

Further Submission on Proposed Plan Change 26 (Residential Zone Intensification) to the Operative Waipā District Plan by Kāinga Ora – Homes And Communities

Clause 8 of Schedule 1 to the Resource Management Act 1991

To: Wāipā District Council
Private Bag 2402,
Te Awamutu 3840
Submitted via email to: districtplan@waipadc.govt.nz

Name of Further Submitter: Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities

1. **Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities (“Kāinga Ora”)** makes this further submission on the Proposed Plan Change 26 – Residential Zone Intensification (“**PC26**”) in support of/in opposition to original submissions on PC26
2. Kāinga Ora has an interest in PC26 that is greater than the interest the general public has, being an original submitter on the PC26 with respect to its interests as Crown entity responsible for the provision of public housing, and its housing portfolio in the Waikato District.
3. Kāinga Ora makes this further submission in respect of submissions by third parties to the PC26.


Reasons for further submission

4. The submissions that Kāinga Ora supports or opposes are set out in the table attached as **Appendix A** to this further submission.
5. The reasons for this further submission are:
 - (a) The reasons set out in the Kāinga Ora primary submission on the PC26.
 - (b) In the case of the Primary Submissions that are opposed:

- (i) The Primary Submissions do not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are otherwise inconsistent with the purpose and principles of the Resource Management Act 1991 (“**RMA**”);
 - (ii) The relief sought in the Primary Submissions is not the most appropriate in terms of section 32 of the RMA;
 - (iii) Rejecting the relief sought in the Primary Submissions opposed would more fully serve the statutory purpose than would implementing that relief; and
 - (iv) The Primary Submissions are inconsistent with the policy intent of the Kāinga Ora primary submission.
- (c) In the case of Primary Submissions that are supported:
- (i) The Primary Submissions promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are consistent with the purpose and principles of the RMA and with section 32 of the RMA;
 - (ii) The reasons set out in the Primary Submissions; and
 - (iii) Allowing the relief sought in the Primary Submissions supported would more fully serve the statutory purpose than would disallowing that relief.
6. Without limiting the generality of the above, the specific relief in respect of each Primary Submission that is supported or opposed is set out in **Appendix A**.
7. Kāinga Ora wishes to be heard in support of its further submission.
8. If others make a similar submission, Kāinga Ora will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing.

DATED 12th of December 2022

Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities



Brendon Liggett

Manager – Development Planning

ADDRESS FOR SERVICE:

Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities

██████████
██████████████████
██████████████████████████████
██

Appendix A – Further Submission Table

Submitter Name	Original Submission Number	Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Provision/ Chapter Topic	Summary of Decision Requested	Kāinga Ora response (support or oppose)	Kāinga Ora reasons	Decision(s) sought (allow or disallow)
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	55.1	Oppose	Part B Definitions	Add the following definition to Part B Definitions: <u>'Community corrections activity' means the use of land and buildings for non-custodial services for safety, welfare and community purposes, including probation, rehabilitation and reintegration services, assessments, reporting, workshops and programmes, administration, and a meeting point for community works groups.</u>	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the inclusion of the National Planning Standards definition within the District Plan.	Allow submission
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	55.2	Oppose	Commercial Zone - 6.4.1.1	Amend the Activity Status Table in the Commercial Zone to enable "community corrections activities" to be undertaken as a permitted activity (in all three overlay areas): 6.4.1.1 Permitted activities The following activities must comply with the performance standards of this zone ... <u>(ab) Community corrections activities</u>	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the need to provide for such activities with the community.	Allow submission
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	55.5	Support	All	Retain as notified the PC26 'Residential Zone' Section, including the provisions relating to "residential activities" and "dwellings".	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the need to provide for such activities with the community.	Allow submission

Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	55.6	Support	All	Retain all provisions throughout the Operative District Plan and PC26 sections relating to “residential activities” and “dwellings”.	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the need to provide for such activities with the community.	Allow submission
CKL NZ Limited	65.6	Amend	Section 2A-2A.4.1.1(e)	Delete part Activity Status Table 2A.4.1.1 (e) (e) Accessory buildings to any permitted activity.	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the submission, provided that there are no unintended consequences from the relief sought, and that ‘accessory buildings’ as-envisaged cannot be defined as ‘dwellings’.	Allow submission.
CKL NZ Limited	65.13	Amend	Section 15 – 15.4.1.1 (o)	Amend rule as follows: Rule 15.4.1.1 (o) Subdivision to create three to six <u>or more</u> lots for infill housing between 350m ² to 500m ² in conjunction with a land use consent for the development Residential Zone – RD Medium Density Residential Zone <u>for four or more lots</u> –NA RD.	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the submission as it is consistent with the overall intent of its primary submission.	Allow submission.
CKL NZ Limited	65.15	Amend	Section 15 - 15.4.2.3	Amend rule as follows: Rules-Lot frontage, lot shape factor and vehicle crossings - 15.4.2.3 Medium density residential except front lots on entrance corridors – Lot frontage ≥10m, lot shape factor 13m diameter circle, Vehicle crossing – 3m -5.5m Medium density residential front lots on entrance corridors - Lot frontage ≥15m, lot shape factor 10m	Oppose	Kāinga Ora oppose the submission as it is inconsistent with the overall intent of its primary submission.	Disallow submission.

				<p>diameter circle, vehicle crossing – 3m-5.5m</p> <p>Residential except front lots on entrance corridors;</p> <p>- Lot frontage 210m, lot shape factor 13m</p> <p>diameter circle, vehicle crossing – 3m-5.5m</p> <p>Residential front lots on entrance corridors</p> <p>- Lot frontage 215m, lot shape factor 106m</p> <p>diameter circle, vehicle crossing – 3m -5.5m</p>			
CKL NZ Limited	65.19	Amend	Financial Contributions - 18.5.1.3(c) (iv)	<p>Amend Rule as follows:</p> <p>Rule 18.5.1.3(c)(v)...</p> <p>(iv) Where an existing network is not available and a development is within 250m of the nearest network, the cost of extending the network;</p> <p>...</p> <p>(d) Calculations for contributions shall be as set out in the performance standards.</p>	Oppose	Kāinga Ora oppose the submission as it is inconsistent with the overall intent of its primary submission.	Disallow submission.
Cogswell Surveys Limited	53.12	Oppose	Natural Hazards - Qualifying Matter	<p>Geotechnical suitability can be investigated and mitigate any adverse effects from Natural Hazards. Natural Hazards are also required to be addressed under s106 of the RMA, therefore it is considered that there is sufficient provision for investigating natural hazard risks without introducing an additional qualifying matter.</p> <p>Remove Natural Hazards from the list of qualifying matters.</p>	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the submission for the reasons provided by the submitter.	Allow submission.

Cogswell Surveys Limited	53.13	Oppose	Nationally Significant Infrastructure – Qualifying Matter	<p>Development next to a railway should not be considered a qualifying matter, as it can already be controlled through acoustic insulation under the Building Act, which is to a very high standard. If it is to remain a qualifying matter, is Kiwi Rail Written approval required or can the requirements for building next to a railway be explicitly outlined in the rule. An acoustic report offers little value.</p> <p>Development next to a railway should not be a qualifying matter. If it is to remain as a qualifying matter, is KiwiRail written approval required or can the requirements for building next to a railway be explicitly outlined in the rule.</p>	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the submission for the reasons provided by the submitter.	Allow submission.
Cogswell Surveys Limited	53.15	Oppose	Section 2A - 2A.4.2.4	Amend the Yard references in Rule 2A.4.2.4 to refer to Road and internal boundary setbacks.	Oppose	Kāinga Ora oppose this submission insofar as the terminology used within the proposed performance standards is consistent with that of Schedule 3A of the Enabling Housing Supply Act	Disallow submission
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	47.2	Support in Part	Section 2 – 2.3.2.4	<p>Amend Policy 2.3.2.4 as follows:</p> <p>Provided that there is no loss of privacy, sunlight or daylight on adjoining properties, and where sufficient area is maintained on site for outdoor living <u>and to provide for the health and safety of residents</u>, and the building does not <u>excessively and unduly</u> dominate outdoor living areas on adjoining sites.</p>	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the submission as such issues are managed through building act and there may be amenity related reasons for why a setback reduction is appropriate. The proposed changes also confuse the purpose of the standard in relation to adjoining and onsite amenity.	Disallow submission

Fire and Emergency New Zealand	47.4	Support in Part	Section 2A - 2A.2.4	Amend 2A.2.4 as follows: Developments and subdivisions can have adverse visual and functional effects on the amenity of the Medium Density Residential Zone. The amenity values of the Medium Density Residential Zone include: <u>(d) Neighbourhoods and sites that are accessible and provide for the health, safety and wellbeing of residents.</u>	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the submission as safety is already referenced in the objective.	Disallow submission.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	47.8	Support in Part	Section 2A- 2A.3.4.3	Amend 2A.3.4.3 as follows: Policies -Building setback: side boundaries 2A.3.4.3 To maintain a degree of separation between buildings when viewed from the road (except where perimeter block development is proposed), provide opportunities for planting where possible, provide a degree of privacy, maintain sunlight and daylight, provide ongoing access to the rear of the site and enable building maintenance <u>and emergency service access</u> from within the site by maintaining a consistent setback between buildings on different sites.	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the submission as it introduces an ambiguous information requirement – exactly what type of emergency access is required via the side boundary? The policy already requires access for maintenance which is sufficient to ensure ‘access’ in a residential context.	Disallow submission.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	47.9	Support in part	Section 2A – 2A.3.4.5	Amend 2A.3.4.5 as follows: To ensure that all sites have sufficient open space to provide for landscaping, outdoor activities, storage, on-site stormwater disposal, parking, and vehicle manoeuvring <u>and emergency service access</u> by maintaining a maximum site coverage requirement for buildings in the Medium Density Residential Zone.	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the submission as it introduces an ambiguous information requirement – exactly what type of emergency access is required via the side boundary? The policy already requires access for maintenance which is sufficient to ensure ‘access’ in a residential context.	Disallow submission.

Fire and Emergency New Zealand	47.11	Support in part	Section 2A – 2A.3.5.3	Amend 2A.3.5.3 as follows: To enable the construction of buildings up to and on rear and side site boundaries in circumstances where there is minimal loss of privacy, sunlight or daylight or noise effects on adjoining properties or such effects are mitigated, and where sufficient area is maintained on site for outdoor living <u>and emergency services access</u> , and the building does not unduly dominate outdoor living areas on adjoining sites	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the submission as it introduces an ambiguous information requirement – exactly what type of emergency access is required via the side boundary? The policy already requires access for maintenance which is sufficient to ensure ‘access’ in a residential context.	Disallow submission.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	47.19	Support in part	2A.4.2.4	Add advice note to Rule 2A.4.2.4: <u>Advice note: Building setback requirements are further controlled by the Building Code. Plan users should refer to the applicable controls within the Building Code to ensure compliance can be achieved at the building consent stage. Issuance of a resource consent does not imply that waivers of Building Code requirements will be considered/granted.</u>	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports the intent of the submission for the reasons provided by the submitter but questioned if it is necessary to be included in the District Plan.	Allow submission.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	47.21	Support in part	2A.4.2.10	Add advice note to 2A.4.2.10: <u>Advice note: Site layout requirements are further controlled by the Building Code. This includes the provision for firefighter access to buildings and egress from buildings. Plan users should refer to the applicable controls within the Building Code to ensure compliance can be achieved at the building consent stage. Issuance of a resource consent does not imply that waivers of Building Code requirements will be considered/granted.</u>	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports the intent of the submission for the reasons provided by the submitter but questioned if it is necessary to be included in the District Plan.	Allow submission.

Fire and Emergency New Zealand	47.27	Oppose	15.4.2.3	Amend Rule 15.4.2.3: Vehicle Crossing minimum: <u>3.5m</u>	Oppose	While Kāinga Ora acknowledges that emergency services are a core component of a well-functioning environment; Kāinga Ora questions whether the 3.5m width sought relates to the physical formed vehicle crossing itself or the overall width of an access (unobstructed)? Wider vehicle crossings may have a cumulative effect on the streetscape and reduce area available for housing which needs to be fully-assessed and justified by the submitter.	Disallow submission.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	47.35	Support in Part	Section 21 - 21.1.2A.8	Add new matter of discretion to 21.1.2A.8: <u>- The extent to which the non-compliance compromises the efficient movement of residents and emergency services and the provision for the health and safety of residents in meeting their day-to-day needs.</u>	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the submission as the proposed matter of discretion would be difficult for an applicant to address given the breadth of its requirement. It is not clear what level of information is required to therefore satisfy the matter.	Disallow submission.
Fonterra Limited	56.1	Support in Part	Section 2A - Planning map 56	Retain Planning Map 56 as notified with amendments sought in the submission. Specifically, retain the qualifying matters (stormwater constraint and infrastructure constraint) that apply to all of the land located immediately to the south of the Waikato Expressway (the area surrounding the Hautapu Dairy Manufacturing site and the rural farmland that is utilised by Hautapu Dairy Factory for spray irrigation purposes). Amendments are required to add an additional qualifying matter relating for the land surrounding the Hautapu Dairy Factory site and the land surrounding the rural farmland that is utilised for spray irrigation activities	Oppose	Kāinga Ora does not support expansive 'reverse sensitivity' type overlays that may place onerous constraints on residential intensification and development, and/or require mitigation for effects generated by other activities. Effects should be managed 'at source' as far as practicable. There are also existing provisions within the District Plan that require buildings to be appropriately insulated to meet specific noise levels.	Disallow submission.

				associated with wastewater from the Hautapu Dairy Factory. The identification of an additional qualifying matter in these specific locations is needed to limit intensification and allow potential reverse sensitivity effects to be taken into account.			
KiwiRail	54.1	Support	Nationally Significant Infrastructure – 2A.1.9(h) 2A.1.24	Supports the identification of rail as a qualifying matter. It is critical that PC26 provides for adequate management of the interface between urban development and lawfully established, critical infrastructure, such as the railway network. Retain 2A.1.9(h) and 2A.1.24 as notified.	Oppose	Kāinga Ora is opposed to provisions concerning reverse sensitivity, that require mitigation for effects generated by other activities (whether infrastructure or otherwise). Effects should be managed 'at source' as far as practicable, and consider that the noise and vibration provisions will appropriately mitigate any potential effects on future development on sites within proximity to the North Island Main Trunk Railway.	Disallow submission
KiwiRail	54.2	Support	Nationally Significant Infrastructure – 2A.2.7	Supports recognition of potential reverse sensitivity effects when noise sensitive activities locate close to existing activities such as railway lines. Retain 2A.2.7 as notified.	Oppose	Kāinga Ora is opposed to provisions concerning reverse sensitivity, that require mitigation for effects generated by other activities (whether infrastructure or otherwise). Effects should be managed 'at source' as far as practicable, and consider that the noise and vibration provisions will appropriately mitigate any potential effects on future development on sites within proximity to the North Island Main Trunk Railway.	Disallow submission
KiwiRail	54.3	Support	Nationally Significant Infrastructure – 2.3.2	Seeks the inclusion of a new policy into the zones adjoining the rail corridor to ensure the interface between urban development is appropriately managed. This is appropriate to ensure the setback rules give effects to the objectives and policies of the District Plan.	Oppose	Kāinga Ora is opposed to provisions concerning reverse sensitivity, that require mitigation for effects generated by other activities (whether infrastructure or otherwise). Effects should be managed 'at source' as far as practicable, and consider that the noise and vibration provisions will appropriately mitigate any potential effects	Disallow submission

				<p>Include a new policy in the Residential Zone in 2.3.2:</p> <p><u>Require activities adjacent to regionally significant network utilities to be setback a safe distance in order to ensure the ongoing safe and efficient operation of those utilities and the communities who live adjacent to them.</u></p>		on future development on sites within proximity to the North Island Main Trunk Railway.	
KiwiRail	54.4	Support	Nationally Significant Infrastructure – 2A.3.4	<p>Seeks the inclusion of a new policy into the zones adjoining the rail corridor to ensure the interface between urban development is appropriately managed. This is appropriate to ensure the setback rules give effects to the objectives and policies of the District Plan.</p> <p>Include a new policy in the Residential Zone in 2A.3.4:</p> <p><u>Require activities adjacent to regionally significant network utilities to be setback a safe distance in order to ensure the ongoing safe and efficient operation of those utilities and the communities who live adjacent to them.</u></p>	Oppose	Kāinga Ora is opposed to provisions concerning reverse sensitivity, that require mitigation for effects generated by other activities (whether infrastructure or otherwise). Effects should be managed 'at source' as far as practicable, and consider that the noise and vibration provisions will appropriately mitigate any potential effects on future development on sites within proximity to the North Island Main Trunk Railway.	Disallow submission
KiwiRail	54.5	Support	Nationally Significant Infrastructure – 2A.3.4.9	<p>Supports recognition of potential reverse sensitivity effects when noise sensitive activities locate close to existing activities such as railway lines.</p> <p>Retain 2A.3.4.9 as notified.</p>	Oppose	Kāinga Ora is opposed to provisions concerning reverse sensitivity, that require mitigation for effects generated by other activities (whether infrastructure or otherwise). Effects should be managed 'at source' as far as practicable, and consider that the noise and vibration provisions will appropriately mitigate any potential effects on future development on sites within proximity to the North Island Main Trunk Railway.	Disallow submission

KiwiRail	54.6	Support in Part	Nationally Significant Infrastructure– 2.4.2	<p>Seeks a new permitted activity rule requiring buildings and structures to be setback 5m from a boundary with a rail corridor to be added to the setback rules for the Residential Zone.</p> <p>Include a new rule in Rule 2.4.2: <u>Buildings and structures must be set back a minimum of 5 metres from the rail corridor.</u></p>	Oppose	Kāinga Ora is opposed to provisions concerning reverse sensitivity, that require mitigation for effects generated by other activities (whether infrastructure or otherwise). Effects should be managed 'at source' as far as practicable, and consider that the noise and vibration provisions will appropriately mitigate any potential effects on future development on sites within proximity to the North Island Main Trunk Railway.	Disallow submission
KiwiRail	54.7	Support in Part	Nationally Significant Infrastructure– 2.4.2	<p>Seeks a new matter of discretion be added to the Residential Zone for activities that do not comply with the new permitted activity rule requiring buildings and structures to be setback at least 5m from the rail corridor.</p> <p>Include a new matter for discretion in Rule 2.4.2 for activities that do not comply with a setback at least 5m from the rail corridor: <u>X. The location and design of the building as it relates to the ability to safely use, access and maintain buildings without requiring access on, above or over the rail corridor.</u></p>	Oppose	Kāinga Ora is opposed to provisions concerning reverse sensitivity, that require mitigation for effects generated by other activities (whether infrastructure or otherwise). Effects should be managed 'at source' as far as practicable, and consider that the noise and vibration provisions will appropriately mitigate any potential effects on future development on sites within proximity to the North Island Main Trunk Railway.	Disallow submission
KiwiRail	54.8	Amend	Nationally Significant Infrastructure– 2A.4.1. (a)(vii)	<p>Supports discretionary activity status for non-compliance with the performance standard for noise insulation and noise sensitive activities. Seeks that the provision be amended to also include reference to the vibration performance standard proposed in the submission.</p>	Oppose	Kāinga Ora is opposed to provisions concerning reverse sensitivity, that require mitigation for effects generated by other activities (whether infrastructure or otherwise). Effects should be managed 'at source' as far as practicable, and consider that the noise and vibration provisions will appropriately mitigate any potential effects on future development on sites within proximity to the North Island Main Trunk Railway.	Disallow submission

KiwiRail	54.9	Support in Part	Nationally Significant Infrastructure – 2A.4.2.6	<p>Seeks a new permitted activity rule requiring buildings and structures to be setback 5m from a boundary with a rail corridor be added to the setback rules for the Medium Density Residential Zone.</p> <p>Amend 2A.4.2.6 by adding a new rule: <u>(g) Buildings and structures must be set back a minimum of 5 metres from the rail corridor.</u></p>	Oppose	Kāinga Ora is opposed to provisions concerning reverse sensitivity, that require mitigation for effects generated by other activities (whether infrastructure or otherwise). Effects should be managed 'at source' as far as practicable, and consider that the noise and vibration provisions will appropriately mitigate any potential effects on future development on sites within proximity to the North Island Main Trunk Railway.	Disallow submission
KiwiRail	54.10	Amend	Nationally Significant Infrastructure– 2A.4.2.6	<p>Seeks the matters of discretion in the Medium Density Residential Zone rule 2A.4.2.6 be amended to provide for activities that do not comply with the new permitted activity rule requiring buildings</p> <p>Amend 2A.4.2.6 matters for discretion by as follows:</p> <p>- Effects on the safe and efficient operation of the state highway network <u>and railway corridor (including the ability to safely use, access and maintain buildings without requiring access on, above or over the rail corridor)</u>, where applicable; and</p> <p>...</p>	Oppose	Kāinga Ora is opposed to provisions concerning reverse sensitivity, that require mitigation for effects generated by other activities (whether infrastructure or otherwise). Effects should be managed 'at source' as far as practicable, and consider that the noise and vibration provisions will appropriately mitigate any potential effects on future development on sites within proximity to the North Island Main Trunk Railway.	Disallow submission
KiwiRail	54.11	Amend	Nationally Significant Infrastructure– 2.4.2.29	Seeks amendment to Rule 2.4.2.29 to ensure that the noise controls apply to 100m from the rail corridor and to include associated ventilation standards.	Oppose	Kāinga Ora is opposed to provisions concerning reverse sensitivity, that require mitigation for effects generated by other activities (whether infrastructure or otherwise). Effects should be	Disallow submission

						managed 'at source' as far as practicable, and consider that the noise and vibration provisions will appropriately mitigate any potential effects on future development on sites within proximity to the North Island Main Trunk Railway.	
KiwiRail	54.12	Amend	Nationally Significant Infrastructure – 2A.4.2.40	Seeks amendment to Rule 2A.4.2.40 to ensure that the noise controls apply to 100m from the rail corridor and to include associated ventilation standards.	Oppose	Kāinga Ora is opposed to provisions concerning reverse sensitivity, that require mitigation for effects generated by other activities (whether infrastructure or otherwise). Effects should be managed 'at source' as far as practicable, and consider that the noise and vibration provisions will appropriately mitigate any potential effects on future development on sites within proximity to the North Island Main Trunk Railway.	Disallow submission
KiwiRail KiwiRail	54.13	Amend	Nationally Significant Infrastructure – 2.4.2	KiwiRail seeks that vibration controls be included to apply to sensitive uses within 60m of the legal boundary of any railway boundary. Consistent with non-compliance with the noise insulation performance standard, KiwiRail seeks that non compliance with the proposed permitted activity rule be assessed as a discretionary activity.	Oppose	Kāinga Ora is opposed to provisions concerning reverse sensitivity, that require mitigation for effects generated by other activities (whether infrastructure or otherwise). Effects should be managed 'at source' as far as practicable, and consider that the noise and vibration provisions will appropriately mitigate any potential effects on future development on sites within proximity to the North Island Main Trunk Railway.	Disallow submission
KiwiRail	54.14	Amend	Nationally Significant Infrastructure – 2A.4.2	KiwiRail seeks that vibration controls be included to apply to sensitive uses within 60m of the legal boundary of any railway boundary. Consistent with non-compliance with the noise insulation performance standard, KiwiRail seeks that non compliance with the proposed permitted activity rule be assessed as a discretionary activity.	Oppose	Kāinga Ora is opposed to provisions concerning reverse sensitivity, that require mitigation for effects generated by other activities (whether infrastructure or otherwise). Effects should be managed 'at source' as far as practicable, and consider that the noise and vibration provisions will appropriately mitigate any potential effects	Disallow submission

						on future development on sites within proximity to the North Island Main Trunk Railway.	
KiwiRail	54.15	Support	Nationally Significant Infrastructure– 21.1.2A.8(b) and (h)	<p>KiwiRail supports (h) which refers to the extent of reverse sensitivity effects. KiwiRail seeks that (b) also be amended to refer to rail.</p> <p>Supports 21.1.2A.8(h) Setbacks and seeks that 21.1.2A.8(b) be amended to refer to rail:</p> <p>b) The extent to which the road boundary <u>and rail boundary</u> setback affects the safe and efficient operation of the road <u>and railway</u> network.</p>	Oppose	Kāinga Ora is opposed to provisions concerning reverse sensitivity, that require mitigation for effects generated by other activities (whether infrastructure or otherwise). Effects should be managed 'at source' as far as practicable, and consider that the noise and vibration provisions will appropriately mitigate any potential effects on future development on sites within proximity to the North Island Main Trunk Railway.	
Metlifecare Limited	72.3	Oppose	Section 2A	Seeks that provisions for the Medium Density Residential Zone recognise the need for retirement villages and that existing residential character and amenity will change over time	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the submission, to the extent it is consistent with its primary submission (while noting that Kāinga Ora is opposed to the compact housing activity in its primary submission).	Allow submission
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	73.8	Oppose	2A.4.1	<p>Retirement villages need to be provided for as a residential activity and enabled in the Residential Zone and MRZ. Retirement villages are required to be restricted discretionary activities under the MDRS as they require "the construction and use of 4 or more residential units on a site". The rules must be amended to ensure the restricted discretionary activity status only relates to the construction of retirement village buildings and not the retirement village activity.</p> <p>Provide for retirement villages in the MDRZ with a rule that permits the use and operation of retirement villages, recognising that this</p>			

				activity is expected and encouraged in residential zones; and a rule that regulates the construction of retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity, recognising that this activity is anticipated in residential zones with limited matters requiring assessment.			
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	73.14	Oppose	All	Seeks fit for purpose retirement planning provisions in appropriate commercial zones and seeks permitted activity status for retirement villages as an activity with construction of a retirement village regulated as a restricted discretionary activity with matters for discretion to reflect the unique characteristics of retirement villages. Also seeks retirement-village specific objectives and policies as for the residential zones.	Oppose	While Kāinga Ora supports the need to encourage housing for an ageing population, there is a risk that making retirement village activities a permitted activity allows for an unfettered intensity of development. As such Kāinga Ora considers that an RDA activity status remains appropriate.	Disallow submission.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	73.22	Oppose	1.3.3.1	Opposes Policy 1.3.3.1 that seeks to avoid any unplanned development that is inconsistent with the settlement pattern and directions of the Waikato Regional Policy Statement and the Future Proof Growth Strategy. The RPS has not yet been updated to give effect to the MDRS under the Enabling Housing Act and is potentially inconsistent with the intent of the MDRS. Further, it is not possible for applicants for subdivision and development to “be consistent with” the settlement pattern and directions of “any subsequent replacement” of the Future Proof Growth Strategy and the	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports in part the submission and seeks any reference to the Future Proof Growth Strategy is deleted. References to the RPS shall remain in place as the District Plan is required to give effect to the Regional Policy Statement. Kāinga Ora recognises the RPS should be updated as requested by the submitter.	Allow in part the submission.

				District Growth Strategy as these are not yet documents which have been produced.			
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	73.64	Oppose in Part	2A.3.4.1	<p>The policy does not recognise that the setbacks are a permitted standard, and Policy 5 MDRS requires developments not meeting permitted activity status to be provided for. Further, in order to reflect the concept in Policy 2A.3.2.4, it needs to recognise that only some qualifying matters will require the modifications to the setback MDRS.</p> <p>Delete policy 2A.3.4.1. If retained, amend Policy to identify the specific qualifying matters that require modification of the road boundary setback.</p>	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the submission as the policy is related to setbacks applied under the MDRS standards. Other policies address modification of MDRS by qualifying matters already.	Disallow submission
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	73.83	Support	Section 2A - 2A.3	<p>A policy is required that recognises the diverse and changing residential needs of communities, and that the existing character and amenity of the residential zones will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.</p> <p>Seeks that a new Policy is included in the Policies of the Medium Density Residential Zone section, as follows:</p> <p><u>2A.3.2.8 Changing communities To provide for the diverse and changing residential needs of communities, recognise that the existing character and amenity of the residential zones will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.</u></p>	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the submission, to the extent it is consistent with its primary submission.	Allow submission.

Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	73.84	Support	Section 2A - 2A.3.2	<p>A policy regarding the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites should be included in the District Plan.</p> <p>Seeks that a new Policy is included in the Policies of the Medium Density Residential Zone section that recognises the intensification opportunities provided for by larger sites:</p> <p><u>2A.3.2.9 Larger sites</u> <u>Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within all residential zones by providing for more efficient use of those sites.</u></p>	Oppose	Kainga Ora opposes the submission and proposal to include a new specific policy on larger sites. Intensification opportunities should be provided by all sites within the residential zones, regardless of size.	Disallow submission.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	73.85	Support	Section 2A- 2A.3.2	<p>It would be appropriate to enable the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments.</p> <p>Seeks that a new Policy is included in the Policies of the Medium Density Residential Zone section, as follows:</p> <p><u>2A.3.2.10 Role of density standards</u> <u>Enable the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments</u></p>	Oppose	The permitted baseline is codified in case law and the RMA. There is no need to include specific policies to that effect.	Disallow submission.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	73.93	Support in Part	2A.2.4.2 and 2A.4.2.3	<p>Supports Rules 2A.2.4.2 and 2A.4.2.3 but considers that additional exclusions should be integrated with this standard to enable larger scale developments to occur where adjacent to less sensitive zones, where the effects of larger buildings will be appropriate. The submitter also considers that the matters of</p>	Support in part	Kāinga Ora support the additional exclusion to the Height in Relation to Boundary performance standard; however, do not support the application of this specifically to retirement villages.	Allow in part.

				<p>discretion for a restricted discretionary activity under Rule 2A.4.2.3 are not appropriate for retirement villages. The submitter seeks that retirement village specific matters of discretion apply instead.</p> <p>Seeks to amend Rule 2A.4.2.3 as follows to include additional exclusions from this standard:</p> <p>Height in Relation to Boundary 2A.4.2.3 This standard does not apply to (a) a boundary with a road (b) existing or proposed internal boundaries within a site (c) site boundaries where there is an existing common wall between 2 buildings on adjacent sites or where a common wall is proposed <u>(d) boundaries adjoining the Commercial Zone, Industrial Zone or Deferred Zones.</u></p>		<p>Kāinga Ora oppose the use of separate matters of discretion associated with this performance standard, where relating to a retirement village.</p>	
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	73.94	Support in Part	2A.4.2.3	<p>Supports Rules 2A.2.4.2 and 2A.4.2.3 but considers that additional exclusions should be integrated with this standard to enable larger scale developments to occur where adjacent to less sensitive zones, where the effects of larger buildings will be appropriate. The submitter also considers that the matters of discretion for a restricted discretionary activity under Rule 2A.4.2.3 are not appropriate for retirement villages. The submitter seeks that retirement village specific matters of discretion apply instead.</p>	Oppose	<p>Kāinga Ora considers the matters of discretion appropriate as they manage development within the zone. Providing for reduced assessment and discretion for larger buildings and intensive activities such as retirement villages may compromise the amenity of surrounding residential sites.</p>	Disallow submission.

				Seeks to amend Rule 2A.4.2.3 Height in Relation to Boundary to exclude retirement villages from these matters of discretion so the retirement village specific matters of discretion apply to the construction of a retirement village building that exceeds this standard (as per the amendment requested by the submitter to Rule 2A.4.1.3(e) in another point of submission).			
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	73.96	Support in Part	2A.4.2.4 - 2A.4.2.6	Considers that the matters of discretion for a restricted discretionary activity under Rule 2A.4.2.6 are not appropriate for retirement villages. The submitter seeks that retirement village specific matters of discretion apply instead.	Oppose	Kāinga Ora considers the matters of discretion appropriate as they manage development within the zone. Providing for reduced assessment and discretion for larger buildings and intensive activities such as retirement villages may compromise the amenity of surrounding residential sites.	Disallow submission.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	73.101	Oppose in Part	2A.4.2.10 and 2A.4.2.11	<p>Considers that as a result of retirement villages providing a range of private and communal outdoor areas, amendments should be made to Rules 2A.4.2.10 and 2A.4.2.11 that enable the communal areas to count towards the amenity standard. The submitter also considers that the matters of discretion for a restricted discretionary activity under Rule 2A.4.2.11 are not appropriate for retirement villages.</p> <p>Amend Rule 2A.4.2.11 to exclude retirement villages from these matters of discretion so the retirement village specific matters of discretion apply to the construction of a retirement village building that exceeds this standard (as per the</p>	Oppose	Kāinga Ora considers the matters of discretion appropriate as they manage development within the zone. Providing for reduced assessment and discretion for larger buildings and intensive activities such as retirement villages may compromise the amenity of surrounding residential sites.	Disallow submission.

				amendment requested by the submitter to Rule 2A.4.1.3(e) in another point of submission).			
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	73.102	Oppose in Part	2A.4.2.12 - 2A.4.2.20	<p>The submitter considers that in a retirement village environment (that has multiple communal spaces available for residents), the Outlook space standard is not directly relevant. The submitter considers amendments should be made to the outlook space rules to provide for outlook space requirements that are appropriate for retirement villages.</p> <p>The RVA also seeks to amend this rule to exclude retirement villages from these matters of discretion so the retirement village specific matters of discretion apply to the construction of a retirement village building that exceeds this standard (as per Rule 2A.4.1.3(e) above).</p>	Oppose	Kāinga Ora considers the use of the MDRS standards as included in Schedule 3A of the Housing Supply Act are appropriate for all residential activities within the relevant residential areas. Kāinga Ora does not support tailoring these provisions for various residential activities.	Disallow submission.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	73.103	Oppose in Part	2A.4.2.20	<p>The matters for discretion for a restricted discretionary activity under Rule 2A.4.2.20 are not appropriate for retirement villages. The submitter seeks that retirement specific matters of discretion apply instead as requested by the submitter in the submission to Rule 2A.4.1.3(e) in another point of submission.</p> <p>Amend Rule 2A.4.2.20 to exclude retirement villages from these matters of discretion so the retirement village specific matters of discretion apply to the construction of a retirement village building that exceeds this standard (as per the</p>	Oppose	Kāinga Ora considers the matters of discretion appropriate as they manage development within the zone. Providing for reduced assessment and discretion for larger buildings and intensive activities such as retirement villages may compromise the amenity of surrounding residential sites.	Disallow submission.

				amendment requested by the submitter to Rule 2A.4.1.3(e) in another point of submission).			
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	73.105	Oppose in Part	2A.4.2.21	<p>The matters for discretion for a restricted discretionary activity under Rule 2A.4.2.21 are not appropriate for retirement villages. The submitter seeks that retirement specific matters of discretion apply instead as requested by the submitter in the submission to Rule 2A.4.1.3(e) in another point of submission.</p> <p>Amend Rule 2A.4.2.21 to exclude retirement villages from these matters of discretion so the retirement village specific matters of discretion apply to the construction of a retirement village building that exceeds this standard (as per the amendment requested by the submitter to Rule 2A.4.1.3(e) in another point of submission).</p>	Oppose	Kāinga Ora considers the matters of discretion appropriate as they manage development within the zone. Providing for reduced assessment and discretion for larger buildings and intensive activities such as retirement villages may compromise the amenity of surrounding residential sites.	Disallow submission.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	73.108	Oppose in Part	2A.4.2.24	<p>The matters for discretion for a restricted discretionary activity under Rule 2A.4.2.24 are not appropriate for retirement villages. The submitter seeks that retirement specific matters of discretion apply instead as requested by the submitter in the submission to Rule 2A.4.1.3(e) in another point of submission.</p> <p>Amend Rule 2A.4.2.24 to exclude retirement villages from these matters of discretion so the retirement village specific matters of discretion apply to the construction of a retirement village</p>	Oppose	Kāinga Ora considers the matters of discretion appropriate as they manage development within the zone. Providing for reduced assessment and discretion for larger buildings and intensive activities such as retirement villages may compromise the amenity of surrounding residential sites.	Disallow submission.

				building that exceeds this standard (as per the amendment requested by the submitter to Rule 2A.4.1.3(e) in another point of submission).			
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	73.110	Oppose in Part	2.5	<p>The submitter considers that the assessment criteria for a restricted discretionary activity under Rule 2.5.1 are not appropriate for retirement villages. The submitter considers that the retirement village specific matters of discretion are sufficient, and no assessment criteria are necessary.</p> <p>Seeks to amend Rule 2.5.1 to exclude retirement villages from these assessment criteria so the retirement village specific matters of discretion apply to the construction of a retirement village building that exceeds this standard (as per the amendment requested by the submitter to Rule 2A.4.1.3(e) in another point of submission).</p>	Oppose	Kāinga Ora considers the matters of discretion appropriate as they manage development within the zone. Providing for reduced assessment and discretion for larger buildings and intensive activities such as retirement villages may compromise the amenity of surrounding residential sites.	Disallow submission.
The New Zealand Transport Agency Waka Kotahi	63.3	Support in part	2A.4.2.6(a))	Under Rule 2A.4.2.6(a), a 7.5m setback from the boundaries of state highways is required under PC26. This differs to the MDRS provisions which requires a 1.5 front yard setback. It is advised within the Assessment of Existing Qualifying Matters (Appendix 2) that a 7.5m setback may impact on building density. However, no justification has been provided regarding how the setback will ensure the safe and efficient operation of nationally significant infrastructure. Waka Kotahi consider that	Oppose	Kāinga Ora is opposed to provisions concerning reverse sensitivity, that require mitigation for effects generated by other activities (whether infrastructure or otherwise). Effects should be managed 'at source' as far as practicable. There are also existing provisions that require buildings to be appropriately insulated to meet specific noise levels. In that context a 7.5m setback should be fully justified, or reduced to provide a more-enabling approach to development (particularly in a residential context).	Disallow

				further justification is required in relation to this.			
The New Zealand Transport Agency Waka Kotahi	63.5	Support in Part	Various	<p>There are existing provisions that require buildings to be appropriately insulated to meet specific noise levels. There are also specific provisions that address access onto the state highway and Integrated Transport Assessments. Further justification is required to relation to the state highway network being a qualifying matter.</p> <p>Provide further justification for the state highway being identified as a qualifying matter.</p>	Oppose	Kāinga Ora is opposed to provisions concerning reverse sensitivity, that require mitigation for effects generated by other activities (whether infrastructure or otherwise). Effects should be managed 'at source' as far as practicable. There are also existing provisions that require buildings to be appropriately insulated to meet specific noise levels.	Disallow
The New Zealand Transport Agency Waka Kotahi	63.7	Support	2A.4.2.40 - 2A.4.2.41	<p>Supports the inclusion of noise insulation provisions within the MDRS. This will ensure that undue restrictions are not placed on the operation of the state highway network and the health and wellbeing of nearby residents is protected.</p> <p>Retain Rules-Noise Insulation: noise sensitive activities (2A.4.2.40 - 2A.4.2.41) as notified.</p>	Oppose	Kāinga Ora is opposed to provisions concerning reverse sensitivity, that require mitigation for effects generated by other activities (whether infrastructure or otherwise). Effects should be managed 'at source' as far as practicable. There are also existing provisions that require buildings to be appropriately insulated to meet specific noise levels.	Disallow
The New Zealand Transport Agency Waka Kotahi	63.11	Support	2A.3.4.9	<p>Waka Kotahi supports policy 2A.3.4.9 as it ensures that noise sensitivity adjacent strategic roads will be acoustically treated. This will ensure the function and operation of the transport network is not compromised by adverse effects, including reverse sensitivity effects.</p>	Oppose	Kāinga Ora is opposed to provisions concerning reverse sensitivity, that require mitigation for effects generated by other activities (whether infrastructure or otherwise). Effects should be managed 'at source' as far as practicable. There are also existing provisions that require buildings to be appropriately insulated to meet specific noise levels.	Disallow

The New Zealand Transport Agency Waka Kotahi	63.14	Amend	Definitions	<p>It is noted that the term "transport network" is referred to within the PC26 amendments but is not defined. Waka Kotahi considers that the term requires defining for plan user interpretation.</p> <p>Add a new definition to Part B: Definitions as follows:</p> <p><u>'Transport Network'</u> <u>Means all public rail, public roads, public pedestrian and cycling facilities, public transport, and associated public infrastructure.</u> <u>It includes:</u> <u>train stations; bus stops; bus shelters; and park and ride areas serving train stations.</u></p>	Oppose	The proposed definition may conflict with existing plan provisions and should be fully-investigated and tested in the context of the overall plan.	Disallow submission
The New Zealand Transport Agency Waka Kotahi	63.15	Support in Part	Infrastructure - Objective 16.3.1	<p>Amend Objective 16.3.1 as follows:</p> <p>All new development, subdivision and transport infrastructure shall be designed and developed to contribute to a sustainable, safe, integrated, efficient (including energy efficient network design), <u>accessible</u> and affordable multi-modal land transport system.</p>	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the submission, to the extent it is consistent with its primary submission.	Allow submission.
The New Zealand Transport Agency Waka Kotahi	63.17	Support in Part	Infrastructure - Rule 16.4.2.22	<p>Amend 16.4.2.22 as follows:</p> <p>Assessment will be restricted to the following matters:</p> <p>...</p> <p>- Provision for multi-modal transport options <u>and identification of initiatives for reducing Vehicle Kilometres Travelled (Broad ITA only);</u> and</p>	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the submission as this is an onerous requirement. Reduction of VKT should be a byproduct of other strategies within the plan (i.e. promoting multi-modal transport, public transport).	Disallow submission.

Transpower New Zealand Limited	38.5	Amend	2.3.7.5	Retain Policy 2.3.7.5 without amendment, or amend as follows: 2.3.7.5 To not <u>compromise</u> exclude foreclose operation or maintenance options or, to the extent practicable , the carrying out of routine and planned upgrade works.	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the submission as it is consistent with NPSET (Policy 10).	Allow submission.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	38.12	Amend	Nationally Significant Infrastructure– 2A.1.27	Amend 2A.1.27 as follows: Several National Grid transmission lines traverse the Waipā District. The subdivision, use and development of land is controlled <u>managed</u> within a defined National Grid Corridor ... where there is the greatest potential for adverse effects to occur <u>and for the National Grid to be compromised</u> . The restrictions recognise ...	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the submission as it is consistent with NPSET.	Allow submission.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	38.14	Amend	Nationally Significant Infrastructure– 2A.3.2	Amend Objective 2A.3.2 as follows: A relevant residential z- <u>The Medium Density Residential Zone</u> provides for a variety of housing types and sizes ...	Oppose	While Kāinga Ora appreciate the intent of the change, the use of 'relevant residential zone' is specifically defined in the Housing Enabling Act and should remain referenced as-notified.	Disallow submission.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	38.17	Amend	Nationally Significant Infrastructure– 2A.3.2.3	Amend Policy 2A.3.2.3, as follows, and subject to amendments being made to Policy 2A.3.2.4: To apply the Medium Density Residential Standards across <u>all relevant residential zones in the district plan the Medium Density Residential Zone</u> , except...	Oppose	While Kāinga Ora appreciate the intent of the change, the use of 'relevant residential zone' is specifically defined in the Housing Enabling Act and should remain referenced as-notified.	Disallow submission.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	38.25	Amend	Nationally Significant Infrastructure– 2A.3.9.5	Amend Policy 2A.3.9.5 as follows: To not compromise exclude operation or maintenance options or, to the extent practicable , the carrying out of routine and planned upgrade works.	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the submission as it is consistent with NPSET (Policy 10).	Allow submission.

Transpower New Zealand Limited	38.34	Amend	15.4.1.1(e)	If Rule 15.4.1.1(e) is amended so that that subdivision in the Medium Density Residential Zone is a controlled activity, include a new rule, or amend clause (e), so that subdivision within the National Grid Corridor is a restricted discretionary activity, with matters of discretion including "effects on the National Grid electricity transmission network".	Oppose	Kāinga Ora considers that a separate activity is not required, and additional matters of control can be added to require that any subdivision demonstrate the ability to accommodate a dwelling clear of the national grid yard/overlay at the least. Should that not be achievable then a higher activity status would be appropriate.	Disallow submission.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	38.35	Amend	15.4.1.1(l)	Include a new rule, or amend clause (l) in 15.4.1.1, so that subdivision within the National Grid Corridor is a restricted discretionary activity, with matters of discretion including "effects on the National Grid electricity transmission network."	Oppose	Kāinga Ora considers that a separate activity is not required, and additional matters of control can be added to require that any subdivision demonstrate the ability to accommodate a dwelling clear of the national grid yard/overlay at the least. Should that not be achievable then a higher activity status would be appropriate.	Disallow submission.
Waikato Community Lands Trust, etc. (64)	64.1	Amend	Inclusionary Zoning	Seek that PC26 be amended to provide for inclusionary zoning.	Oppose	While Kāinga Ora does not disagree with the benefits that inclusionary zoning may bring to residential development, at this stime it may not be consistent with the intent of the Enabling Housing Supply Amendment Act.	Disallow submission.
Waikato Community Lands Trust, etc. (64)	64.2	Amend	Inclusionary Zoning	Integrate the Queenstown Lakes District Council (QLDC) model plan provisions attached to the submission into PC26, subject to amending the QLDC model plan provisions to address comments contained in section 16 of the submission.	Oppose	While Kāinga Ora does not disagree with the benefits that inclusionary zoning may bring to residential development, at this stime it may not be consistent with the intent of the Enabling Housing Supply Amendment Act.	Disallow submission.
Waikato Regional Council	30.15	Support in Part	Climate change - 1.1.25	Add reference in 1.1.25 to investment decisions to transform to a low carbon transport system, and that support urban form that facilitates the transition.	Oppose	Kāinga Ora questions whether 'investment decisions' is a relevant RMA matter.	Disallow submission

Waikato Regional Council	30.20	Support in Part	2A.3.8 and associated policies	Add objectives, policies and rules that will enable more, or expansion of existing commercial and mixed uses where intensification will be occurring. Also, delete references to providing on-site parking.	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the submission to the extent it is consistent with its primary submission.	Allow the submission.
Waikato Regional Council	30.23	Oppose	Section 16 - Transportation	Add new or amend objectives, policies, rules and standards in Section 16 Transportation to address climate change and carbon emission reduction goals in the context of housing intensification.	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the intent of the submissions, to the extent it aligns with the relief sought in its primary submission and a review or the specific changes proposed to Section 16 Transportation.	Allow submission.
Waipa District Council	32.1	Amend	Medium Density Residential Standards – Schedule 3A	Such further amendments to PC26 that are necessary to accurately and effectively incorporate the requirements of Schedule 3A of the Act.	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the submission, to the extent it is consistent with the relief sought in its primary submission.	Allow submission
Waipa District Council	32.4	Amend	Significant Natural Areas – 2A.1.9	Amend 2A.1.9 (e) by deleting the words 'and significant natural areas' and insert a new sub-clause in 2A.1.9: <u>'Where it is necessary to protect significant natural areas and public open spaces that provide significant habitats of indigenous fauna and include areas of significant indigenous vegetation'</u> .	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the submission, to the extent it is consistent with the relief sought in its primary submission.	Allow submission
Waipa District Council	32.5	Amend	Significant Natural Areas –2A.1	Add to 2A.1: <u>"Qualifying Matter – Protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna. Section 24 of the District Plan includes objectives, policies and methods for the protection of indigenous vegetation and</u>	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the submission, to the extent it is consistent with the relief sought in its primary submission.	Allow submission

				<p><u>significant habitats of indigenous fauna, and such protection is a matter of national importance under s 6(c) of the Act. The objective to maintain and enhance the existing level of biodiversity within the District is given effect to by methods that include the identification of significant natural areas (SNA). Reserves Zones are also used, in some cases, for the purpose of protecting and preserving indigenous flora and fauna, the intrinsic worth, and for scientific study and ecological associations. The MDRS have been modified to the extent necessary to accommodate the protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna."</u></p>			
Waipa District Council	32.6	Amend	Significant Natural Areas - 2A.3	<p>Add a new objective and policy relating to the outcomes to be achieved by setbacks from the boundary of significant natural areas and reserve zones as follows, or alternative wording to achieve the same or similar meaning: <u>Objective – Significant Natural Areas. To ensure that buildings and activities at the interface of residential zones with significant natural areas do not adversely affect the ecological values of those areas. Policy Adverse effects of adjoining development on significant natural areas will be managed through requiring the setback of buildings from the boundary.</u></p>	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the submission, to the extent it is consistent with the relief sought in its primary submission.	Allow submission

Waipa District Council	32.7	Amend	Significant Natural Areas - 2A.4.2.6	<p>(1) Add additional matters for discretion to Rule 2A.4.2.6 to address the effects of buildings within 20m of a significant natural area, by adding the following wording or alternative wording to achieve the same or similar meaning:</p> <p>Activities that fail to comply with Rules 2A.4.2.4 to 2A.4.2.6 will require a resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity with the discretion being restricted over:</p> <p>... <u>Effects on ecological values, vegetation, biodiversity, soil, stormwater runoff and groundwater levels within a significant natural area, where applicable; and Effects of artificial lighting on native species within a significant natural area, where applicable; and Effects on the existing health and function of a significant natural area's vegetation and biodiversity.</u></p> <p>And (2) Make consequential amendments to the related assessment criteria in Section 21.</p>	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the submission, to the extent it is consistent with the relief sought in its primary submission.	Allow submission
Waipa District Council	32.8	Amend	River/Gully Proximity – 2A.4.2.23	<p>(1) Insert an additional rule under the heading “Rules – Landscaped area” as a new Rule 2A.4.2.25 (with consequential renumbering of rules that follow) for sites within the River / Gully Proximity Qualifying Matter Overlay to require an increased provision of landscaped area, together with a requirement for that landscaping to be native species, as follows:</p> <p><u>“Within the River / Gully Proximity Qualifying Matter Overlay, a residential dwelling at ground floor level must have a landscaped area of a minimum of 30% of a developed site</u></p>	Oppose	<p>While Kāinga Ora is not fundamentally opposed to increased landscaping within the River/Gully QM overlay, this needs to be fully-justified under ss77J and 77L of the</p> <p>Housing Supply Act in terms of impacts on housing supply and whether there are other methods that may achieve a similar outcome in relation to water quality and river health.</p>	Disallow submission.

				<p><u>with native plants, and can include the canopy of trees regardless of the ground treatment below them.”</u></p> <p>And (2) Include an objective, policies and a rule that directs planting in the River / Gully Proximity Qualifying Matter Overlay area to largely incorporate native species that support the ecological integrity and function in these environments.</p>			
Waikato Tainui	49.4	Amend	Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato - 2.3 Objectives and Policies	<p>Plan Change 26 requires further recognition of Te Ture Whaimana in relation to developments in all residential zones. Including this new objective and policy into Section 2.3 will better implement Te Ture Whaimana and ensure it is achieved through new residential developments.</p> <p>And any consequential amendments or alternative relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.</p>	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports in part the proposed amendments, to the extent they reflect the relevant associated rules/standards and relief sought in its primary submission.	Allow in part the submission.
Waikato Tainui	49.7	Amend	Section 21 – 2A.4.1; 2A.4.1.3	<p>Waikato-Tainui consider that the increase in overall development across Cambridge, Te Awamutu, and Kihikihi will be significant which will have an adverse impact on the whenua and awa, therefore it may potentially have an impact on achieving the objectives of Te Ture Whaimana. This relief ensures that consented activities in Cambridge, Te Awamutu, and Kihikihi implement and give effect to the JMA, Te Ture Whaimana and engaging mana whenua, it is important that any proposals include in the AEE any recommendations by</p>	Oppose	<p>While Kāinga Ora supports engagement with mana whenua, as required by legislation, Kāinga Ora does not consider the relief and new standard is required in the District Plan.</p> <p>Kāinga Ora notes that the rules 2A.4.1.1(b) or (c) are permitted activities and as such would not be subject to an application/AEE.</p>	Disallow submission

				<p>mana whenua. The scale of development across the district will likely have an impact on mana whenua values. Further provision is required to ensure the development within the district does not affect the Councils ability to provide for the health and wellbeing of the awa and to provide for betterment.</p> <p>Tai Tumu, Tai Pari, Tai Ao outlines a clear consultation and engagement process that is under-utilised by applicants/developers.</p> <p>And any consequential amendments or alternative relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.</p>			
Waikato Tainui	49.8		<p>Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato - 2A.4.1</p>	<p>Waikato-Tainui consider that the increase in overall development across Cambridge, Te Awamutu, and Kihikihi will be significant which will have an adverse impact on the whenua and awa, therefore it may potentially have an impact on achieving the objectives of Te Ture Whaimana. This relief ensures that consented activities in Cambridge, Te Awamutu, and Kihikihi implement and give effect to the JMA, Te Ture Whaimana and engaging mana whenua, it is important that any proposals include in the AEE any recommendations by mana whenua. The scale of development across the district will likely have an impact on mana whenua values. Further provision is required to ensure the development within the district does not affect the Councils ability to provide for the health and wellbeing of the awa and to provide for betterment.</p>	Oppose	<p>While Kāinga Ora supports engagement with mana whenua as required by legislation, Kāinga Ora does not consider the relief and new standard is required in the District Plan.</p>	Disallow submission

				<p>Tai Tumu, Tai Pari, Tai Ao outlines a clear consultation and engagement process that is under-utilised by applicants/developers.</p> <p>Add a new appendix to outline an updated engagement strategy mechanisms that Waipā Council will implement to provide for the engagement sought in submission 49.7.</p> <p>And any consequential amendments or alternative relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.</p>			
Waikato-Tainui	49.9	Amend	Section 21 – Assessment Criteria and Information Requirements -2A.4.2	<p>This relief better reflects the standing and status of iwi plans. This relief makes it clear that in the context of implementing these rules, that the iwi plans are a matter for consideration, both in regards to the effects of a proposal and in regards to Section 104(1)(a) and 104(1)(c) of the RMA.</p>	Oppose	<p>While Kāinga Ora supports engagement with mana whenua as required by legislation, Kāinga Ora does not consider the relief and new standard is required in the District Plan. Kāinga Ora notes that the rules sighted are permitted activities and as such would not be subject to an AEE.</p>	Disallow submission