

# Summary of Decisions Requested to Proposed Plan Change 14: Rezoning of part of C10 Growth Cell By Topic

15 August 2024

## Contents

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Reader's Guide .....                   | 3  |
| How to read the summary .....          | 3  |
| How to make a further submission ..... | 4  |
| Submitter Details .....                | 5  |
| All of Plan Change .....               | 6  |
| Bats .....                             | 10 |
| Economic .....                         | 17 |
| Industrial Zone Activities .....       | 21 |
| Infrastructure Capacity .....          | 26 |
| Kiwifruit Block .....                  | 29 |
| Mangaone Stream .....                  | 31 |
| National Grid Yard .....               | 35 |
| Rezoning .....                         | 41 |
| Rural .....                            | 42 |
| Structure Plan .....                   | 54 |
| Transport .....                        | 59 |

## Reader's Guide

This document is a summary of the 15 submissions received and the relief sought/decision(s) requested. This summary is ordered by submission topic alphabetically. This summary helps readers to see all the decisions requested by topic (e.g. Rural). If you would like to see all the submissions lodged by Submitter on the proposed plan change, then refer to “Summary of Decisions Requested to Proposed Plan Change 14: Rezoning of part of C10 Growth Cell by Submitter”.

Call for further submissions opens on **15 August 2024**. The closing date for making further submissions is **29 August 2024**. **No late further submissions will be accepted.**

In the summary, every submitter has been allocated a submitter number and each submission point is referenced by a unique number. This whole number (e.g. 1/3) is required to be referenced when you make a further submission.

### **EXAMPLE:**

Submission 1/3

1 is the submitter number

3 is the submission point number

## How to read the summary

- This summary is ordered by topic. The summary lists all of the submission points made on a particular topic by all the submitters.
- If after looking at this summary you wish to look at all the submission points to a particular submitter then you need to refer to the “Summary of Decisions Requested to Proposed Plan Change 14: Rezoning of part of C10 Growth Cell by Submitter”.
- For your information separate spell checks have been carried out on the Topic and Submitter reports. In the event of there being any discrepancy the “Summary of Decisions Requested to Proposed Plan Change 14: Rezoning of part of C10 Growth Cell by Submitter” will prevail.

## **How to make a further submission**

People can make a further submission if they represent a relevant aspect of the public interest and/or have an interest in Proposed Plan Change 14 greater than the interest of the general public.

**A further submission can only be made in support or opposition of matters raised in the submissions. No new points can be raised.**

Further submissions should be set out in the format shown in the submission form. Copies of the further submission form are available at Council offices at Cambridge and Te Awamutu, as well as online at [www.waipadc.govt.nz/planchange14](http://www.waipadc.govt.nz/planchange14).

In accordance with the Resource Management Act 1991 a copy of the further submission must be sent to the person who made the original submission within five (5) working days of sending the further submission to the Waipā District Council.

We have made the decision to redact the contact details of all submitters. We have done this because increasingly people are expressing privacy concerns with having their contact details publicly available. If you need to contact a submitter Council can provide their details to you on request.

**Please email [districtplan@waipa.govt.nz](mailto:districtplan@waipa.govt.nz) to request the contact details of the original submitter.**

### **Submissions can be:**

- Posted to:** Waipā District Council  
Private Bag 2402  
Te Awamutu 3840
- Delivered to:** Waipā District Council – Te Awamutu Office  
101 Bank Street  
Te Awamutu
- Delivered to:** Waipā District Council – Cambridge Office  
23 Wilson Street  
Cambridge
- Emailed to:** [districtplan@waipadc.govt.nz](mailto:districtplan@waipadc.govt.nz)

## Submitter Details

| By Surname                               | Submission Number |
|--|-------------------|
| Bardowie Investments Ltd                 | 7                 |
| Director-General of Conservation         | 12                |
| Dredge, Kenneth                          | 11                |
| Dredge, Lesley May                       | 8                 |
| Fire and Emergency New Zealand           | 14                |
| Fonterra Ltd                             | 5                 |
| Henmar Trust                             | 9                 |
| Kama Trust                               | 6                 |
| Laurent Property Co                      | 13                |
| Taylor, Reon                             | 15                |
| Transpower                               | 3                 |
| Waikato Regional Council                 | 10                |
| Waipā District Council                   | 4                 |
| West, Terence Maxfield                   | 1                 |
| Wood, Hannah & O'Sheas Trustees No 8 Ltd | 2                 |

## All of Plan Change

| Submission Point | Submitter | District Plan Provision | Support / Oppose | Submission Summary   | Relief Sought/Decision Requested  |
|------------------|-----------|-------------------------|------------------|--|---|
| 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. |
| 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. |
| 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. |
| 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. |
| 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 located immediately adjacent to the emerging  | Approve PC14 as notified  |

| Submission Point | Submitter  | District Plan Provision | Support / Oppose | Submission Summary   | Relief Sought/Decision Requested   |
|------------------|------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|--|
|                  |            |                         |                  | 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.<br>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. |  |
| 6/1              | Kama Trust | Not Specified           | Support in Part  | Conditional Support Subject to:<br>1. Transport effects (construction and operation) being properly mitigated<br>2. Incorporation of plan provisions which protect against adverse effects on Kama Trust land  | 1. Only approve PC14 subject to matters in the submission being satisfactorily addressed through specific plan provisions.<br>2. Unless issues are satisfactorily addressed, decline PC14.   |
| 6/3              | Kama Trust | Not Specified           | Support in Part  | 1. Impact on C9 Growth Cell if development enabled under PC14 is able to progress before roading infrastructure upgrades have been completed.<br>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:<br>1. the necessary infrastructure is in place prior to any development enabled by PC14 commencing; and<br>2. that this infrastructure has adequate capacity available to service that development. |
| 6/6              | Kama Trust | Not Specified           | Support in Part  | Concerned about adverse amenity effects on Kama Trust land arising under PC14.   | 1. Appropriate provisions to mitigate any adverse amenity effects arising under PC14.<br>2. Any such consequential relief necessary to give effect to this submission.   |
| 7/1              | Bardowie   | Not Specified           | Support in       | Support subject to incorporating plan provisions   | Approve PC14 subject to the above matters being  |

| Submission Point | Submitter                    | District Plan Provision | Support / Oppose   | Submission Summary  | Relief Sought/Decision Requested   |
|------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|---|--|
|                  | Investments Ltd              |                         | Part               | which protect against adverse effects on BIL land, including:<br>1. Adverse amenity effects are appropriately mitigated, including in relation to dust, noise, odour and urban design<br>2. Adverse effects on transport network are appropriately mitigated.   | satisfactorily addressed through plan provisions.  |
| 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).        |
| 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. |
| 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  | Caveats to when development can occur based on transportation requirements.  |



| Submission Point | Submitter                      | District Plan Provision | Support / Oppose | Submission Summary   | Relief Sought/Decision Requested  |
|------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|---|
|                  |                                |                         |                  | 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.   |   |
| 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 Subdivision of the Waipā District Plan apply to the PPC14 area. | <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> |

## Bats

| Submission Point | Submitter                | District Plan Provision | Support / Oppose | Submission Summary   | Relief Sought/Decision Requested   |
|------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|--|
| 10/10            | Waikato Regional Council | Appendix S27            | Support          | <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> | Retain the proposed extent of the Mangaone Stream Reserve on the structure plan, including the buffer around the identified High Value Bat Habitat Area. |
| 10/11            | Waikato Regional Council | Appendix S27            | In Part          | <p>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.</p>                  | Add a description of the High Value Bat Habitat Area and its purpose/function to Appendix S27 - Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan.                        |
| 10/12            | Waikato Regional Council | 7.3                     | In Part          | <p>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</p>  | Add an objective relating to the protection and enhancement of long-tailed bats and their habitat within the Mangaone Precinct.                          |

| Submission Point | Submitter                     | District Plan Provision | Support / Oppose | Submission Summary  | Relief Sought/Decision Requested   |
|------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|---|--|
|                  |                               |                         |                  | Mangaone Precinct.  |  |
| 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.  |
| 10/20            | Waikato Regional Council      | 21.1.1.20               | In Part          | We support proposed Assessment criteria 21.1.1.20 relating to adverse effects on the ecological values of the High Value Bat Habitat Area from light intensity and light spill.   | Retain Assessment criteria 21.1.1.20.  |
| 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.   |
| 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.<br>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.   |
| 12/1             | Director-General of Conservat | 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   | 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 |

| Submission Point | Submitter                        | District Plan Provision | Support / Oppose | Submission Summary   | Relief Sought/Decision Requested  |
|------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|---|
|                  | ion                              |                         |                  | <p>System (NZTCS). Long-tailed bats are Absolutely Protected under the Wildlife Act 1953.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>  | Value Bat Habitat Area.   |
| 12/2             | Director-General of Conservation | Appendix S27            | In Part          | <p>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).</p> <p>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.</p> | Add a description of the High Value Bat Habitat Area and its purpose/function to Appendix S27 - Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan. |
| 12/3             | Director-General                 | 7.2                     | In Part          | <p>PC14 provides for a “High Value Bat Habitat Area” and several rules to manage effects on long-tailed</p>  | Add a resource management issue that addresses ecology to provide for protection and  |

| Submission Point | Submitter                        | District Plan Provision | Support / Oppose | Submission Summary  | Relief Sought/Decision Requested  |
|------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|---|---|
|                  | of Conservation                  |                         |                  | <p>bats and their habitat, as recommended in the memorandum prepared by Blue Wattle Ecology (Appendix D2).</p> <p>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.</p>                                       | enhancement of long-tailed bat habitat values.  |
| 12/4             | Director-General of Conservation | 7.3                     | In Part          | <p>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).</p> <p>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</p> | Add an objective to provide for protection and enhancement of long-tailed bat habitat values. |

| Submission Point | Submitter                        | District Plan Provision | Support / Oppose | Submission Summary   | Relief Sought/Decision Requested   |
|------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|--|
|                  |                                  |                         |                  | benefit from appropriate policy direction on bats and ecology.   |  |
| 12/5             | Director-General of Conservation | 7.3                     | In Part          | <p>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).</p> <p>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.</p> | Add a policy to provide for protection and enhancement of long-tailed bat habitat values.  |
| 12/7             | Director-General of Conservation | 7.4.2.36                | In Part          | <p>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</p>  | <p>Amend Rule 7.4.2.36(c) to read:</p> <p>(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></p> <p>(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</u></p> |

| Submission Point | Submitter                        | District Plan Provision | Support / Oppose | Submission Summary   | Relief Sought/Decision Requested   |
|------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|--|
|                  |                                  |                         |                  | Development Agreement, potentially reducing its ecology and bat habitat value.   | <u>contribution will be offset against the reserve land to be vested.</u><br>And any further or alternative relief to like effect.   |
| 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   |
| 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:<br>(d) The first subdivision or land use consent application of the Mangaone Precinct <del>for industrial purposes</del> , shall include: ...                        |
| 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:<br>(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> |
| 12/11            | Director-General of Conservation | 21.1.7.19               | Support          | I support the requirement to assess activities not otherwise permitted in the Central Focal Area the extent to which bat habitat values associated with the Mangaone Stream Reserve will be avoided.   | Retain 21.1.7.19(iv).  |
| 12/12            | Director-General of              | 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   | Retain   |

| Submission Point | Submitter                        | District Plan Provision | Support / Oppose | Submission Summary   | Relief Sought/Decision Requested  |
|------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|---|
|                  | Conservation                     |                         |                  | of the High Value Bat Habitat Area.  |   |
| 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:<br>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.   |
| 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:<br>e. ... The planned works <del>should</del> <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. |



## Economic

| Submission Point | Submitter     | District Plan Provision | Support / Oppose | Submission Summary   | Relief Sought/Decision Requested   |
|------------------|---------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|--|
| 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.   |
| 8/1              | Lesley Dredge | Not Specified           | Oppose           | <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>There is provision for 132 ha 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 different forecasts over different time periods is a manipulation of data which has no substance. There is no evidence of capacity estimates being overstated.</p> | <p>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.</p> <p>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 Industrial Structure Plan has reached 80% development (i.e. 80% of the developable land area is the subject of s 224 certificates) or by 31 March 2035, whichever is the sooner.</p> |

| Submission Point | Submitter                | District Plan Provision | Support / Oppose   | Submission Summary  | Relief Sought/Decision Requested   |
|------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|---|--|
|                  |                          |                         |                    | <p>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> |  |
| 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  | Provide a more robust assessment to demonstrate that the proposed plan change gives effect to Clause 3.6(1)(a) of the NPS-HPL. |

| Submission Point | Submitter                | District Plan Provision | Support / Oppose   | Submission Summary   | Relief Sought/Decision Requested   |
|------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|--|--|
|                  |                          |                         |                    | <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>  |  |
| 10/3             | Waikato Regional Council | Not Specified           | Further Assessment | <p>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.</p>   | <p>Provide a more robust assessment to demonstrate that the proposed plan change gives effect to Clause 3.6(5) of the NPS-HPL.</p>                                   |
| 10/4             | Waikato Regional Council | Not Specified           | Further Assessment | <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The relevant objectives, policies and methods of the Land and freshwater (LF) chapter, particularly given that the</li> </ul> | <p>Ensure the proposed plan change is assessed against all relevant objectives, policies and methods of the WRPS and Proposed WRPS Change 1 – Decisions version.</p> |

| Submission Point | Submitter                | District Plan Provision | Support / Oppose   | Submission Summary  | Relief Sought/Decision Requested  |
|------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
|                  |                          |                         |                    | <p>Mangaone Stream flows through the plan change site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The relevant objectives, policies and methods of the Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity (ECO) chapter. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 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.</li> <li>○ 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.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Policies UFD-P1, UFD-P2, UFD-P11 and UFD-P13.</li> <li>▪ Methods UFD-M1, UFD-M7, UFD-M8 and UFD-M11.</li> </ul> |   |
| 10/5             | Waikato Regional Council | Not Specified           | Further Assessment | <p>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</p>  | <p>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.</p> |

| Submission Point | Submitter                | District Plan Provision | Support / Oppose   | Submission Summary  | Relief Sought/Decision Requested  |
|------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
|                  |                          |                         |                    | 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.   |   |
| 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.   |
| 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. |

## Industrial Zone Activities

| Submission Point | Submitter                | District Plan Provision | Support / Oppose | Submission Summary   | Relief Sought/Decision Requested |
|------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|----------------------------------|
| 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                           |
| 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                           |
| 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                           |

| Submission Point | Submitter                | District Plan Provision                       | Support / Oppose | Submission Summary  | Relief Sought/Decision Requested  |
|------------------|--------------------------|---|------------------|---|---|
| 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  |
| 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  |
| 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  |
| 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. | Amend to read as follows:<br>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.<br><del>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.</del> |
| 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.   |
| 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  |

| Submission Point | Submitter    | District Plan Provision | Support / Oppose | Submission Summary   | Relief Sought/Decision Requested   |
|------------------|--------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|--|
| 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.<br>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 production. | (i) Reject the proposed amendment and leave Rule 7.4.1.1(a) as currently exists in the District Plan.<br>(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 <u>and the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area</u> ” |
| 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.   |
| 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).   |
| 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  | Amend Rule 7.4.1.1(u) to read as follows; “Within the Bardowie Industrial Precinct   |

| Submission Point | Submitter        | District Plan Provision | Support / Oppose | Submission Summary  | Relief Sought/Decision Requested   |
|------------------|------------------|-------------------------|------------------|---|--|
|                  |                  |                         |                  | 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.  | Structure Plan Area the following activities are also permitted:<br>i. Stormwater ponds and/or facilities;<br>ii. Farming activities;<br>iii. <del>Spray Irrigation of dairy factory wastewater until 31 March 2024;</del><br>iv. <del>Innovation and Advanced Technology Activities (as defined in the Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan); and</del>  |
| 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(a) as follows:<br>d. Relocated buildings; <del>and</del><br>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;<br><u>f. Within the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area, to the north of the Mangaone Stream, Glass Manufacturing;</u><br><u>g. Demolition yards;</u><br><u>h. Recycling depots/facilities;</u><br><u>i. Use, creation or storage of radioactive materials;</u><br><u>j. Hazardous facility;</u><br><u>k. Chemical Manufacturing;</u><br><u>l. The storage and/or use of trade waste;</u><br><u>m. Smelting Industries;</u><br><u>n. Melting Industries;</u><br><u>o. Power generation activities;</u><br><u>p. Waste to Energy Plants; and</u><br><u>q. Heavy industrial activities."</u> |
| 10/8             | Waikato Regional | 7.4.1.1(x)              | Support          | We support limiting the Central Focal Area for the Mangaone Precinct to providing for small-scale   | Retain the limited range of activities proposed to be permitted within the Central Focal Area under  |



| Submission Point | Submitter                | District Plan Provision | Support / Oppose | Submission Summary   | Relief Sought/Decision Requested   |
|------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|--|
|                  | Council                  |                         |                  | 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.   | Rule 7.4.1.1(x).   |
| 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.  |
| 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 Mangone 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”. |

## Infrastructure Capacity

| Submission Point | Submitter    | District Plan Provision | Support/ Oppose | Submission Summary   | Relief Sought/Decision Requested  |
|------------------|--------------|-------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| 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 result in flooding  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Appropriate provisions to mitigate adverse stormwater effects arising under PC14.</li> <li>2. Any such consequential relief necessary to give effect to this submission.</li> </ol>   |
| 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. |
| 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.   |
| 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  | Amend proposed new Rule 15.4.2.91A to also related to the Bardowie Industrial Precinct.   |

| Submission Point | Submitter                | District Plan Provision | Support/ Oppose    | Submission Summary   | Relief Sought/Decision Requested   |
|------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|--|--|
|                  |                          |                         |                    | 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.   |  |
| 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"> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul> |
| 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.  |
| 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.   |

| Submission Point | Submitter                | District Plan Provision | Support/ Oppose    | Submission Summary  | Relief Sought/Decision Requested  |
|------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| 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.   |
| 10/27            | Waikato Regional Council | Not Specified           | Neutral            | To assist with understanding the proposed stormwater management 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. | Clarify whether Waipā District Council proposes to seek stormwater discharge consent for the entire PC14 area and manage all the stormwater discharges from private developments.   |
| 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.   |
| 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  | 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 |

| Submission Point | Submitter | District Plan Provision | Support/ Oppose | Submission Summary  | Relief Sought/Decision Requested  |
|------------------|-----------|-------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
|                  |           |                         |                 | 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. | service to properties up and down stream of the plan change site can be maintained. |

### **Kiwifruit Block**

| Submission Point | Submitter                | District Plan Provision | Support / Oppose | Submission Summary   | Relief Sought/Decision Requested  |
|------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|---|
| 7/2              | Bardowie Investments Ltd | Planning Maps           | Support          | 1. Support rezoning of Kiwifruit Block to Industrial<br>2. Any changes to notified objectives, policies, rules and methods applying to Kiwifruit Block opposed   | Retain  |
| 7/3              | Bardowie Investments Ltd | Appendix S20            | Support          | Support extension of Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan to the Kiwifruit Block  | Retain  |
| 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.  |
| 9/5              | Henmar Trust             | Not Specified           | Oppose           | The technical reports provided with this Private Plan change cannot be accurate if they have excluded this area of land (the Kiwifruit Block)  | That Section 4, 7 Survey Office Plan 499872 comprised in Record of Title 811702 and Section 1 Survey Office Plan 499872 comprised in Record |

| Submission Point | Submitter    | District Plan Provision | Support / Oppose | Submission Summary   | Relief Sought/Decision Requested  |
|------------------|--------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|---|
|                  |              |                         |                  | <p>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> | 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. |
| 9/16             | Henmar Trust | Maps                    | Oppose           | 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  | 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   |

| Submission Point | Submitter  | District Plan Provision | Support / Oppose | Submission Summary   | Relief Sought/Decision Requested   |
|------------------|------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|--|
|                  |            |                         |                  | assessed.  | 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 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. |
| 11/02            | Ken Dredge | Appendix S27            | Oppose           | <p>The Kiwifruit block has been omitted from a number of expert PC 14 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"> <li>▪ afford Swayne Road users and residents the same level of protection of amenity across the total industrial area to be re zoned.</li> <li>▪ prevent a fragmented and ad hoc development approach, with continuous application of design elements across the total industrial area to be re zoned.</li> <li>▪ achieve a well-functioning urban environment with good urban design.</li> </ul> | Incorporate the Kiwifruit block with the Mangaone Structure Plan   |

## Mangaone Stream

| Submission Point | Submitter      | District Plan Provision | Support / Oppose | Submission Summary   | Relief Sought/Decision Requested   |
|------------------|----------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|--|
| 4/1              | Waipā District | 7.4.2.7                 | In Part          | Rule 7.4.2.7 specifies daylight controls in relation to zone boundaries. In this instance the proposed | Amend Rule 7.4.2.7 as follows:<br>Where a site adjoins a road, a reserve or any zone |

| Submission Point | Submitter              | District Plan Provision | Support / Oppose | Submission Summary  | Relief Sought/Decision Requested  |
|------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|---|---|
|                  | Council                |                         |                  | 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.   | 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.   |
| 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:<br>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...;<br><u>(c) 4 lux at the boundary of the Mangaone Stream Reserve as identified on the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan.</u><br>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. |
| 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 Plan</u>  |
| 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 Plan</u>  |



| Submission Point | Submitter                | District Plan Provision | Support / Oppose | Submission Summary  | Relief Sought/Decision Requested  |
|------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|---|---|
| 4/5              | Waipā District Council   | 15.4.2.91A              | In Part          | <p>Rule 15.4.2.91A provides requirements that apply to any subdivision and development within the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan area. Rules 15.4.2.91A (d) and (g) require that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 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).</li> <li>- The proposed Mangaone Stream Reserve is planted and fenced, and pedestrian / cycle paths are constructed as part of the first subdivision consent</li> </ul> | <p>Rule 15.4.2.91A(g) is amended to read: The Mangaone Stream Reserve is planted and fenced, and pedestrian / 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.</p> <p>Or other relief as may be appropriate (including the inclusion of specific fencing requirements for industrial / reserve boundaries within the Industrial Zone provisions.</p> |
| 4/6              | Waipā District Council   | 21.2.7.1(i)             | In Part          | <p>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.</p>  | <p>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></p> <p>Or other relief as may be appropriate (including the inclusion of specific fencing requirements for industrial / reserve boundaries within the Industrial Zone provisions.</p>  |
| 9/23             | Henmar Trust             | 7.3.4.1                 | In Part          | <p>Agree with maintain and enhancing the cultural, ecological, and amenity values of the Mangaone Stream and its margins within or adjacent to industrial areas.</p>  | <p>Council accepts the submitters proposed amendments to Proposed Plan Change 14.</p>   |
| 10/14            | Waikato Regional Council | 7.4.2.5A                | Support          | <p>We support this proposed rule requiring buildings to be setback at least 5m from the boundary of the Mangone Stream Reserve in accordance with the recommendations of Bluewattle Ecology.</p>  | <p>Retain</p>   |
| 10/15            | Waikato Regional Council | 7.4.2.42                | Support          | <p>We support this proposed rule for the Mangaone Stream Reserve to mitigate adverse lighting effects on long-tailed bats, in accordance with the</p>   | <p>Retain</p>   |

| Submission Point | Submitter                | District Plan Provision | Support / Oppose | Submission Summary   | Relief Sought/Decision Requested   |
|------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|--|
|                  |                          |                         |                  | 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.  |  |
| 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 Mangone Stream Reserve Management Plan. |
| 10/18            | Waikato Regional Council | 15.4.2.91A(f)           | In Part          | We support the proposed requirement for the Mangone 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 Mangone Stream Reserve Management Plan.     |
| 10/19            | Waikato Regional Council | 15.4.2.91A(g)           | In Part          | We support the proposed requirement for the Mangone 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. 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. | Amend Rule 15.4.2.91A(g) to apply to the first subdivision or land use consent for the Mangaone Precinct.  |

| Submission Point | Submitter                        | District Plan Provision | Support / Oppose | Submission Summary   | Relief Sought/Decision Requested   |
|------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|--|
| 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 Mangone Stream Reserve in accordance with the recommendations of Bluewattle Ecology (Appendix D2).  | Retain   |
| 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.<br>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:<br>(a) <del>Clarification Evidence</del> <u>Evidence</u> (by way of mapping) <del>that as to</del> the precise area and extent of the reserve area <u>is generally in accordance with Appendix S27 and Figure S27.B;</u> |

## National Grid Yard

| Submission Point | Submitter  | District Plan Provision | Support / Oppose | Submission Summary  | Relief Sought/Decision Requested   |
|------------------|------------|-------------------------|------------------|---|--|
| 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 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, | 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. |

| Submission Point | Submitter  | District Plan Provision | Support / Oppose | Submission Summary  | Relief Sought/Decision Requested   |
|------------------|------------|-------------------------|------------------|---|--|
|                  |            |                         |                  | and therefore should be deleted.  |  |
| 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.                                 |
| 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). |
| 3/4              | Transpower | 7.1                     | Neutral          | Given the current WDP zone-based framework, it is appropriate that Introductory text be provided to   | Insert the following into Section 7.1 Introduction of Section 7:   |

| Submission Point | Submitter  | District Plan Provision | Support / Oppose | Submission Summary  | Relief Sought/Decision Requested   |
|------------------|------------|-------------------------|------------------|---|--|
|                  |            |                         |                  | 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.  | <p><u>7.1.8</u> 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 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.</p> <p><u>7.1.9</u> The management of subdivision within the National Grid Corridor is addressed in Section 15 (Infrastructure, Hazards, Development and Subdivision).</p> |
| 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. | <p>Insert the following into Section 7.2 Resource Management Issues of Section 7:</p> <p><u>7.2.21</u> 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</p>  |

| Submission Point | Submitter  | District Plan Provision | Support / Oppose | Submission Summary  | Relief Sought/Decision Requested  |
|------------------|------------|-------------------------|------------------|---|---|
|                  |            |                         |                  |   | <u>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>   |
| 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:<br><u>Objective - National Grid transmission networks</u><br><u>7.3.9 To recognise and provide for the ongoing operation, maintenance and development of the National Grid electricity transmission network.</u>  |
| 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:<br><u>Policies – Management of activities within National Grid Corridors</u><br><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, maintenance and development of the Grid through the management of activities within identified setbacks and corridors.</u><br><u>7.3.9.2 To ensure safe and efficient use and</u> |

| Submission Point | Submitter  | District Plan Provision | Support / Oppose | Submission Summary   | Relief Sought/Decision Requested  |
|------------------|------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|---|
|                  |            |                         |                  |  | <p><u>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> |
| 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- | <p>Insert the following into Section 7.4 Rules of Section 7:</p> <p><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>   |

| Submission Point | Submitter  | District Plan Provision | Support / Oppose | Submission Summary  | Relief Sought/Decision Requested  |
|------------------|------------|-------------------------|------------------|---|---|
|                  |            |                         |                  | complying activity should resource consent be required.   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) <u>Be no deeper than 300mm within 6m of the outer visible edge of a National Grid tower; and</u></li> <li>ii) <u>Be no deeper than 3m between 6m to 12m from the outer visible edge of a National Grid tower.</u></li> <li>c) <u>Anywhere within the National Grid Yard</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) <u>Not create an unstable batter that will affect a transmission support structure; and</u></li> <li>ii) <u>Ensure vehicular access to any National Grid support structure is available; and</u></li> <li>iii) <u>Not result in a reduction in the ground to conductor clearance distances below what is required by Table 4 of NZECP34.</u></li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><u>Provided that the following are exempt from Rule 7.4.2.45.a. and b. above:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) <u>Earthworks undertaken by a network utility operator.</u></li> </ul> <p><u>Activities that fail to comply with this rule will require a resource consent for a non-complying activity.</u></p> |
| 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  |
| 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 | <p>Insert a new standard into proposed rule 15.4.2.91A as follows: ...</p> <p>(b) Only light vehicles are able to use the proposed road connection to Swayne Road .....</p> <p>(i) <u>On all lots, building platforms for the</u></p>   |



| Submission Point | Submitter | District Plan Provision | Support / Oppose | Submission Summary   | Relief Sought/Decision Requested  |
|------------------|-----------|-------------------------|------------------|--|---|
|                  |           |                         |                  | 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. | <u>principal buildings can be accommodated outside of the National Grid Yard.</u> |

## Rezoning

| Submission Point | Submitter    | District Plan Provision | Support / Oppose | Submission Summary  | Relief Sought/Decision Requested |
|------------------|--------------|-------------------------|------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| 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"> <li>▪ Ensuring that any actual or potential adverse effects of the proposal are less than minor.</li> <li>▪ Ensuring that the proposal is in accordance with the objectives and policies of the Waipa District Plan.</li> <li>▪ Ensure that the District Plan Rules are amended to protect the adjoining Rural Zones and the Industrial/Rural Interface.</li> <li>▪ 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.</li> </ul> | Rezone Lot 2 DP 529042.          |

| Submission Point | Submitter    | District Plan Provision | Support / Oppose | Submission Summary  | Relief Sought/Decision Requested   |
|------------------|--------------|-------------------------|------------------|---|--|
|                  |              |                         |                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul> |  |
| 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.  |
| 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. |

## Rural

| Submission Point | Submitter                          | District Plan Provision | Support / Oppose | Submission Summary   | Relief Sought/Decision Requested |
|------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|----------------------------------|
| 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.           |

| Submission Point | Submitter                          | District Plan Provision | Support / Oppose | Submission Summary   | Relief Sought/Decision Requested  |
|------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|---|
| 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. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The building setback should be increased to 30 meters, as originally represented.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul> |
| 7/11             | Bardowie Investments Ltd           | Not Specified           | Support          | Support proposed amendments requiring fencing and landscape buffers along Swayne Road boundaries   | Retain  |
| 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   | 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.   |

| Submission Point | Submitter    | District Plan Provision | Support / Oppose | Submission Summary   | Relief Sought/Decision Requested  |
|------------------|--------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|---|
|                  |              |                         |                  | proposed Industrial Precinct Areas.  |   |
| 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 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 increase yard setback where the site adjoins the Rural Zone to 25m from the boundary. For example, buildings over 250m <sup>2</sup> 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. |
| 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.   |
| 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.  |
| 9/9              | Henmar Trust | Not Specified           | Oppose           | Oppose lack of consideration of any actual or potential adverse environmental effects on   | Council alters the existing Rules and Performance Standards to ensure that any adverse effects on   |

| Submission Point | Submitter    | District Plan Provision | Support / Oppose | Submission Summary  | Relief Sought/Decision Requested  |
|------------------|--------------|-------------------------|------------------|---|---|
|                  |              |                         |                  | adjoining properties and on the adjoining Rural Zone. Any actual or potential adverse effects should be mitigated internally within the proposed Industrial Precinct Areas.   | 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.   |
| 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"> <li>▪ 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</li> <li>▪ is co-ordinated with infrastructure provision ensuring connectivity to all land within the C10 Industrial Growth Cell.</li> </ul> <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> | <p>Amend to read as follows:</p> <p>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.</p>  |
| 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</p>  | <p>Amend proposed new/replacement version of Policy 7.3.4.5 to read:</p> <p>“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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Hautapu Industrial Structure Plan Area;</li> <li>(ii) Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan</li> </ul> |

| Submission Point | Submitter    | District Plan Provision | Support / Oppose | Submission Summary   | Relief Sought/Decision Requested  |
|------------------|--------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|---|
|                  |              |                         |                  | <p>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>   | <p>Area; and</p> <p>(iii) Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area <del>(particularly along Zig Zag Road and Swayne Road.</del>"</p>   |
| 9/28             | Henmar Trust | 7.4.1.3(f)              | In Part          | <p>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.</p> | <p>Amend Rule 7.4.1.3(f) as follows:<br/>Assessment will be restricted to the following matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <u>Any actual or potential adverse effects on the local environment, adjoining properties, and adjoining zones.</u></li> <li>▪ Adverse effect on the Hautapu Dairy Manufacturing Site due to the discharge of contaminants to air.</li> </ul> <p>These matters will be considered in accordance with the assessment criteria in Section 21.<br/>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></p> |
| 9/30             | Henmar Trust | 7.4.2.1                 | In Part          | <p>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.</p>  | <p>Amend Rule 7.4.2.1 to read as follows:<br/>"The minimum building setback from road boundaries shall be 5m, except in the following locations: ...</p> <p>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 <del>10m</del> <u>15m</u>.</p>   |

| Submission Point | Submitter    | District Plan Provision | Support / Oppose | Submission Summary  | Relief Sought/Decision Requested   |
|------------------|--------------|-------------------------|------------------|---|--|
| 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:<br>“Rule – Building setback from Mangaone Stream Reserve:<br>Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area <u>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.  |
| 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 also protect the amenity of adjoining land that is not zoned Industrial.   | Amend Rule 7.4.2.7A as follows:<br>“Within the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area <u>and the Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan Area</u> , where a site adjoins Swayne 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> ” |
| 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.   |

| Submission Point | Submitter    | District Plan Provision | Support / Oppose | Submission Summary   | Relief Sought/Decision Requested  |
|------------------|--------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|---|
| 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. | <p>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):</p> <p>The following rules shall apply in respect of the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area <u>and Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan Area</u>:</p> <p>a. The location, extent, type and density of landscaping within the Landscape Buffer Strips and Landscape Amenity Strips for the <del>Mangaone Precinct</del> Structure Plan Areas shall be as follows: ...</p> <p>ii. A Landscaped Buffer Strip of <del>3m</del> <u>5m</u> (minimum depth) along boundary of the <del>Mangaone Precinct</del> Structure Plan Areas...</p> <p>iii. A Landscaped Amenity Strip of 3m (minimum depth) along the frontage of any lots adjoining an internal road within the <del>Mangaone Precinct</del> Structure Plan Areas...</p> <p>b) ....</p> <p>i. The Zig Zag Road interface and Rural Zone interface (<u>to the north of the Mangaone Stream</u>)...</p> <p>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 <del>Mangaone Precinct</del> Structure Plan Areas to the</p> |



| Submission Point | Submitter    | District Plan Provision | Support / Oppose | Submission Summary   | Relief Sought/Decision Requested   |
|------------------|--------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|--|
|                  |              |                         |                  |  | south of the Mangaone Stream....   |
| 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:<br>“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.”  |
| 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   |
| 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.   |
| 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:<br>All external lighting shall be shaded or directed away from any adjoining residential dwellings, <del>or</del> roads, <u>or adjoining Rural Zones...</u><br>This rule only applies to land within:<br>(a) Area 6 – Hautapu Industrial Structure Plan Area; <del>and</del><br>(b) Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area; <u>and</u><br>(c) <u>Bardowie Industrial Precinct Area.</u> ” |
| 9/42             | Henmar       | 21.1.7.7                | In Part          | The Bardowie Industrial Precinct also adjoins the  | Amend to read as follows:  |

| Submission Point | Submitter    | District Plan Provision | Support / Oppose | Submission Summary  | Relief Sought/Decision Requested   |
|------------------|--------------|-------------------------|------------------|---|--|
|                  | Trust        |                         |                  | Rural Zone. This rule should apply to both Structure Plan Areas to protect amenity.   | 21.1.7.7 Building Colour...<br>c. The extent to which building colour and reflectance levels of developments in the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area <u>and the Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan Area</u> affect the visual amenity of the zone, as well as the visual amenity when viewed from the adjacent Rural zoned areas.  |
| 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:<br>Rule – Vehicle access to sites in the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area <u>and the Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan Area</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 <u>and the Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan</u> , there shall be no direct access to industrial lots within the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area <u>or Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan Area</u> directly from Swayne Road or Zig Zag Road... |
| 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:<br>21.1.7.17A Rural Interface<br>Within the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area <u>and the Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan Area</u> , 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, <del>in particular the effects on rural residential properties on the east side of Swayne Road.</del>  |
| 9/45             | Henmar       | 21.2.7                  | In Part          | Maintain that there should be a 5m deep   | Amend to read as follows:  |

| Submission Point | Submitter  | District Plan Provision | Support / Oppose | Submission Summary   | Relief Sought/Decision Requested   |
|------------------|------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|--|
|                  | Trust      |                         |                  | 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.   | Landscape Buffer Strip Planting and Implementation Plan<br>a. ...:<br>i. Establishing a 5.0m deep Landscape Buffer Strip planting:<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ along Zig Zag Road frontage in the Development Area north of Mangaone Stream; <del>and</del></li> <li>▪ along Swayne Road frontage in the Development Area south of Mangaone Stream; <u>and</u></li> <li>▪ <u>along boundaries that adjoin a Rural Zone.</u></li> </ul> ii. <del>Establish a 3.0m deep Landscape Buffer Strip planting along parts of the Development Area north of Mangaone Stream that adjoin a Rural Zone.</del> |
| 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:<br>a. Increase the width of the landscape strip on Swayne Road to 8m (from 5 m)<br>b. Increase minimum building setback to 15m (from 10 m)<br>c. Include a planted earth bund 2m in height<br>d. Increase the minimum height of trees at maturity to 15m (from 12m)   |
| 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.   |

| Submission Point | Submitter                      | District Plan Provision | Support / Oppose   | Submission Summary  | Relief Sought/Decision Requested   |
|------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|---|--|
| 14/3             | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Not Specified           | In Part            | <p>PPC14 provides detailed landscaping plans, which includes buffer planting. Many areas in New Zealand experience drought conditions over summer, including Cambridge, which heightens the risk of vegetation fire.</p> <p>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.</p> | 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.  |
| 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.   |
| 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.   | <p>Amend Policy 7.3.4.7 as follows:<br/>           “To ensure that landscaping and fencing is <del>provided</del> on perimeter sites (<u>in the areas listed below</u>) <del>identified in the Hautapu Structure Plan Area is undertaken</del> in accordance with (<u>as applicable</u>): <del>the design characteristics and planting requirements specified in the Design Guidelines for the</del></p> <p>a) <u>Hautapu Industrial Structure Plan;</u><br/>           b) <u>Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan and Urban Design and Landscape Guidelines;</u> and</p> |

| Submission Point | Submitter   | District Plan Provision | Support / Oppose | Submission Summary   | Relief Sought/Decision Requested  |
|------------------|-------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|---|
|                  |             |                         |                  |  | <u>Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan (Swayne Road particularly)."</u>  |
| 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 industrial building. | Amend Rule 7.4.2.1 as follows:<br>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 <del>10m</del> <u>15m</u> .   |
| 15/4             | Reon Taylor | 7.4.2.15A               | Oppose           | 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.  | Amend proposed Rule 7.4.2.15A as follows:<br>(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:<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A timber post and rail fence positioned along the road boundary; <u>and</u></li> <li>- <del>A hedge with a minimum height of 2m at maturity; and</del></li> <li>- A row of trees, spaced at 10m apart (or less) that will grow to a height of at least <del>12m</del> <u>15m</u> at maturity;</li> </ul> |

## Structure Plan

| Submission Point | Submitter    | District Plan Provision | Support / Oppose | Submission Summary  | Relief Sought/Decision Requested  |
|------------------|--------------|-------------------------|------------------|---|---|
| 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"> <li>▪ The proposed Structure Plan turns its back on the Henmar Trust property located within the C10 Industrial Growth Cell.</li> <li>▪ No traffic and/or service connectivity to the adjoining Henmar Trust property located within C10 Growth Cell.</li> <li>▪ No connectivity to the Kiwifruit Block to the south. Currently Heavy Vehicles access the Kiwifruit Block.</li> <li>▪ The solid black line is not included in the key.</li> <li>▪ 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.</li> <li>▪ 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</li> </ul> | <p>Accept submitters proposed amendments to Appendix S27 Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan. Submitters amendments are detailed below:</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) Include the solid black line in the key, identifying what this represents.</p> <p>(c) The Collector Road from the Bardowie Industrial Precinct to the Henmar Trust property needs to be shown as a Collector Road.</p> <p>(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.</p> <p>(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.</p> <p>(f) Show services connections to the Henmar Trust property and include this in the key.</p> <p>(g) To provide connectivity and integration within the C10 Growth Cell all roading and/or services crossing the Mangaone</p> |

| Submission Point | Submitter    | District Plan Provision | Support / Oppose | Submission Summary  | Relief Sought/Decision Requested  |
|------------------|--------------|-------------------------|------------------|---|---|
|                  |              |                         |                  | <p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 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.</li> <li>▪ A round-a-bout in this location provides: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ access to both the Mangaone Precinct and the Henmar Trust property;</li> <li>○ reduces the need for another round-about on Zig Zag Road to provide access to the Henmar Trust property;</li> <li>○ improves sight visibility in both directions;</li> <li>○ 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</li> <li>○ provides a safe communal entrance to properties north of the Mangaone Stream with access to the primary internal distribution collector road and intersection.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <p>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.</p> <p>(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.</p> <p>(i) Amend the proposed Structure Plan to have a Landscaped/Planted Buffer Strip of 5m along the western boundary with the Henmar Trust property.</p> <p>(j) Amend the proposed Structure Plan to identify pedestrian and cycle connectivity to the adjoining Henmar Trust property located within C10 Growth Cell.</p> <p>(k) Show the power sub-station currently located on the Structure Plan Area.</p> |
| 9/14             | Henmar Trust | Appendix S20            | Oppose           | (i) No assessment of the Kiwifruit Block in any of the technical reports and therefore appears  | Reject Appendix S20 – Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan as notified.  |

| Submission Point | Submitter | District Plan Provision | Support / Oppose | Submission Summary   | Relief Sought/Decision Requested |
|------------------|-----------|-------------------------|------------------|--|----------------------------------|
|                  |           |                         |                  | <p>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> |                                  |



| Submission Point | Submitter    | District Plan Provision | Support / Oppose | Submission Summary  | Relief Sought/Decision Requested  |
|------------------|--------------|-------------------------|------------------|---|---|
|                  |              |                         |                  | (vii) If the Kiwifruit Block is to be rezoned Industrial, need technical assessment of the effects of this rezoning.  |   |
| 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> <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</p> | <p>Accept submitters proposed amendments to Appendix S20 – Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan. Submitters amendments are detailed below:</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</p> |

| Submission Point | Submitter    | District Plan Provision | Support / Oppose | Submission Summary   | Relief Sought/Decision Requested  |
|------------------|--------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|---|
|                  |              |                         |                  | <p>development on the Bardowie Industrial Precinct must be restricted to a maximum of 80% pre-development peak runoff.</p> <p>If the Kiwifruit Block is to be rezoned Industrial, need technical assessment of the effects of this rezoning.</p>   | <p>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>  |
| 9/39             | Henmar Trust | 15.4.1.1(aa)            | In Part          | <p>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 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.</p> | <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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Traffic and service connectivity to other properties within the C10 Industrial Growth Cell.</li> <li>▪ Whether the proposal will prevent other properties within the C10 Industrial Growth Cell from being developed.</li> <li>▪ The provision of traffic and services to the boundary of adjoining properties within the C10 Industrial Growth Cell.</li> <li>▪ 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</li> </ul> |

| Submission Point | Submitter | District Plan Provision | Support / Oppose | Submission Summary | Relief Sought/Decision Requested  |
|------------------|-----------|-------------------------|------------------|--------------------|---|
|                  |           |                         |                  |                    | <p>property within the C10 Industrial Growth Cell.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>The extent to which the subdivision layout is in general accordance with the Bardowie Industrial Precinct Structure Plan.</li> <li>The provision of Landscaped Buffer Strips along the boundary with adjoining Zones.</li> </ul> |

## Transport

| Submission Point | Submitter                          | District Plan Provision | Support / Oppose | Submission Summary  | Relief Sought/Decision Requested  |
|------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|---|---|
| 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. |
| 2/3              | H Wood & O'Sheas Trustees          | 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  | If an access road onto Swayne Road is approved, we strongly recommend that this intersection be moved north along Swayne  |

| Submission Point | Submitter                | District Plan Provision | Support / Oppose | Submission Summary   | Relief Sought/Decision Requested  |
|------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|---|
|                  | No 8 Ltd                 |                         |                  | 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.         | 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.  |
| 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"> <li>1. Appropriate provisions to mitigate adverse transport effects arising under PC14.</li> <li>2. Any such consequential relief necessary to give effect to this submission.</li> </ol>  |
| 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  |
| 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.  |
| 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           | 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 |

| Submission Point | Submitter                | District Plan Provision | Support / Oppose | Submission Summary  | Relief Sought/Decision Requested  |
|------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|---|---|
|                  |                          |                         |                  | Precinct.   | in the key.   |
| 10/30            | Waikato Regional Council | Not Specified           | In Part          | <p>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 Reduction Plan (as per s74(2)(d) of the RMA).</p> <p>We do, however, acknowledge that due to the functional needs of industrial areas, continued reliance on cars and trucks is anticipated.</p> | Provide an assessment of the proposed plan change in relation to transport emissions reduction and the Emissions Reduction Plan.  |
| 10/31            | Waikato Regional Council | Appendix S27            | In Part          | <p>We support the inclusion of walking and cycling infrastructure in the proposed structure plan and recommend ensuring this is connected to the existing network.</p> <p>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.</p>   | 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. |
| 10/32            | Waikato Regional Council | Section 7               | In Part          | <p>We support the inclusion of walking and cycling infrastructure in the proposed structure plan and recommend ensuring this is connected to the existing network.</p> <p>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)</p>  | 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. |

| Submission Point | Submitter                | District Plan Provision | Support / Oppose | Submission Summary  | Relief Sought/Decision Requested  |
|------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|---|---|
|                  |                          |                         |                  | principles, end-of-journey facilities and electric vehicle (EV) charging facilities.  |   |
| 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. |
| 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).                                     |
| 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  | Add provisions referencing CPTED principles and requiring provision of end-of-journey facilities and EV charging facilities (including for heavy vehicles).                                     |

| Submission Point | Submitter                | District Plan Provision | Support / Oppose | Submission Summary   | Relief Sought/Decision Requested  |
|------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|---|
|                  |                          |                         |                  | employment sites (beyond those that might serve business fleets).<br>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).  |   |
| 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).<br>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).   |
| 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"> <li>1. Ensure the proposed plan change considers the relevant provisions of the Waikato Regional Public Transport Plan.</li> <li>2. That Waipā District Council continues to work with WRC in relation to public transport planning for the plan change area.</li> </ol> |

| Submission Point | Submitter                      | District Plan Provision | Support / Oppose   | Submission Summary   | Relief Sought/Decision Requested  |
|------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|--|---|
| 13/01            | 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.   |
| 14/02            | 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.                                   |
| 15/05            | 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:<br>"Rule – Vehicle access to sites in the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area<br><u>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 |



| Submission Point | Submitter | District Plan Provision | Support / Oppose | Submission Summary | Relief Sought/Decision Requested  |
|------------------|-----------|-------------------------|------------------|--------------------|---|
|                  |           |                         |                  |                    | <p>directly from Swayne Road or Zig Zag Road; and</p> <p>2. <u>Construction traffic shall not use Swayne Road for accessing Mangaone Precinct Structure Area.</u></p> <p>Activities that fail to comply with this rule will require a resource consent for a non-complying activity.”</p> |