land.</p>	Amend to read as follows: h. Within the <u>Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan Area</u> and Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area, enables industrial development whilst protecting and enhancing the ecological values of the Mangaone Stream and natural wetlands.	Accept Refer to paragraph 4.11.22.
FS2/47	Fonterra Ltd	7.3.4	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 9/20 by Henmar Trust. The only changes sought to the Bardowie Industrial Precinct are three consequential changes needed to enable Plan Change 14. Fonterra considers that the relief sought is outside the scope of this Plan Change 14 process as it is not intended to include a full review of the Bardowie Industrial Precinct.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.11.22.
9/21	Henmar Trust	7.3.4.5	In Part	<p>i) Support that the surrounding rural areas need to be protected through applying specific performance standards for perimeter sites, including the adjoining Rural Zone. The protection of the adjoining Henmar Trust property that is located in the Rural Zone is as important as the protection of properties across the road on Zig Zag Road and Swayne Road.</p> <p>ii) Oppose that the specific performance standards proposed do not protect the surrounding rural areas.</p>	Amend proposed new/replacement version of Policy 7.3.4.5 to read: “To ensure protection of surrounding rural areas through applying specific performance standards (such as buffer areas and building setbacks) for perimeter sites within the following areas: (i) Hautapu Industrial Structure Plan Area; (ii) Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan Area; and (iii) Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area (particularly along Zig Zag Road and Swayne Road.) ”	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.11.23.
FS2/48	Fonterra Ltd	7.3.4.5	Oppose	<p>Fonterra opposes submission point 9/21 by Henmar Trust. Plan Change 14 is supported by a comprehensive range of detailed technical reports including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Landscape Assessment (Appendix C) o Urban Design Statement (Appendix N) <p>These technical reports sufficiently assess the effects of proposed Plan Change 14 on the rural/industrial interface, particularly along Swayne Road and Zig Zag Road. The proposed mitigation measures from these reports have been included in the proposed policies, objectives and rules for the Mangaone Precinct and results in a stronger set of provisions when dealing with this interface compared to the existing Waipā District Plan.</p> <p>Fonterra notes that the Henmar Trust property has not been specifically identified in terms of the rural/industrial interface as its part of the industrial growth cell and it is intended to be zoned Industrial in future.</p>	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.11.23.

Submission Point	Submitter name	District Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose / In Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
9/28	Henmar Trust	7.4.1.3(f)	In Part	The location of the Bardowie Industrial Precinct and the Mangaone Industrial Precinct in close proximity of Residential homes, and adjoining Rural Zone land, means that the effects of activities requiring an air discharge consent needs to include an assessment of any actual or potential effects on the local environment, adjoining properties and adjoining zones. Activities requiring air discharge consents can have adverse health effects that must be considered, with potentially affected parties having the opportunity to be party to the process that affects the air quality of their home and/or workplace.	Amend Rule 7.4.1.3(f) as follows: Assessment will be restricted to the following matters: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any actual or potential adverse effects on the local environment, adjoining properties, and adjoining zones. Adverse effect on the Hautapu Dairy Manufacturing Site due to the discharge of contaminants to air. These matters will be considered in accordance with the assessment criteria in Section 21. Advice Note: This rule addresses the potential effects on <u>the local environment, adjoining properties and adjoining zones, as well as the food safety implications of discharges to air associated with the ongoing operation of the Hautapu Dairy Manufacturing Site.</u>	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.5.5.
FS2/55	Fonterra Ltd	7.4.1.3(f)	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 9/28 by Henmar Trust as the need to assess the potential and actual effects on people and the environment is required under the Resource Management Act section 104. Fonterra also notes that any activities which require an air discharge permit from Waikato Regional Council is required to obtain a land use consent from Waipā District Council, as required by the proposed amendment to Rule 7.4.1.3(f).	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.5.5.
9/30	Henmar Trust	7.4.2.1	In Part	Setback should be 15m as in other Industrial Precincts. Additionally, the rule needs to be amended to include the Bardowie Industrial Precinct Area as the Kiwifruit Block has significant road frontage with Swayne Road.	Amend Rule 7.4.2.1 to read as follows: “The minimum building setback from road boundaries shall be 5m, except in the following locations: ... e. <u>Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area and Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan Area</u> – The minimum setback from the boundary of Swayne Road and Zig Zag Road or from any segregation strips along those roads shall be 10m <u>15m</u> .”	Accept in Part Refer to paragraphs 4.11.5 to 4.11.8.
FS2/57	Fonterra Ltd	7.4.2.1	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 9/30 by Henmar Trust for the reasons set out in Fonterra’s primary submission.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraphs 4.11.5 to 4.11.8.
9/31	Henmar Trust	7.4.2.5A	In Part	This rule should include the Bardowie Industrial Precinct Area as the Mangaone Stream passes through this Area as well and the Bardowie Industrial Precinct discharges to the Mangaone Stream.	Amend proposed new Rule 7.4.2.5A to read: “Rule – Building setback from Mangaone Stream Reserve: <u>Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area and Bardowie Industrial Precinct Area</u> Within the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area <u>and the Bardowie Industrial Precinct Area</u> , the minimum building setback from the perimeter of the Mangaone Stream Reserve shall be 5m provided that this rule does not apply to roads and associated roading and/or stormwater infrastructure.	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.11.24
FS2/58	Fonterra Ltd	7.4.2.5A	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission points 9/31, 9/32, 9/33, 9/34, 9/35 and 9/36 by Henmar Trust. The only changes sought to the Bardowie Industrial Precinct are three consequential changes needed to enable Plan Change 14. Fonterra considers that the relief sought is outside the scope of the Plan Change 14 process as this is not intended to include a full review of the Bardowie Industrial Precinct.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.11.24.
9/32	Henmar Trust	7.4.2.7A	In Part	The Bardowie Industrial Precinct also fronts Swayne Road. Both the Mangaone Industrial Precinct Structure Plan Area and the Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan Area adjoin Rural Zone land. Need to	Amend Rule 7.4.2.7A as follows: “Within the <u>Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area and the Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan Area</u> , where a site adjoins Swayne	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.11.21.

Submission Point	Submitter name	District Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose / In Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
				also protect the amenity of adjoining land that is not zoned Industrial.	Road or Zig Zag Road, <u>or any zone other than the Industrial Zone</u> ; no building or stored materials shall penetrate through a recession plane at right angles to the road boundary inclined inwards and upwards at an angle of 30 degrees from 3m above ground level at the <u>front boundary, side boundary and rear boundary of a site road boundary.</u> "	
FS2/59	Fonterra Ltd	7.4.2.7A	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission points 9/31, 9/32, 9/33, 9/34, 9/35 and 9/36 by Henmar Trust. The only changes sought to the Bardowie Industrial Precinct are three consequential changes needed to enable Plan Change 14. Fonterra considers that the relief sought is outside the scope of the Plan Change 14 process as this is not intended to include a full review of the Bardowie Industrial Precinct.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.11.21.
9/33	Henmar Trust	7.4.2.12	In Part	For the Bardowie Industrial Precinct this rule refers to Rule 7.4.2.15 which then refers to the Urban Design and Landscape Guidelines for the Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan Area. This is confusing and poorly drafted. The requirements for the Bardowie Industrial Precinct should be written into Rule 7.4.2.15 and/or proposed 7.4.2.15A.	Amend Rule 7.4.2.15 and/or proposed 7.4.2.15A to ensure that the landscaping rules are included in the District Plan. Make any other necessary changes to the District Plan rules to cater for this amendment.	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.11.25.
FS2/60	Fonterra Ltd	7.4.2.12	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission points 9/31, 9/32, 9/33, 9/34, 9/35 and 9/36 by Henmar Trust. The only changes sought to the Bardowie Industrial Precinct are three consequential changes needed to enable Plan Change 14. Fonterra considers that the relief sought is outside the scope of the Plan Change 14 process as this is not intended to include a full review of the Bardowie Industrial Precinct.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.11.25.
9/34	Henmar Trust	7.4.2.15A	In Part	The Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan Area also adjoins Rural zoned land within the C10 Growth Cell, contains the Mangaone Stream, and has frontage to Swayne Road via the proposed inclusion of the Kiwifruit Block. It is only logical that these rules would apply to both Structure Plan Areas, particularly as they are both located within the C10 Industrial Growth Cell.	Amend 7.4.2.15A as follows (including consequential amendments to Rules 7.4.2.12, 7.4.2.13, 7.4.2.14, and 7.4.2.15 for admin purposes): The following rules shall apply in respect of the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area <u>and Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan Area</u> : a. The location, extent, type and density of landscaping within the Landscape Buffer Strips and Landscape Amenity Strips for the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Areas shall be as follows: ... ii. A Landscaped Buffer Strip of 3m <u>5m</u> (minimum depth) along boundary of the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Areas... iii. A Landscaped Amenity Strip of 3m (minimum depth) along the frontage of any lots adjoining an internal road within the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Areas... b) i. The Zig Zag Road interface and Rural Zone interface (<u>to the north of the Mangaone Stream</u>)... ii. The Swayne Road interface <u>and Rural Zone interface (to the south of the Mangaone Stream)</u> is to be landscaped at the time of the first subdivision and/or development of the land within the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Areas <u>to the south of the Mangaone Stream</u>	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.11.25.
FS2/61	Fonterra Ltd	7.4.2.15A	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission points 9/31, 9/32, 9/33, 9/34, 9/35 and 9/36 by Henmar Trust. The only changes sought to the Bardowie Industrial Precinct are three consequential changes needed to enable	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.11.25.

Submission Point	Submitter name	District Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose / In Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
				Plan Change 14. Fonterra considers that the relief sought is outside the scope of the Plan Change 14 process as this is not intended to include a full review of the Bardowie Industrial Precinct.		
9/35	Henmar Trust	7.4.2.15	In Part	Is an administrative matter.	Amend the unnumbered rule following Rule 7.4.2.15 to read: "Activities that fail to comply with Rules 7.4.2.12 to 7.4.2.15A will require a resource consent for a discretionary activity."	Accept in Part Consequential numbering and renumbering of the District Plan provisions will be required following the inclusion of all recommended amendments.
FS2/62	Fonterra Ltd	7.4.2.15	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission points 9/31, 9/32, 9/33, 9/34, 9/35 and 9/36 by Henmar Trust. The only changes sought to the Bardowie Industrial Precinct are three consequential changes needed to enable Plan Change 14. Fonterra considers that the relief sought is outside the scope of the Plan Change 14 process as this is not intended to include a full review of the Bardowie Industrial Precinct.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Consequential numbering and renumbering of the District Plan provisions will be required following the inclusion of all recommended amendments.
9/36	Henmar Trust	7.4.2.17	In Part	This should apply to all buildings within the Mangaone Structure Plan and Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan area to mitigate any adverse visual amenity effects.	Council to amend the proposed rules to ensure that these standards apply to all buildings within the Mangaone Structure Plan and Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan area to mitigate any adverse visual amenity effects	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.11.26.
FS2/63	Fonterra Ltd	7.4.2.17	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission points 9/31, 9/32, 9/33, 9/34, 9/35 and 9/36 by Henmar Trust. The only changes sought to the Bardowie Industrial Precinct are three consequential changes needed to enable Plan Change 14. Fonterra considers that the relief sought is outside the scope of the Plan Change 14 process as this is not intended to include a full review of the Bardowie Industrial Precinct.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.11.26.
9/37	Henmar Trust	7.4.2.20	In Part	Support that noise rules are required for the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area but oppose the lack of specific noise standards/rules within the boundary of any property zoned Rural. Developments within the Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan Area and Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area require a high level of amenity. Concerned with adverse noise effects on the adjoining property owned by the Henmar Trust and zoned Rural.	Council amends this rule to protect the amenity of the adjoining Rural Zone.	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.11.2 to 4.11.4.
FS2/64	Fonterra Ltd	7.4.2.20	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 9/37 by Henmar Trust. Fonterra notes that there are existing noise regulations contained within the Waipā District Plan and Plan Change 14 does not modify these other than amending the first sentence of Rule 7.4.2.20 (specifying noise limits) to read: <i>"Within the Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan Area, the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area and Hautapu 'Area 6' all activities shall be conducted, and buildings located, designed and used to ensure that they do not exceed the following limits:...</i> These existing noise limits will apply to Plan Change 14.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept Refer to paragraph 4.11.2 to 4.11.4.
9/38	Henmar Trust	7.4.2.41	In Part	Should also include the Bardowie Industrial Precinct as there are residential dwellings in close proximity to the Precinct boundaries. Should also relate to adjoining Rural Zones.	Amend to read as follows: All external lighting shall be shaded or directed away from any adjoining residential dwellings, or roads, or adjoining Rural Zones... This rule only applies to land within:	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.11.27.

Submission Point	Submitter name	District Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose / In Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
					(a) Area 6 – Hautapu Industrial Structure Plan Area; and (b) Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area; and (c) Bardowie Industrial Precinct Area.”	
FS2/65	Fonterra Ltd	7.4.2.41	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 9/38 by Henmar Trust. The only changes sought to the Bardowie Industrial Precinct are three consequential changes needed to enable Plan Change 14. Fonterra considers that the relief sought is outside the scope of the Plan Change 14 process as this is not intended to include a full review of the Bardowie Industrial Precinct.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.11.27.
9/42	Henmar Trust	21.1.7.7	In Part	The Bardowie Industrial Precinct also adjoins the Rural Zone. This rule should apply to both Structure Plan Areas to protect amenity.	Amend to read as follows: 21.1.7.7 Building Colour... c. The extent to which building colour and reflectance levels of developments in the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area and the Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan Area affect the visual amenity of the zone, as well as the visual amenity when viewed from the adjacent Rural zoned areas.	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.11.26.
FS2/69	Fonterra Ltd	21.1.7.7	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission points 9/42, 9/43 and 9/44 by Henmar Trust. The only changes sought to the Bardowie Industrial Precinct are three consequential changes needed to enable Plan Change 14. Fonterra considers that the relief sought is outside the scope of the Plan Change 14 process as this is not intended to included a full review of the Bardowie Industrial Precinct.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.11.26.
9/43	Henmar Trust	16.4.2.12A	In Part	The Kiwifruit Block has a road frontage of approximately 200m along Swayne Road and therefore should be included in this rule to minimise any actual or potential traffic effects.	Amend Rule 16.4.2.12A as follows: Rule – Vehicle access to sites in the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area and the Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan Area Apart from one point of roading access onto each of Swayne Road and Zig Zag Road in accordance with the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan and the Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan, there shall be no direct access to industrial lots within the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area or Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan Area directly from Swayne Road or Zig Zag Road...	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.11.28.
FS2/70	Fonterra Ltd	16.4.2.12A	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission points 9/42, 9/43 and 9/44 by Henmar Trust. The only changes sought to the Bardowie Industrial Precinct are three consequential changes needed to enable Plan Change 14. Fonterra considers that the relief sought is outside the scope of the Plan Change 14 process as this is not intended to included a full review of the Bardowie Industrial Precinct.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.11.28.
9/44	Henmar Trust	21.1.1.17A	In Part	The Bardowie Industrial Precinct also adjoins Rural land to the north, and to the east via the proposed inclusion of the Kiwifruit Block within this Precinct. The Kiwifruit Block has road frontage to Swayne Road. All land within the Rural Zone should be given the same consideration.	Amend to read as follows: 21.1.7.17A Rural Interface Within the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area and the Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan Area, the extent to which the bulk, design and location of proposed buildings will affect the outlook from, and visual amenity values and rural character of, the Rural Zone, in particular the effects on rural residential properties on the east side of Swayne Road.	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.11.25.
FS2/71	Fonterra Ltd	21.1.1.17A	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission points 9/42, 9/43 and 9/44 by Henmar Trust. The only changes sought to the Bardowie Industrial Precinct are three consequential changes needed to enable Plan Change 14. Fonterra considers that the relief sought is outside the scope of the Plan	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.11.25.

Submission Point	Submitter name	District Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose / In Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
				Change 14 process as this is not intended to included a full review of the Bardowie Industrial Precinct.		
9/45	Henmar Trust	21.2.7	In Part	Maintain that there should be a 5m deep Landscape Buffer Strip planting along boundaries that adjoin a Rural Zone. The Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan Area and the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area both adjoin land in the Rural Zone and therefore 21.2.7.1 must be amended to include this information.	Amend to read as follows: Landscape Buffer Strip Planting and Implementation Plan a. ...: i. Establishing a 5.0m deep Landscape Buffer Strip planting: ▪ along Zig Zag Road frontage in the Development Area north of Mangaone Stream; and ▪ along Swayne Road frontage in the Development Area south of Mangaone Stream; <u>and</u> ▪ <u>along boundaries that adjoin a Rural Zone.</u> ii. Establish a 3.0m deep Landscape Buffer Strip planting along parts of the Development Area north of Mangaone Stream that adjoin a Rural Zone.	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.11.29.
FS2/72	Fonterra Ltd	21.2.7	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 9/45 by Henmar Trust for the reasons set out in Fonterra's primary submission.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept Refer to paragraph 4.11.29.
11/1	Ken Dredge	Appendix S27	Oppose	The landscape buffer treatments and set back requirements, detailed in the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan, take steps to protect the existing rural character of the area, however I consider this to be inadequate. Suitable mitigation for adverse visual and aural effects to Swayne Road residents and landowners is not provided.	Amend to the Mangaone Structure Plan to: a. Increase the width of the landscape strip on Swayne Road to 8m (from 5m) b. Increase minimum building setback to 15m (from 10 m) c. Include a planted earth bund 2m in height d. Increase the minimum height of trees at maturity to 15m (from 12m)	Accept in Part Refer to paragraphs 4.11.9 to 4.11.15 regarding part (a); Refer to paragraphs 4.11.5 to 4.11.8 regarding part (b); Refer to paragraph 4.11.6 regarding part (c); and Refer to paragraph 4.11.17 to 4.11.18 regarding part (d).
FS2/100	Fonterra Ltd	Appendix S27	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 11/1 by Kenneth Dredge. Plan Change 14 is supported by a comprehensive range of detailed technical reports that sufficiently assess the effects of proposed Plan Change 14 on the rural/industrial interface, particularly along Swayne Road and Zig Zag Road. The proposed mitigation measures from these reports have been included in the proposed policies, objectives and rules for the Mangaone Precinct and results in a stronger set of provisions when dealing with this interface compared to the existing Waipā District Plan.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Kenneth Dredge (Submitter 11) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraphs 4.11.5 to 4.11.18.
11/3	Ken Dredge	Appendix S27	Oppose	Swayne Road will be subject to potential road upgrades, with an increase in traffic movements and therefore adverse noise effects. Noise protections have not been detailed as part of PC14 and should be included, with appropriate measures taken to address adverse effects.	Include an acoustic report to determine noise effects and include the recommendations within PC14.	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.11.2 to 4.11.4.
FS2/102	Fonterra Ltd	Appendix S27	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 11/3 by Kenneth Dredge. Existing noise regulations are contained within the Waipā District Plan and Plan Change 14 does not modify these other than amending the first sentence of Rule 7.4.2.20 (specifying noise limits) to read: <i>"Within the Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan Area, the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area and Hautapu 'Area 6' all activities shall be conducted, and buildings located, designed and used to ensure that they do not exceed the following limits:...</i> These existing noise limits will apply to Plan Change 14.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Kenneth Dredge (Submitter 11) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.11.2 to 4.11.4.
14/3	Fire and	Not Specified	In Part	PPC14 provides detailed landscaping plans, which includes buffer	That the applicant considers the selection of low flammability planting	Accept in Part

Submission Point	Submitter name	District Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose / In Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
	Emergency New Zealand			planting. Many areas in New Zealand experience drought conditions over summer, including Cambridge, which heightens the risk of vegetation fire. Fire and Emergency acknowledge that the planting plans are in keeping with the surrounding area and what is commonly recommended with similar developments, however request that the applicant considers the selection of low flammability planting to reduce the likelihood of unwanted fire and to help manage fire spread in the event of a vegetation fire.	to reduce the likelihood of unwanted fire and to help manage fire spread in the event of a vegetation fire.	Refer to paragraph 4.11.30.
FS1/27	Henmar Trust	Not Specified	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.11.30.
FS2/116	Fonterra Ltd	Not Specified	Neutral	Fonterra is supportive in principle of low flammability planting, however, is at a level of detail which is beyond the requirements of a plan change. Fonterra also notes that other priorities, such as planting that enhances bats habitat and amenity screening may prevail when selecting plant species.	That the Council considers the relief sought by Fire and Emergency New Zealand (Submitter 14) in the balance of the other purposes planting needs to serve in the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.11.30.
15/1	Reon Taylor	Not Specified	Further Assessment	PC14 has not adequately considered the amenity, traffic and acoustic effects for the properties located along Swayne Road. The Assessment of Effects (AEE) in support of PC14 does not appropriately consider all relevant adverse effects. In particular no acoustic assessment has been undertaken.	Acoustic Report commissioned to determine noise effects.	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.11.2 to 4.11.4.
FS2/117	Fonterra Ltd	Not Specified	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 15/1 by Reon Taylor. Existing noise regulations are contained within the Waipā District Plan and Plan Change 14 does not modify these other than amending the first sentence of Rule 7.4.2.20 (specifying noise limits) to read: <i>“Within the Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan Area, the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area and Hautapu 'Area 6' all activities shall be conducted, and buildings located, designed and used to ensure that they do not exceed the following limits:...</i> These existing noise limits will apply to Plan Change 14	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Reon Taylor (Submitter 15) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.11.2 to 4.11.4.
15/2	Reon Taylor	7.3.4.7	Oppose	PC14 has not adequately considered the amenity, traffic and acoustic effects for the properties located along Swayne Road. The proposed landscaping and signage rules will not provide suitable mitigation. I consider the proposed policy to not consider the amenity and outlook effects that future industrial buildings will have on my property and have suggested that Swayne Road is specifically provided for in this policy.	Amend the amended Policy 7.3.4.7 as follows: “To ensure that landscaping and fencing on perimeter sites (in the areas listed below) is undertaken in accordance with (as applicable): a) Hautapu Industrial Structure Plan; b) Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan and Urban Design and Landscape Guidelines; and c) Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan (Swayne Road particularly).”	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.11.31.
FS2/118	Fonterra Ltd	7.3.4.7	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 15/2 by Reon Taylor. The proposed provisions for the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area already provides for sufficient landscaping and fencing on the boundaries.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Reon Taylor (Submitter 15) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.11.31.
15/3	Reon Taylor	7.4.2.1	Oppose	I consider that a 10m building setback is not consistent with the other required building setbacks listed under rule 7.4.2.1. A 15m setback from Swayne Road is considered appropriate and will mitigate adverse shading, dominance, outlook and privacy effects on my property. Figure 18 located in Appendix C of the PC14 application shows tested sightlines from a dwelling that will view a 20m high industrial building. By providing a 15m building setback requirement, this in theory should remove any line of sight from my property to any future 20m high	Amend Rule 7.4.2.1 as follows: Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area - The minimum setback from the boundary of Swayne Road and Zig Zag Road or from any segregation strips along those roads shall be 10m <u>15m</u> .	Accept Refer to paragraphs 4.11.5 to 4.11.8.

Submission Point	Submitter name	District Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose / In Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
				industrial building.		
FS2/119	Fonterra Ltd	7.4.2.1	Oppose	<p>Fonterra opposes submission points 15/3 and 15/4 by Reon Taylor. Plan Change 14 is supported by a comprehensive range of detailed technical reports including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Landscape Assessment (Appendix C) o Urban Design Statement (Appendix N) <p>These technical reports sufficiently assess the effects of proposed Plan Change 14 on the rural/industrial interface, particularly along Swayne Road and Zig Zag Road. The proposed mitigation measures from these reports have been included in the proposed policies, objectives and rules for the Mangaone Precinct and results in a stronger set of provisions when dealing with this interface compared to the existing Waipā District Plan.</p> <p>Fonterra notes also notes increasing building setbacks could result in the land being utilised for yard space thus generating additional lighting glare, noise closer to boundaries etc.</p>	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Reon Taylor (Submitter 15) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraphs 4.11.5 to 4.11.8.
15/4	Reon Taylor	7.4.2.15A	Oppose	<p>I consider that more landscaping that reaches higher heights at maturity is required to mitigate visual effects on my property as industrial buildings are permitted to be 20m in height under the district plan. An earth bund that is a minimum of 2m in height will provide immediate and effective mitigation of any visual and acoustic effects on my property. Earth bunds are used extensively around the district and to very good effect. There will be surplus topsoil available when the site is stripped for new roads etc.</p>	<p>Amend proposed Rule 7.4.2.15A as follows:</p> <p>(a) (i) A Landscaped Buffer Strip of 5m (minimum depth) <u>that comprises a planted earth bund with a minimum height of 2m</u> along any boundary with Swayne Road and Zig Zag Road except for points of roading connectivity and associated sight lines and the Mangaone Stream Reserve comprising of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A timber post and rail fence positioned along the road boundary; <u>and</u> - A hedge with a minimum height of 2m at maturity; and - A row of trees, spaced at 10m apart (or less) that will grow to a height of at least 12m <u>15m</u> at maturity; 	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.11.6.
FS2/120	Fonterra Ltd	7.4.2.15A	Oppose	<p>Fonterra opposes submission points 15/3 and 15/4 by Reon Taylor. Plan Change 14 is supported by a comprehensive range of detailed technical reports including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Landscape Assessment (Appendix C) o Urban Design Statement (Appendix N) <p>These technical reports sufficiently assess the effects of proposed Plan Change 14 on the rural/industrial interface, particularly along Swayne Road and Zig Zag Road. The proposed mitigation measures from these reports have been included in the proposed policies, objectives and rules for the Mangaone Precinct and results in a stronger set of provisions when dealing with this interface compared to the existing Waipā District Plan.</p> <p>Fonterra notes also note increasing building setbacks could result in the land being utilised for yard space thus generating additional lighting glare, noise closer to boundaries etc.</p>	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Reon Taylor (Submitter 15) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.11.6.

Table 11 - Structure Plan

Submission Point	Submitter name	District Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose / In Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
9/12	Henmar Trust	Appendix S27	Oppose	<p>Oppose the proposed Structure Plan in its current form for the following reasons;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The proposed Structure Plan turns its back on the Henmar Trust property located within the C10 Industrial Growth Cell. ▪ No traffic and/or service connectivity to the adjoining Henmar Trust property located within C10 Growth Cell. ▪ No connectivity to the Kiwifruit Block to the south. Currently Heavy Vehicles access the Kiwifruit Block. ▪ The solid black line is not included in the key. ▪ The topography of Zig Zag Road, Victoria Road and Bruntwood Road intersection does not lean itself to a suitable access point to the Henmar Trust property. ▪ Henmar Trust property will need access to the primary internal distributive intersection via the proposed Mangaone Industrial Precinct. It does not make sense for future development on the Henmar Trust property to go around the C10 Industrial Growth Cell to access the Waikato Expressway Interchange. It is logical that future development on the Henmar Trust property would be able to gain access via the other properties within the C10 Industrial Growth Cell. The distance of the two different options is similar. Integrating transport within the Growth Cell is considered the preferred option, minimising traffic effects and keeping traffic away from the Zig Zag Road, Victoria Road and Bruntwood Road intersection which is a high crash point. ▪ The proposed round-a-bout on Zig Zag Road has poor sight visibility and needs to be relocated approximately 125m to the west, with an access point into the Henmar Trust property and an access point into the Mangaone Precinct. ▪ A round-a-bout in this location provides: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ access to both the Mangaone Precinct and the Henmar Trust property; ○ reduces the need for another round-about on Zig Zag Road to provide access to the Henmar Trust property; ○ improves sight visibility in both directions; ○ provides connectivity between the Precincts within the C10 Industrial Growth Cell, giving the Henmar Trust property access to the primary internal distribution collector road and intersection; and ○ provides a safe communal entrance to properties north of the Mangaone Stream with access to the primary internal distribution collector road and intersection. 	<p>Accept submitters proposed amendments to Appendix S27 Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan. Submitters amendments are detailed below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a) The plan key of the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan and Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan should be the same to provide consistency. (b) Include the solid black line in the key, identifying what this represents. (c) The Collector Road from the Bardowie Industrial Precinct to the Henmar Trust property needs to be shown as a Collector Road. (d) Amend the proposed Structure Plan to identify road and service connectivity to the adjoining Henmar Trust property located within C10 Growth Cell, from the Mangaone Precinct. (e) Relocate the round-a-bout on Zig Zag Road approximately 120m to the west, so that the proposed round-a-bout is located on the boundary of the Mangaone Precinct and Henmar Trust property, providing access to both properties within the C10 Industrial Growth Cell. (f) Show services connections to the Henmar Trust property and include this in the key. (g) To provide connectivity and integration within the C10 Growth Cell all roading and/or services crossing the Mangaone Stream Reserve in the Mangaone Precinct, are to be connected to the boundary of the Henmar Trust property at the same time as the first development occurs in the Mangaone Precinct on its northern side of the Mangaone Stream Reserve. (h) Amend the proposed Structure Plan to provide connectivity to the Kiwifruit Block to ensure that the only traffic using the Swayne Road entrance are light vehicles, or if the Kiwifruit Block has a heavy vehicle access onto Swayne Road to ensure that the whole of the C10 Growth Cell has access to this entrance. (i) Amend the proposed Structure Plan to have a Landscaped/Planted Buffer Strip of 5m along the western boundary with the Henmar Trust property. (j) Amend the proposed Structure Plan to identify pedestrian and cycle connectivity to the adjoining Henmar Trust property located within C10 Growth Cell. (k) Show the power sub-station currently located on the Structure Plan Area. 	<p>Accepted in Part Refer to paragraph 4.12.2 and 4.12.3.</p>
FS2/39	Fonterra Ltd	Appendix S27	Oppose	<p>Fonterra opposes submission point 9/12 by Henmar Trust. Appendix S27 is supported by a comprehensive range of detailed technical reports. These reports detail why future infrastructure such as the roundabout is in a specific location, mitigation measures for the rural/industrial</p>	<p>That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.</p>	<p>Accepted in Part Refer to paragraph 4.12.2 and 4.12.3.</p>

Submission Point	Submitter name	District Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose / In Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
				interface including restricting Swayne Road access to light vehicles and urban design controls that will be imposed on future development. The changes proposed by Henmar Trust to Appendix S27 are opposed.		
9/14	Henmar Trust	Appendix S20	Oppose	<p>(i) No assessment of the Kiwifruit Block in any of the technical reports and therefore appears to be being rezoned with no assessment of effects.</p> <p>(ii) The proposed Structure Plan shows the Kiwifruit Block as Industrial Node 1A not Stormwater Reserve.</p> <p>(iii) No buffer and/or segregation strip along the frontage of the Kiwifruit Block that adjoins Swayne Road. This means that heavy vehicles will still be able to use Swayne Road via the existing access to the Kiwifruit Block. Needs to be one access to Swayne Road for the whole C10 Industrial Growth Cell that is limited to light vehicles only, or the whole of the C10 Growth Cell should have access to this heavy vehicle entrance.</p> <p>(iv) The keys of the proposed Structure Plans within the C10 Growth Cell vary and some features completely missed from the key creating confusion.</p> <p>(v) The Structure Plan does not reflect the agreement between Henmar Trust, Council and BIL.</p> <p>(vi) Due to the topography of the C10 Growth Cell and Victoria Road culvert being designed to flood the Henmar Trust property in the case of a major event, to protect downstream properties, stormwater from future development on the Bardowie Industrial Precinct must be restricted to a maximum of 80% pre-development peak runoff.</p> <p>(vii) If the Kiwifruit Block is to be rezoned Industrial, need technical assessment of the effects of this rezoning.</p>	Reject Appendix S20 – Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan as notified.	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.12.4.
FS2/41	Fonterra Ltd	Appendix S20	Oppose	<p>Fonterra opposes submission points 9/14 and 9/15 by Henmar Trust. Plan Change 14 results in three consequential changes to the Structure Plan relating to the Bardowie Industrial Precinct (Appendix 20). Fonterra considers that the “Kiwifruit Block” has already been subject to Council approved technical studies. Site investigations in relation to the Kiwifruit Block (undertaken by BIL) have included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Preliminary Site Investigation (re Contaminated Land) • An integrated Transportation Assessment; • Assessments in relation to cultural effects, construction effects, archaeological effects, stormwater management, noise effects, and effects on character amenity and landscape values; and • Confirmation from Heritage New Zealand that no Authority is required. <p>These supported the resource consents that enabled the development on the “Kiwifruit Block”. There is no reasonable need to repeat technical assessments.</p>	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.12.4.
9/15	Henmar Trust	Appendix S20	In Part	<p>(i) No assessment of the Kiwifruit Block in any of the technical reports and therefore appears to be being rezoned with no assessment of effects.</p> <p>(ii) The proposed Structure Plan shows the Kiwifruit Block as Industrial Node 1A not Stormwater Reserve.</p>	Accept submitters proposed amendments to Appendix S20 – Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan. Submitters amendments are detailed below:	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.12.4.

Submission Point	Submitter name	District Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose / In Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
				<p>(iii) No buffer and/or segregation strip along the frontage of the Kiwifruit Block that adjoins Swayne Road. This means that heavy vehicles will still be able to use Swayne Road via the existing access to the Kiwifruit Block. Needs to be one access to Swayne Road for the whole C10 Industrial Growth Cell that is limited to light vehicles only, or the whole of the C10 Growth Cell should have access to this heavy vehicle entrance.</p> <p>(iv) The keys of the proposed Structure Plans within the C10 Growth Cell vary and some features completely missed from the key creating confusion.</p> <p>(v) The Structure Plan does not reflect the agreement between Henmar Trust, Council and BIL.</p> <p>(vi) Due to the topography of the C10 Growth Cell and Victoria Road culvert being designed to flood the Henmar Trust property in the case of a major event, to protect downstream properties, stormwater from future development on the Bardowie Industrial Precinct must be restricted to a maximum of 80% pre-development peak runoff. If the Kiwifruit Block is to be rezoned Industrial, need technical assessment of the effects of this rezoning.</p>	<p>(a) The plan key of the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan and Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan should be the same to provide consistency.</p> <p>(b) Amend the proposed Structure Plan to identify traffic and service connectivity (not indicative) to the Henmar Trust property to the north. This collector road needs to be shown as a solid black line like the other collector road (or whatever the notation for Collector Road may be).</p> <p>(c) Show the agreed round-a-about at the intersection of the collector roads (that is the one to the north and the one running west to east).</p> <p>(d) Show services connections to the Henmar Trust property and include this in the key.</p> <p>(e) Show connectivity between the “Kiwifruit Block” and the Mangaone Precinct to the north.</p> <p>(f) Include a buffer and segregation strip along the entire frontage of the “Kiwifruit Block” to ensure only light vehicles can access Swayne Road from the C10 Growth Cell. Alternatively, should a heavy vehicle entrance off Swayne Road be provided to the Kiwifruit Block, the roading network must be updated to ensure the whole of the C10 Industrial Growth Cell has access to this heavy vehicle entrance.</p> <p>(g) Show proposed and existing stormwater retention areas and overland flow paths.</p> <p>(h) Show proposed and existing reserve areas.</p> <p>(i) Show the location of the proposed new electricity substation.</p>	
FS2/42	Fonterra Ltd	Appendix S20	Oppose	<p>Fonterra opposes submission points 9/14 and 9/15 by Henmar Trust. Plan Change 14 results in three consequential changes to the Structure Plan relating to the Bardowie Industrial Precinct (Appendix 20). Fonterra considers that the “Kiwifruit Block” has already been subject to Council approved technical studies. Site investigations in relation to the Kiwifruit Block (undertaken by BIL) have included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Preliminary Site Investigation (re Contaminated Land) • An integrated Transportation Assessment; • Assessments in relation to cultural effects, construction effects, archaeological effects, stormwater management, noise effects, and effects on character amenity and landscape values; and • Confirmation from Heritage New Zealand that no Authority is required. <p>These supported the resource consents that enabled the development on the “Kiwifruit Block”. There is no reasonable need to repeat technical assessments.</p> <p>(vii)</p>	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.12.4.
9/39	Henmar Trust	15.4.1.1(aa)	In Part	Needs to refer to the Bardowie Industrial Precinct as well. It is important that any subdivision within the C10 Industrial Growth Cell is well designed and provides for the development of the whole of the Industrial Cell to provide a cohesive and well planned development. The assessment criteria should include the Note on the Existing and	<p>a) Council to amend the proposed Rule to also include the Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan Area.</p> <p>b) Council to amend the proposed Rule to also include the following assessment criteria;</p>	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.12.5.

Submission Point	Submitter name	District Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose / In Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
				Proposed Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan area that requires roading and service connections to be provided to the boundary of the Henmar Trust property located to the North that is within the C10 Industrial Growth Cell. This provides clarity for those assessing future applications.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic and service connectivity to other properties within the C10 Industrial Growth Cell. Whether the proposal will prevent other properties within the C10 Industrial Growth Cell from being developed. The provision of traffic and services to the boundary of adjoining properties within the C10 Industrial Growth Cell. For subdivisions within the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area, to the north of the Mangaone Stream, the provision of roading and services to boundary of the Henmar Trust property within the C10 Industrial Growth Cell. For subdivisions within Node 3 of the Bardowie Industrial Precinct, roading and service connections to be provided to the adjoining boundary of the Henmar Trust property located to the north that is within the C10 Industrial Growth Cell. The extent to which the subdivision layout is in general accordance with the Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan. The provision of Landscaped Buffer Strips along the boundary with adjoining Zones. 	
FS2/66	Fonterra Ltd	15.4.1.1(aa)	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission points 9/39 and 9/40 by Henmar Trust for the reasons set out in Fonterra's primary submission. Additionally, the only changes sought to the Bardowie Industrial Precinct are three consequential changes needed to enable Plan Change 14. Fonterra considers that the relief sought is outside the scope of the Plan Change 14 process as this is not intended to completely review the Bardowie Industrial Precinct.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.12.5.

Table 12 - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter name	District Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose / In Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
2/2	H Wood & O'Sheas Trustees No 8 Ltd	Not Specified	Oppose	We strongly object to the proposed access from the development onto Swayne Road, as we believe the issues have not been adequately mitigated to ensure a safe route for residents and their children. Notably, in addition to the current heavy and light truck traffic, vehicles using Swayne Road often treat it as a highspeed thoroughfare.	While it has been suggested that the speed limit be reduced to 60 km/h, we believe it should be further reduced to 50 km/h, along with the introduction of speed management devices, should an access onto Swayne Road be approved.	Reject Refer to paragraphs 4.13.2 to 4.13.6.
FS2/6	Fonterra Ltd	Not Specified	Oppose	Fonterra opposes Hannah Wood and O'Sheas Trustees No. 8 Ltd submission points 2/2 and 2/3. A detailed Integrated Traffic Assessment (ITA) (Appendix H) was submitted with Plan Change 14. It's also noted that New Zealand Transport Agency Waka Kotahi has reviewed and accepted this report. The ITA sufficiently assesses traffic safety and includes details of the physically restricted design of road access onto Swayne Road as shown on "Figure 10:4 : Indicative Internal Minor Accessway Link with Swayne Road" page 61. Fonterra also notes that the proposed Rule 15.4.2.91A will limit vehicle access on Swayne Road.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Hannah Wood and O'Sheas Trustees No. 8 Ltd (Submitter 2) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraphs 4.13.2 to 4.13.6.

Submission Point	Submitter name	District Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose / In Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
2/3	H Wood & O'Sheas Trustees No 8 Ltd	Not Specified	Oppose	Plan Change 14 proposes restricting vehicles to 12 tonnes, which includes light to medium goods trucks. It should be noted that a 12-tonne truck can have an overall length of 9 meters, which is not a small vehicle. As the development expands, the number of such vehicles will also increase. The Stantec Integrated Transport Assessment - Appendix H, Plan Change Transport Infrastructure – Long Term Transport Network Form, indicates a T-intersection approximately 60 to 70 meters south of the driveway entrance at 176 Swayne Road.	If an access road onto Swayne Road is approved, we strongly recommend that this intersection be moved north along Swayne Road to a point past the last driveway entrance at 190 Swayne Road, or that a joint access point be established using the current Swayne House access entrance onto Swayne Road.	Reject Refer to paragraphs 4.13.2 to 4.13.6.
FS2/7	Fonterra Ltd	Not Specified	Oppose	Fonterra opposes Hannah Wood and O'Sheas Trustees No. 8 Ltd submission points 2/2 and 2/3. A detailed Integrated Traffic Assessment (ITA) (Appendix H) was submitted with Plan Change 14. It's also noted that New Zealand Transport Agency Waka Kotahi has reviewed and accepted this report. The ITA sufficiently assesses traffic safety and includes details of the physically restricted design of road access onto Swayne Road as shown on "Figure 10:4 : Indicative Internal Minor Accessway Link with Swayne Road" page 61. Fonterra also notes that the proposed Rule 15.4.2.91A will limit vehicle access on Swayne Road.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Hannah Wood and O'Sheas Trustees No. 8 Ltd (Submitter 2) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept Refer to paragraphs 4.13.2 to 4.13.6.
6/5	Kama Trust	Not Specified	Support in Part	Concerned about adverse effects on the wider transport network arising under PC14.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriate provisions to mitigate adverse transport effects arising under PC14. Any such consequential relief necessary to give effect to this submission. 	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.13.7.
FS1/6	Henmar Trust	Not Specified	Oppose	The proposed Plan Change area is located within the C10 Industrial Growth Cell and is an anticipated form of development. Provided the transport network enables connectivity within the C10 Growth Cell, and is well designed, future development within C10 Industrial Growth Cell would have minimal/if any effect on the wider transport network due to the C10 Industrial Growth Cell being ideally located next to the Waikato Expressway and its close proximity to the Hautapu Interchange.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Dismiss submission. Accept the relief sought by Henmar Trust. Make amendments to any other provisions within the Waipa District Plan and/or proposed Plan Change 14 linked to the relief sought by the submitter, Henmar Trust, including any cross references in other chapters, be undertaken. Undertake any further relief that is considered necessary to give effect to the relief sought by the submitter, Henmar Trust, be undertaken. 	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.13.7 to 4.13.10.
FS2/23	Fonterra Ltd	Not Specified	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 6/5 by the Kama Trust. The relief sought to address transport concerns is vague. Fonterra also notes that traffic impacts are assessed in detail in the Integrated Traffic Assessment (Appendix H). This technical report sufficiently assesses the traffic effects from the proposed Plan Change 14 area.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Kama Trust (Submitter 6) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.13.7.
7/4	Bardowie Investments Ltd	Appendix S20	Support	Support proposed deletion of collector road on Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan and replacement with new northern collector road.	Retain	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.13.8.
FS1/10	Henmar Trust	Not Specified	Support in Part / Oppose in Part	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> No assessment of the Kiwifruit Block in any of the technical reports and therefore appears to be being rezoned with no assessment of effects. The proposed Structure Plan shows the Kiwifruit Block as Industrial Node 1A not Stormwater Reserve. No buffer and/or segregation strip along the frontage of the Kiwifruit Block that adjoins Swayne Road. This means that heavy vehicles will still be able to use Swayne Road via the existing access to the Kiwifruit Block. Needs to be one access to Swayne Road for the 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Reject Appendix S20 – Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan as notified. Accept submitters proposed amendments to Appendix S20 – Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan. Submitters amendments are detailed below: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The plan key of the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan and Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan should be the same to provide consistency. Amend the proposed Structure Plan to identify traffic and service 	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.13.8.

Submission Point	Submitter name	District Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose / In Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
				<p>whole C10 Industrial Growth Cell that is limited to light vehicles only, or the whole of the C10 Growth Cell should have access to this heavy vehicle entrance.</p> <p>(iv) The keys of the proposed Structure Plans within the C10 Growth Cell vary and some features completely missed from the key creating confusion.</p> <p>(v) The Structure Plan does not reflect the agreement between Henmar Trust, Council and BIL.</p> <p>(vi) Due to the topography of the C10 Growth Cell and the Victoria Road culvert being designed to flood the Henmar Trust property in the case of a major weather event, to protect downstream properties, stormwater from future development on the Bardowie Industrial Precinct must be restricted to a maximum of 80% pre-development peak runoff.</p> <p>(vii) If the Kiwifruit Block is to be rezoned Industrial, need technical assessment of the effects of this rezoning, including stormwater.</p>	<p>connectivity (not indicative) to the Henmar Trust property to the north. This collector road needs to be shown as a solid black line like the other collector road (or whatever the notation for Collector Road may be).</p> <p>(c) Show the agreed round-a-about at the intersection of the collector roads (that is the collector road to the north and the collector road running west to east).</p> <p>(d) Show services connections to the Henmar Trust property and include this in the key.</p> <p>(e) Show connectivity between the “Kiwifruit Block” and the Mangaone Precinct to the north.</p> <p>(f) Include a buffer and segregation strip along the entire frontage of the “Kiwifruit Block” to ensure only light vehicles can access Swayne Road from the C10 Growth Cell.</p> <p>Alternatively, should a heavy vehicle entrance off Swayne Road be provided to the Kiwifruit Block, the roading network must be updated to ensure the whole of the C10 Industrial Growth Cell has access to this heavy vehicle entrance.</p> <p>(g) Show proposed and existing stormwater retention areas and overland flow paths in all scenarios including extreme weather events.</p> <p>(h) Show proposed and existing reserve areas.</p> <p>(i) Show the location of the proposed new electricity substation.</p>	
9/2	Henmar Trust	Not Specified	Oppose	Oppose the lack of connectivity of the proposed Plan Change with the Henmar Trust property located within C10 Industrial Growth Cell. It is common practice for Structure Plans to provide connectivity to adjoining sites within the same Growth Cell. The proposed Bardowie Structure Plan needs to reflect the access arrangement that was agreed with Council with Bardowie Industrial Precinct.	That the proposed Mangaone Precinct and the Bardowie Industrial Precinct provide traffic and service connectivity to the Henmar Trust property located within Growth Cell C10.	Reject Refer paragraph 4.13.9 and 4.13.10.
FS2/29	Fonterra Ltd	Not Specified	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission points 9/2 and 9/3 by Henmar Trust. The planning assessment report titled “Plan Change 14 to the Waipā District Plan Mangaone Precinct C10 Industrial Growth Cell- Hautapu” section 4.11 discusses the future integration of remaining land in the C10 Growth Cell.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer paragraph 4.13.9 and 4.13.10.
9/3	Henmar Trust	Appendix S27	Oppose	Oppose the lack of connectivity of the proposed Plan Change with the Henmar Trust property located within C10 Industrial Growth Cell. It is common practice for Structure Plans to provide connectivity to adjoining sites within the same Growth Cell. The proposed Bardowie Structure Plan needs to reflect the access arrangement that was agreed with Council with Bardowie Industrial Precinct.	That the Proposed Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan removes the word indicative from the collector road to the Henmar Trust property, marks the road the same as other collector roads, and includes the round-a-bout that was agreed. Additionally, services connections along this Collector Road need to be shown on the Structure Plan and referenced in the key.	Reject Refer paragraph 4.13.9 and 4.13.10.
FS2/30	Fonterra Ltd	Appendix S27	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission points 9/2 and 9/3 by Henmar Trust. The planning assessment report titled “Plan Change 14 to the Waipā District Plan Mangaone Precinct C10 Industrial Growth Cell- Hautapu” section 4.11 discusses the future integration of remaining land in the C10 Growth Cell.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Henmar Trust (Submitter 9) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer paragraph 4.13.9 and 4.13.10.
10/30	Waikato Regional Council	Not Specified	In Part	The Integrated Transport Assessment has a focus on promoting resilience to current and future effects of climate change through consideration of flood risk and stormwater management but does not appear to include an assessment that considers emissions reduction (transport being a major source of greenhouse gases and a contributing factor to climate change) despite the need to consider the Emissions	Provide an assessment of the proposed plan change in relation to transport emissions reduction and the Emissions Reduction Plan.	Reject Refer paragraph 4.13.11 and 4.13.12.

Submission Point	Submitter name	District Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose / In Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
				Reduction Plan (as per s74(2)(d) of the RMA). We do, however, acknowledge that due to the functional needs of industrial areas, continued reliance on cars and trucks is anticipated.		
FS2/92	Fonterra Ltd	Not Specified	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 10/30 by Waikato Regional Council. While an emissions reduction plan has not been specifically included, a range of measures have been included to address the outcomes sought. The Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area has purposely included multimodal forms of transport with an emphasis on cycling and walking. Public transport connections are enabled within the proposed Central Focal Area.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Waikato Regional Council (Submitter 10) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer paragraph 4.13.11 and 4.13.12.
10/31	Waikato Regional Council	Appendix S27	In Part	We support the inclusion of walking and cycling infrastructure in the proposed structure plan and recommend ensuring this is connected to the existing network. We recommend additional provisions be added to the plan change that support people to use alternative modes of travel, for example Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles, end-of-journey facilities and electric vehicle (EV) charging facilities.	Add new objectives, policies, rules and standards into the plan change to address climate change and transport emission goals in the context of increased industrial activity in this location.	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.13.13.
FS2/93	Fonterra Ltd	Appendix S27	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission points 10/31, 10/32, 10/33, 10/34, 10/35, 10/36 and 10/37 by Waikato Regional Council. The Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area is near an established residential area only separated by the Waikato Expressway and has purposely included multimodal forms of transport with an emphasis on cycling and walking. Public transport connections are enabled within the proposed Central Focal Area. These factors assist in reducing vehicle trip movements to and from Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Waikato Regional Council (Submitter 10) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.13.13.
10/32	Waikato Regional Council	Section 7	In Part	We support the inclusion of walking and cycling infrastructure in the proposed structure plan and recommend ensuring this is connected to the existing network. We recommend additional provisions be added to the plan change that support people to use alternative modes of travel, for example Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles, end-of-journey facilities and electric vehicle (EV) charging facilities.	Add new objectives, policies, rules and standards into the plan change to address climate change and transport emission goals in the context of increased industrial activity in this location.	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.13.13.
FS2/94	Fonterra Ltd	Appendix S27	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission points 10/31, 10/32, 10/33, 10/34, 10/35, 10/36 and 10/37 by Waikato Regional Council. The Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area is near an established residential area only separated by the Waikato Expressway and has purposely included multimodal forms of transport with an emphasis on cycling and walking. Public transport connections are enabled within the proposed Central Focal Area. These factors assist in reducing vehicle trip movements to and from Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Waikato Regional Council (Submitter 10) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.13.13.
10/33	Waikato Regional Council	Section 16	In Part	We support the inclusion of walking and cycling infrastructure in the proposed structure plan and recommend ensuring this is connected to the existing network. We recommend additional provisions be added to the plan change that support people to use alternative modes of travel, for example Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles, end-of-journey facilities and electric vehicle (EV) charging facilities.	Add new objectives, policies, rules and standards into the plan change to address climate change and transport emission goals in the context of increased industrial activity in this location.	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.13.13.

Submission Point	Submitter name	District Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose / In Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
FS2/95	Fonterra Ltd	Appendix S27	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission points 10/31, 10/32, 10/33, 10/34, 10/35, 10/36 and 10/37 by Waikato Regional Council. The Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area is near an established residential area only separated by the Waikato Expressway and has purposely included multimodal forms of transport with an emphasis on cycling and walking. Public transport connections are enabled within the proposed Central Focal Area. These factors assist in reducing vehicle trip movements to and from Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Waikato Regional Council (Submitter 10) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.13.13.
10/34	Waikato Regional Council	Appendix S27	In Part	End-of-journey facilities and EV charging facilities are important factors in transport emissions reduction. Requiring provision of end-of-journey facilities would encourage people to use the cycleways proposed in the plan change. Meanwhile, EV charging facilities enable charging of EVs at employment sites (beyond those that might serve business fleets). We recommend provisions be added requiring provision of end of journey facilities and EV charging facilities (including for heavy vehicles), either in Section 7 – Industrial Zone or Section 16 – Transportation (or other appropriate location within the plan).	Add provisions referencing CPTED principles and requiring provision of end-of-journey facilities and EV charging facilities (including for heavy vehicles).	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.13.13.
FS2/96	Fonterra Ltd	Appendix S27	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission points 10/31, 10/32, 10/33, 10/34, 10/35, 10/36 and 10/37 by Waikato Regional Council. The Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area is near an established residential area only separated by the Waikato Expressway and has purposely included multimodal forms of transport with an emphasis on cycling and walking. Public transport connections are enabled within the proposed Central Focal Area. These factors assist in reducing vehicle trip movements to and from Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Waikato Regional Council (Submitter 10) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.13.13.
10/35	Waikato Regional Council	Section 7	In Part	End-of-journey facilities and EV charging facilities are important factors in transport emissions reduction. Requiring provision of end-of-journey facilities would encourage people to use the cycleways proposed in the plan change. Meanwhile, EV charging facilities enable charging of EVs at employment sites (beyond those that might serve business fleets). We recommend provisions be added requiring provision of end of journey facilities and EV charging facilities (including for heavy vehicles), either in Section 7 – Industrial Zone or Section 16 – Transportation (or other appropriate location within the plan).	Add provisions referencing CPTED principles and requiring provision of end-of-journey facilities and EV charging facilities (including for heavy vehicles).	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.13.13.
FS2/97	Fonterra Ltd	Section 7	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission points 10/31, 10/32, 10/33, 10/34, 10/35, 10/36 and 10/37 by Waikato Regional Council. The Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area is near an established residential area only separated by the Waikato Expressway and has purposely included multimodal forms of transport with an emphasis on cycling and walking. Public transport connections are enabled within the proposed Central Focal Area. These factors assist in reducing vehicle trip movements to and from Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Waikato Regional Council (Submitter 10) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.13.13.
10/36	Waikato Regional Council	Section 16	In Part	End-of-journey facilities and EV charging facilities are important factors in transport emissions reduction. Requiring provision of end-of-journey facilities would encourage people to use the cycleways proposed in the plan change. Meanwhile, EV charging facilities enable charging of EVs at employment sites (beyond those that might serve business fleets). We recommend provisions be added requiring provision of end of journey facilities and EV charging facilities (including for heavy	Add provisions referencing CPTED principles and requiring provision of end-of-journey facilities and EV charging facilities (including for heavy vehicles).	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.13.13.

Submission Point	Submitter name	District Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose / In Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
				vehicles), either in Section 7 – Industrial Zone or Section 16 – Transportation (or other appropriate location within the plan).		
FS2/98	Fonterra Ltd	Section 7	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission points 10/31, 10/32, 10/33, 10/34, 10/35, 10/36 and 10/37 by Waikato Regional Council. The Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area is near an established residential area only separated by the Waikato Expressway and has purposely included multimodal forms of transport with an emphasis on cycling and walking. Public transport connections are enabled within the proposed Central Focal Area. These factors assist in reducing vehicle trip movements to and from Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Waikato Regional Council (Submitter 10) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.13.13.
10/37	Waikato Regional Council	Not Specified	In Part	There may be future opportunities for public transport in this area. We note that while there is a Cambridge/Hautapu frequent public transport service identified in the Future Proof Strategy (being a 30-year growth strategy), the RPTP as a 10-year plan does not include a public transport node at Hautapu. We therefore recommend continued discussions with the public transport planning team at WRC.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ensure the proposed plan change considers the relevant provisions of the Waikato Regional Public Transport Plan. 2. That Waipā District Council continues to work with WRC in relation to public transport planning for the plan change area. 	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.13.14.
FS2/99	Fonterra Ltd	Section 7	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission points 10/31, 10/32, 10/33, 10/34, 10/35, 10/36 and 10/37 by Waikato Regional Council. The Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area is near an established residential area only separated by the Waikato Expressway and has purposely included multimodal forms of transport with an emphasis on cycling and walking. Public transport connections are enabled within the proposed Central Focal Area. These factors assist in reducing vehicle trip movements to and from Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Waikato Regional Council (Submitter 10) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission. 3.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.13.14.
13/1	Geoffrey and Beverly Laurent	Not Specified	Further Assessment	We believe that the proposal will have a detrimental effect on our site and the wider Hautapu area. We want further consideration and clarification of the resultant traffic effects, particularly. The traffic effects will result in a significant change to industrial land provision within the wider Hautapu area, which have not been assessed through WRTM to take account of wider potential transport network issues, the potential multiple access points to that land and whether this opens up unintended consequences for through traffic movements along the east/west collector road in PC14.	Further reporting is required to address our first concern relating to the traffic modelling.	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.13.15.
FS1/23	Henmar Trust	Not Specified	Support in Part / Oppose in Part	<p>The submitter's property is located within the Industrial Zone and forms part of Industrial Growth Cell C10. The submitters supported proposed PC11 which rezoned their property and reinstated the Industrial Growth Cell.</p> <p>The proposed Plan Change Area is part of the C10 Industrial Growth Cell and the proposed Plan Change is an anticipated form of development, including the associated traffic effects.</p> <p>The Collector Road is designed to facilitate traffic within and through the Industrial Growth Cell.</p> <p>Provided the transport network enables connectivity within the C10 Growth Cell, and is well designed, future development within C10 Industrial Growth Cell would have minimal/if any effect on the local and wider transport network due to the C10 Industrial Growth Cell being ideally located next to the Waikato Expressway and its close proximity to the Hautapu Interchange.</p> <p>The planned round-a-bout on Victoria Road is located at an important</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Amend proposed roading layout to provide for connectivity in and through the C10 Industrial Growth Cell. 2. Accept the relief sought by Henmar Trust. 3. Amendments to any other provisions within the Waipa District Plan and/or proposed Plan Change 14 linked to the relief sort by the submitter, Henmar Trust, including any cross references in other chapters, be undertaken. 4. Any further relief that is considered necessary to give effect to the relief sort by the submitter, Henmar Trust, be undertaken. 	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.13.9 and 4.13.10.

Submission Point	Submitter name	District Plan Provision	Support/ Oppose / In Part	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
				junction of roads going in different directions and we consider its location to being vitally important in the control of traffic to and from the C10 Industrial Growth Cell.		
FS2/113	Fonterra Ltd	Not Specified	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission points 13/1 and 13/2 by Laurent Property Co, Geoffrey and Beverly Laurent. As a detailed Integrated Traffic Assessment (ITA) (Appendix H) was submitted with Plan Change 14. It's also noted that New Zealand Transport Agency Waka Kotahi has reviewed and accepted this report. Fonterra considers that there is no need for further traffic effects assessment or restriction of development.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Laurent Property Co, Geoffrey and Beverly Laurent (Submitter 13) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.13.15.
14/2	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Not Specified	In Part	Fire and Emergency require adequate access to the built and natural environment to ensure that they can respond to emergencies. This includes access in the event of fire, natural hazard, hazardous substances, medical, or a rescue or assist. For fire appliances to access an emergency, adequate carriageway width, height clearance, and road gradient is necessary to support the operational requirements of fire appliances. SNZ PAS 4509:2008 and F5-02 GD require a minimum formed carriageway width of 4m for fire appliances.	All Collector and Local Roads proposed in PPC14 are formed in accordance with the T4 provisions of the Waipā District Plan. This would require all lanes of the Indicative Internal Industrial Collector Road, the Indicative Internal Urban Industrial Local Road and Indicative Internal Industrial Local Road with Swale to be at least 4m wide.	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.13.16.
FS1/26	Henmar Trust	Not Specified	Support	Agree with submission.	Accept submission.	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.13.16.
FS2/115	Fonterra Ltd	Not Specified	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 14/2 by Fire and Emergency New Zealand. The Integrated Traffic Assessment (Appendix H) contains Appendix 1 Indicative Cross Section Forms, which show the proposed road widths for the Mangaone Precinct.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Fire and Emergency New Zealand (Submitter 14) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.13.16.
15/5	Reon Taylor	16.4.2.12A	Oppose	There is no consideration of the potential noise, vibration and traffic effects associated with the development of the land with new services, utilities and roading that allow development of the land. Including a rule for construction traffic will mitigate these adverse effects on my property.	Amend proposed Rule 16.4.2.12A as follows: "Rule – Vehicle access to sites in the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area 1. <u>Apart from one point of roading access onto each of Swayne Road and Zig Zag Road in accordance with the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan, there shall be no direct access to industrial lots within the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area directly from Swayne Road or Zig Zag Road; and</u> 2. <u>Construction traffic shall not use Swayne Road for accessing Mangaone Precinct Structure Area.</u> Activities that fail to comply with this rule will require a resource consent for a non-complying activity."	Reject Refer to paragraph 4.13.17.
FS2/121	Fonterra Ltd	16.4.2.12A	Oppose	Fonterra opposes submission point 15/5 by Reon Taylor. The proposed restrictions on heavy vehicle traffic movements will apply during construction and operation.	That the Council does not adopt any of the relief sought by Reon Taylor (Submitter 15) and accepts the outcome sought by Fonterra in its primary submission.	Accept in Part Refer to paragraph 4.13.17.