

Response to Submissions (excluding Financial Contribution and Inclusionary Zoning submissions)

Plan Change 26: Residential Intensification

By Topic

March 2023

Table of Contents

Submitters Details	3
Exclusions	4
1 Policy 3(d) (see s42a report – Topic 1).....	4
1.1 High Density Residential Zone (see s42a report - Topic 1.2 pgs 27-30).....	4
1.2 Commercial Zone (see s42a report – Topic 1.3 pgs 30-32 and Topic 4.5 pgs 110-111)	10
1.3 Compat Housing Overlay (see s42a report – Topic 1.4 pgs 32 to 34).....	12
2 Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS) (see s42a report Topic 2)	14
2.1 General Opposition (see s42a report – Topic 2.1 pgs 35 to 36).....	14
2.2 General Support (see s42a report – Topic 2.2 pg 36).....	17
2.3 Spatial Extent (see s42a report – Topic 2.3 pg 37).....	19
2.4 Chapter 2A (see s42a report – Topic 2.4 pgs 37 to 39).....	21
2.5 Chapter 15 (see s42a report - Topic 2.5 pgs 43 to 45)	73
3 Qualifying Matters (see s42a report Topic 3).....	78
3.1 Nationally Significant Infrastructure (see s42a report National Grid (pgs 48 to 51) State Highways (pgs 51 to 54) and Rail Corridor (pgs 54 to 55)	79
3.2 Te Ture Whaimana/Infrastructure Overlay (see s42a report pgs 66 to 72)	85
3.3 Stormwater overlay/natural hazards (see s42a report pgs 61 to 63 and pgs 72 to 77)	95
3.4 Historic heritage/character clusters (see 42a report pgs 58 to 60 and pgs 86 to 99).....	97
3.5 SNAs/Reserves (see s42a report pgs 81 to 86).....	113
3.6 River/Gully Proximity Overlay (see s42a report pgs 77 to 81)	114
4 Specific Changes.....	116
4.1 Strategic Policy Framework/Whole Plan Change (see s42a report - Topic 4.1 pgs 105 to 106).....	116
4.2 Climate Change (see s42a report - Topic 4.2 pgs 106 to 107)	120
4.3 Papakainga And Marae (see 42a report - Topic 4.3 pgs 107 to 108).....	120
4.4 Retirement Villages (see 42a report - Topic 4.4 pgs 108 to 110)	122
4.5 Industrial Zone – (Corrections Facilities) (see s42a report Topic 4.5 - pgs 110 to 111)	144
4.6 Section 21 (see 42a report - Topic 4.6 pgs 111 to 113).....	144
4.7 Planning Maps (see s42a report - Topic 4.7 pgs 113 to 114)	148
4.8 Residential Zone (see s42a report - Topic 4.8 pgs 114 to 115).....	149
4.9 Definitions (see s42a report - Topic 4.9 pgs 115 to 118).....	154
4.10 Design Guidance (see s42a report - Topic 4.10 pgs 118 to 119).....	156
4.11 Formatting (see s42a report - Topic 4.14 pgs 121 to 122)	157
4.12 Other (see s42a report - Topic 4.11 pgs 119 to 120)	158
5 Rezoning	159
5.1 Rezoning – Deferred residential zones to 'live' MDRZ (see s42a report - Topic 5.1 pgs 122 to 123).....	159

Submitters Details

Submission No.	Further Sub. No.	Submitter Name
01		Home, Steve
02		Hazlewood, Susan
03		Van Der Merwe, Angelique
04		Burchell, Ramon
05		Burchell, Graham
06		Morris, Jennifer
07		Cumming, Joanne
08		Riggs, Lorraine
09		Woods, Hayden
10		Aberhart, Neil
11		Hall, Denise
12		Swarbrick, Richard Henry
13		Marshall, Josh
14		Douglas, Andrea
15		O'Brien, Anna
16		Hislop, Michelle
17		Martin, Peter
18		Martin, Eunice
19		Millen, Ricky
20		West, Peter
21		Oehley, John
22		Dandy, Michael Robert
23		Hosford, Michelle
24		Suter, Jewell Charmaine
25		Cowan, Francis James
26		Uden, Jason
27		Campion, Graham A and Juliet
28		Ruis, Elaine
29		White, Denis Anthony Wilson
30	FS1	Waikato Regional Council - Contact: Hannah Craven
31		Haysom, Hayley
32		Waipā District Council - Contact: Wayne Allan
33		Lawrence, Marcia and Irene
34		(INVALID)
35		Frost, Angela
36		Carr, Robert
37		Henwood, Margaret Jean
38		Transpower New Zealand Limited - Contact: Pauline Whitney
39		Young, Jeffrey
40		Young, Marilyn

Submission No.	Further Sub. No.	Submitter Name
41		Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Contact: Carolyn McAlley
42		Porter, Seaton Ross and Lynne
43		Rushworth, Christina
44		Vossen, Andrew
45		Pearson, Kellie
46		Wilkinson, Alan
47		Fire and Emergency New Zealand - Contact: Alec Duncan
48		Summerset Group Holdings Limited - Contact: Stephanie Muller
49		Waikato Tainui - Contact: Alana Mako
50		TA Projects Limited - Contact: Craig Shearer
51		MacGillivray, James Alexander and Jennifer Anne
52		Murdoch, Patricia Mary
53		Cogswell Surveys Limited - Contact: Rebecca Steenstra
54	FS3	KiwiRail - Contact: Michelle Grinlinton-Hancock
55		Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections - Contact: Andrea Millar
56	FS2	Fonterra Limited - Contact: Suzanne O'Rourke
57		Overdevest, Paul & Belinda
58		Hall, Sally
59		Triple 3 Farm Limited - Contact: David & Barbara Yzendoorn
60		Barnes, Paul Charles Ian
61		Honiss, Kevin
62		Bannon, Kim
63	FS4	Waka Kotahi - The New Zealand Transport Agency - Contact: Claudia Jones
64		Waikato Community Lands Trust - Thomas Gibbons and Waikato Housing Initiative – Gill Henderson and Momentum Waikato – Kelvyn Eglinton and Habitats for Humanity Central Region Limited – Nic Greene and Bridge Housing Charitable Trust – Jen Palmer CKL NZ Limited - Contact: Tracey Morse
65		Jago, Dion
66		Jay El Limited - Contact: Hamish Ross
67		Rider, Tony
68		Steen, Grant
69		Ryman Healthcare Limited - Contact: Luke Hinchey
70	FS6	Archer, Teri Ellen
71		Metlifecare Limited - Contact: Bianca Tree
72		Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated - Contact: Luke Hinchey
73	FS5	Pratt-Tickelpenny, Nicola Fleur
74		Te Awamutu Community Board - Contact: Ange Holt
75		Shears, Sam
76		Andrew, John
77		Horner, Edmund Bruce
78		Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities - Contact: Brendon Liggett
79	FS8	

Exclusions

It is noted that the submissions relating to Financial Contributions and Inclusionary Zoning are not included in this summary of responses as they will be addressed at a later hearing.

1 Policy 3(d) (see s42a report – Topic 1)

1.1 High Density Residential Zone (see s42a report - Topic 1.2 pgs 27-30)

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
53.2	Support in Part	High Density Residential Zone	All	There is no pathway for high density development and there are areas within the District which are suitable for development above the medium density standards and could be identified on the planning maps.	An easy way to identify areas for high density development could be consider all those properties which are within the Compact Housing Overlay to be high density, or those properties bordering a reserve or commercial centre.		That the point of submission is rejected PC26 intended to remove this overlay completely as it is not required alongside the MDRS in terms of the outcomes that would be achieved. I also note that the Compact Housing Overlay has been around for some time and pre-dates the NPS-UD and therefore has limited relevance in terms of PC26.
63.3	Oppose	High Density Residential Zone	All	The s32 report does not adequately assess whether there are opportunities to increase building heights and densities within adjacent neighbourhood centre zones, local centre zones, and town centre zones (or equivalent). Further assessment is required, supported by an accessibility study of walkable catchments surrounding neighbourhood centre zones, local centre zones and town centre zones. The catchment should be measured along pedestrian infrastructure rather than "as the crow flies".	Undertake further assessment to determine whether there are opportunities within the Te Awamutu and Cambridge townships to provide for higher densities and increased building heights. This should include an accessibility study to assess/determine the extent of the walkable catchments. If supported by the accessibility assessment, seeks that PC26 incorporates high-density residential zones within the walkable catchments surrounding the neighbourhood centre zones, local centre zones and town centres zones (or equivalent).	FS8 – oppose should be 63.4	That the point of submission is rejected Agree further analysis would be appropriate in the case of intensification as the appropriateness of any spatial extent of provision for intensification differs by both urban context and typology to better differentiate the centres of Cambridge and Te Awamutu.
79.3	Amend	High Density Residential Zone	All	Seeks that a High-Density Residential Zone ("HDRZ") should also be incorporated into the District Plan (via PC26) and applied within a 400m walkable catchment of both the Cambridge and Te Awamutu town centres. Both of these town centres are locations where there is a high demand for housing and more people want to live in, and more businesses and community services want to be located in, relative to the Waipā district and the Waikato region. The HDRZ will enable up to 6 storeys for residential intensification in the Waipā district and will give effect to Policy 3(d) of the NPS-UD, in providing for building heights and densities of urban form commensurate with the level of commercial activity and community services in these centres.	Seeks that a High-Density Residential Zone ("HDRZ") that will enable up to 6 storeys be incorporated into the District Plan (via PC26) and applied within a 400m walkable catchment of both the Cambridge and Te Awamutu town centres.		That the point of submission is rejected The walkable catchment (as shown in Kāinga Ora' submission) is too extensive. Further analysis would be appropriate in the case of intensification as the appropriateness of any spatial extent of provision for intensification differs by both urban context and typology.
79.7	Amend	High Density Residential Zone	All	Seeks a new High Density Residential zone and associated District Plan provisions be introduced as included in Appendix 2 to the submission and to the spatial extent outlined in Appendix 3 to the submission.	Seeks a new High Density Residential zone and associated District Plan provisions be introduced as included in Appendix 2 to the submission and to the spatial extent outlined in Appendix 3 to the submission.		That the point of submission is rejected The walkable catchment (as shown in Kāinga Ora' submission) is too extensive. Further analysis would be appropriate in the case of intensification as the appropriateness of any spatial extent of provision for intensification differs by both urban context and typology.
79.41	Support in part	High Density Residential Zone	Volume 3 - Planning Maps; Section 2 - Residential	Seeks that a new High Density Residential Zone ("HDRZ") is introduced within a 400-800m walkable catchment of the town centres of Cambridge and Te Awamutu. The HDRZ will enable up to 6 storeys for residential intensification in the Waipā district and will give effect to Policy 3(d) of the NPS-UD. Locating higher density residential development in proximity to town centres is a consistent approach sought by Kāinga Ora nationally and is	Accept and include a new High Density Residential Zone in the District Plan and adopt the proposed provisions of the new High Density Residential Zone as set out in Appendix 2 into the District Plan and PC26 (refer Appendix 2 to the submission). Consequential amendments will be required	FS5 support FS6 support	That the point of submission is rejected The walkable catchment (as shown in Kāinga Ora' submission) is too extensive. Further analysis would be appropriate in the case of intensification as the appropriateness of any spatial extent of provision for intensification differs by both urban context and typology.

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
			l; and various	consistent with the NPS-UD. Both of these town centres are locations where there is a high demand for housing.	to the rest of the District Plan in giving effect to the relief sought and submission points.		Height variation control over the Cambridge and Te Awamutu town centres to enable a proportionate height of buildings to that sought within a HDRZ is not considered further on the basis that it is not appropriate to apply it in the Waipā district context.
79.42	Support in part	High Density Residential Zone	Volume 3 - Planning Maps; Section 2 - Residential l; and various	Seeks that a new High Density Residential Zone ("HDRZ") is introduced within a 400-800m walkable catchment of the town centres of Cambridge and Te Awamutu. The HDRZ will enable up to 6 storeys for residential intensification in the Waipā district and will give effect to Policy 3(d) of the NPS-UD. Locating higher density residential development in proximity to town centres is a consistent approach sought by Kāinga Ora nationally and is consistent with the NPS-UD. Both of these town centres are locations where there is a high demand for housing.	Rezoning parts of Cambridge to 'high density residential zone' typically within a 400-800m walkable catchment of the town centre as per the proposed area set out in Appendix 3 of the submission. Consequential amendments will be required to the rest of the District Plan in giving effect to the relief sought and submission points.		That the point of submission is rejected The request to apply a height variation control over the Cambridge and Te Awamutu town centres to enable a proportionate height of buildings to that sought within a HDRZ is not considered further on the basis that it is not appropriate to apply it in the Waipā district context.
79.43	Support in part	High Density Residential Zone	Volume 3 - Planning Maps and Section 2 - Residential l	Seeks that a new High Density Residential Zone ("HDRZ") is introduced within a 400-800m walkable catchment of the town centres of Cambridge and Te Awamutu. The HDRZ will enable up to 6 storeys for residential intensification in the Waipā district and will give effect to Policy 3(d) of the NPS-UD. Locating higher density residential development in proximity to town centres is a consistent approach sought by Kāinga Ora nationally and is consistent with the NPS-UD. Both of these town centres are locations where there is a high demand for housing.	Rezoning parts of Te Awamutu to 'high density residential zone' typically within a 400m - 800m walking catchment of the town centre as per the proposed area set out in Appendix 3 of this submission. Consequential amendments will be required to the rest of the District Plan in giving effect to the relief sought and submission points.		That the point of submission is rejected The walkable catchment (as shown in Kāinga Ora' submission) is too extensive. Further analysis would be appropriate in the case of intensification as the appropriateness of any spatial extent of provision for intensification differs by both urban context and typology. A High-Density Residential Zone adjacent to the town centres of Cambridge and Te Awamutu is not appropriate on the basis it represents a building height which would not be commensurate with the level of commercial activity and community services that exist in these centres. Height variation control over the Cambridge and Te Awamutu town centres to enable a proportionate height of buildings to that sought within a HDRZ is not considered further on the basis that it is not appropriate to apply it in the Waipā district context.
79.69	Support in part	High Density Residential Zone	All	Seeks a high density residential zone should be incorporated into the District Plan and applied within a 400m walkable catchment of both Cambridge and Te Awamutu town centres of up to 6 storeys to give effect to Policy 3(d) of the NPS-UD.	Incorporate a High Density Residential Zone within the District Plan as shown in Appendix 2 to the submission.		That the point of submission is rejected A High-Density Residential Zone adjacent to the town centres of Cambridge and Te Awamutu is not appropriate on the basis it represents a building height which would not be commensurate with the level of commercial activity and community services that exist in these centres. Height variation control over the Cambridge and Te Awamutu town centres to enable a proportionate height of buildings to that sought within a HDRZ is not considered further on the basis that it is not appropriate to apply it in the Waipā district context.
79.70	Support in part	High Density Residential Zone	All	Seeks a high density residential zone should be incorporated into the District Plan and applied within a 400m walkable catchment of both Cambridge and Te Awamutu town centres of up to 6 storeys to give effect to Policy 3(d) of the NPS-UD.	Provide for High Density Residential Zone within a 400m walkable catchment of the town centres of Cambridge as shown in Appendix 3 to the submission.		That the point of submission is rejected The walkable catchment (as shown in Kāinga Ora' submission) is too extensive. Further analysis would be appropriate in the case of intensification as the appropriateness of any spatial extent of provision for intensification differs by both urban context and typology. A High-Density Residential Zone adjacent to the town centres of Cambridge and Te Awamutu is not appropriate on the basis it represents a building height which would not be commensurate with the level of commercial activity and community services that exist in these centres.

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
79.71	Support in part	High Density Residential Zone	All	Seeks a high density residential zone should be incorporated into the District Plan and applied within a 400m walkable catchment of both Cambridge and Te Awamutu town centres of up to 6 storeys to give effect to Policy 3(d) of the NPS-UD.	Provide for High Density Residential Zone within a 400m walkable catchment of the town centres of Te Awamutu as shown in Appendix 3 to the submission.		That the point of submission is rejected The walkable catchment (as shown in Kāinga Ora' submission) is too extensive. Further analysis would be appropriate in the case of intensification as the appropriateness of any spatial extent of provision for intensification differs by both urban context and typology. A High-Density Residential Zone adjacent to the town centres of Cambridge and Te Awamutu is not appropriate on the basis it represents a building height which would not be commensurate with the level of commercial activity and community services that exist in these centres.
79.100	Support in part	High Density Residential Zone	All	Seeks the introduction of a HDRZ to be included in the District Plan and applied within a 400m - 800m walkable catchment of the Cambridge Town Centre.	Incorporate a High Density Residential Zone within the District Plan. Proposed provisions shown in Appendix 2 to the submission.		That the point of submission is rejected A High-Density Residential Zone adjacent to the town centres of Cambridge and Te Awamutu is not appropriate on the basis it represents a building height which would not be commensurate with the level of commercial activity and community services that exist in these centres.
79.101	Support in part	High Density Residential Zone	All	Seeks the introduction of a HDRZ to be included in the District Plan and applied within a 400m - 800m walkable catchment of the Cambridge Town Centre.	Provide for High Density Residential Zone within a 400m - 800m walkable catchment of the town centre of Cambridge, as shown in Appendix 3 to the submission.		That the point of submission is rejected The walkable catchment (as shown in Kāinga Ora' submission) is too extensive. Further analysis would be appropriate in the case of intensification as the appropriateness of any spatial extent of provision for intensification differs by both urban context and typology. A High-Density Residential Zone adjacent to the town centres of Cambridge and Te Awamutu is not appropriate on the basis it represents a building height which would not be commensurate with the level of commercial activity and community services that exist in these centres.
79.102	Support in part	High Density Residential Zone	All	Seeks the introduction of a HDRZ to be included in the District Plan and applied within a 400m walkable catchment of the Te Awamutu Town Centre.	Provide for High Density Residential Zone within a 400m walkable catchment of the town centre of Te Awamutu as shown in Appendix 3 to the submission.		That the point of submission is rejected The walkable catchment (as shown in Kāinga Ora' submission) is too extensive. Further analysis would be appropriate in the case of intensification as the appropriateness of any spatial extent of provision for intensification differs by both urban context and typology. A High-Density Residential Zone adjacent to the town centres of Cambridge and Te Awamutu is not appropriate on the basis it represents a building height which would not be commensurate with the level of commercial activity and community services that exist in these centres.
79.257	Amend	High Density Residential Zone	All	Seeks that a new High Density Residential Zone ("HDRZ") is introduced in the District Plan and applied within a 400-800m walkable catchment of the town centres of Cambridge and Te Awamutu.	Accept and include a new High Density Residential Zone in the District Plan.		That the point of submission is rejected The walkable catchment (as shown in Kāinga Ora' submission) is too extensive. Further analysis would be appropriate in the case of intensification as the appropriateness of any spatial extent of provision for intensification differs by both urban context and typology. A High-Density Residential Zone adjacent to the town centres of Cambridge and Te Awamutu is not appropriate on the basis it represents a building height which would not be commensurate with the level of commercial activity and community services that exist in these centres

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
79.258	Amend	High Density Residential Zone	All	Seeks that a new High Density Residential Zone ("HDRZ") is introduced in the District Plan and applied within a 400-800m walkable catchment of the town centres of Cambridge and Te Awamutu. Locating a higher density residential development in proximity to town centres is consistent with the NPS-UD.	Adopt the proposed provisions of the new High Density Residential Zone as set out in Appendix 2 of the submission into the District Plan and PC26.		That the point of submission is rejected The walkable catchment (as shown in Kāinga Ora' submission) is too extensive. Further analysis would be appropriate in the case of intensification as the appropriateness of any spatial extent of provision for intensification differs by both urban context and typology. A High-Density Residential Zone adjacent to the town centres of Cambridge and Te Awamutu is not appropriate on the basis it represents a building height which would not be commensurate with the level of commercial activity and community services that exist in these centres
79.259	Amend	High Density Residential Zone	All	Seeks that a new High Density Residential Zone ("HDRZ") is introduced in the District Plan and applied within a 400-800m walkable catchment of the town centres of Cambridge and Te Awamutu. Locating higher density residential development in proximity to town centres is a consistent approach sought by Kāinga Ora nationally and is consistent with the NPS-UD. Both of these town centres are locations where there is a high demand for housing and more people want to live in, and more businesses and community services want to be located in, relative to the Waipā district and the Waikato region. The HDRZ will enable up to 6 storeys for residential intensification in the Waipā district and will give effect to Policy 3(d) of the NPS-UD, in providing for building heights and densities of urban form commensurate with the level of commercial activity and community services in these centres.	Rezone parts of Cambridge to 'high density residential zone' typically within a 400-800m walkable catchment of the town centre as per the proposed area set out in Appendix 3 attached to the submission.		That the point of submission is rejected The walkable catchment (as shown in Kāinga Ora' submission) is too extensive. Further analysis would be appropriate in the case of intensification as the appropriateness of any spatial extent of provision for intensification differs by both urban context and typology. A High-Density Residential Zone adjacent to the town centres of Cambridge and Te Awamutu is not appropriate on the basis it represents a building height which would not be commensurate with the level of commercial activity and community services that exist in these centres
79.260	Amend	High Density Residential Zone	All	Seeks that a new High Density Residential Zone ("HDRZ") is introduced in the District Plan and applied within a 400-800m walkable catchment of the town centres of Cambridge and Te Awamutu. Locating higher density residential development in proximity to town centres is a consistent approach sought by Kāinga Ora nationally and is consistent with the NPS-UD. Both of these town centres are locations where there is a high demand for housing and more people want to live in, and more businesses and community services want to be located in, relative to the Waipā district and the Waikato region. The HDRZ will enable up to 6 storeys for residential intensification in the Waipā district and will give effect to Policy 3(d) of the NPS-UD, in providing for building heights and densities of urban form commensurate with the level of commercial activity and community services in these centres.	Rezone parts of Te Awamutu to 'high density residential zone' typically within a 400m walking catchment of the town centre as per the proposed area set out in Appendix 3 attached to the submission.		That the point of submission is rejected The walkable catchment (as shown in Kāinga Ora' submission) is too extensive. Further analysis would be appropriate in the case of intensification as the appropriateness of any spatial extent of provision for intensification differs by both urban context and typology. A High-Density Residential Zone adjacent to the town centres of Cambridge and Te Awamutu is not appropriate on the basis it represents a building height which would not be commensurate with the level of commercial activity and community services that exist in these centres
79.261	Amend	High Density Residential Zone	All	Seeks that a new High Density Residential Zone ("HDRZ") is introduced in the District Plan and applied within a 400-800m walkable catchment of the town centres of Cambridge and Te Awamutu.	Consequential amendments will be required to the rest of the District Plan in giving effect to the relief sought and submission points.		That the point of submission is rejected The walkable catchment (as shown in Kāinga Ora' submission) is too extensive. Further analysis would be appropriate in the case of intensification as the appropriateness of any spatial extent of provision for intensification differs by both urban context and typology. A High-Density Residential Zone adjacent to the town centres of Cambridge and Te Awamutu is not appropriate on the basis it represents a building height which would not be commensurate with the level of commercial activity and community services that exist in these centres

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
79.262	Amend	High Density Residential Zone	Section 15	Seeks that the High Density Residential Zone is included within the subdivision provisions in line with relief sought within this submission. The subdivision provisions of the Medium Density Residential Zone are considered appropriate to address subdivision within the High Density Residential Zone also.	Include reference to the High Density Residential Zone within the subdivision provisions associated with the Medium Density Residential Zone.		That the point of submission is rejected A High-Density Residential Zone adjacent to the town centres of Cambridge and Te Awamutu is not appropriate on the basis it represents a building height which would not be commensurate with the level of commercial activity and community services that exist in these centres
79.267	Support in Part	High Density Residential Zone	15.4.1.1(e)	Kāinga Ora questions whether the identification of the activity as a restricted discretionary activity is an error, and matters of control are listed and there are as notified, no controlled activities under (b) to (e) inclusive, within the subdivision activity table. Kāinga Ora seeks that the activity is 'controlled', consistent with Clause 7 of Schedule 3A of the Housing Supply Act, by providing for subdivision applications as a controlled activity within the MDRZ and new HDRZ.	Include High Density Residential Zone as part of the rules and in the subdivision chapter provisions.		That the point of submission is rejected A High-Density Residential Zone adjacent to the town centres of Cambridge and Te Awamutu is not appropriate on the basis it represents a building height which would not be commensurate with the level of commercial activity and community services that exist in these centres
79.278	Support	High Density Residential Zone	15.4.2.1A	Amendments sought to include reference to the new proposed HDRZ.	Amend Rule 15.4.2.1A to include High Density Residential Zone as part of the rules and in the subdivision chapter provisions. Rule – Medium Density Residential Zone and High Density Residential Zone subdivision around existing or proposed dwellings 15.4.2.1 A Subdivision within the Medium Density Residential Zone and High Density Residential Zone is not required to comply with the lot area rules in Rule 15.4.2.1 or the lot frontage or lot shape factor rules in Rule 15.4.2.3 provided that: (a) Subdivision around an existing dwelling (including a dwelling for which land use consent has been granted but not yet implemented) must not result in any new non-compliance or increase the degree of any existing non-compliance with the performance standards in Section 2A – Medium Density Residential Zone or Section 2B – High Density Residential Zone. There must be no vacant lots created as part of the subdivision. b) Subdivision around a proposed dwelling must be accompanied by a land use application that is to be determined concurrently with the subdivision application and which demonstrates that it is practicable to construct a dwelling on every allotment within the proposed subdivision as a permitted activity, and each dwelling complies with the performance standards in Section 2A – Medium Density Residential Zone or Section 2B – High Density Residential Zone. There must be no vacant lots created as part of the subdivision.		That the point of submission is rejected A High-Density Residential Zone ('HDRZ') requested by Kāinga Ora (Submitter 79) adjacent to the town centres of Cambridge and Te Awamutu is not appropriate on the basis it represents a building height which would not be commensurate with the level of commercial activity and community services that exist in these centres.

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
79.283	Support in Part	High Density Residential Zone	15.4.2.3	Support the use of lot shape factors to ensure that new lots are of a shape and size that can accommodate a permitted level of development within the MDRZ, to the extent they are consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission, and on the basis that they do not apply to concurrent land use and subdivision applications as prescribed in Clause 8 of Schedule 3A of the Housing Supply Act. However, Kāinga Ora consider that a shape factor of 8m by 15m is more appropriate for the zone. Kāinga Ora considers that a minimum lot frontage requirement is unnecessary given the shape factor sought above. In addition, the MDRS provides for smaller typologies with smaller frontages and the NPS-UD removes the requirement for carparking, which also removes the requirement to include additional frontage for vehicle access. Amendments sought and to ensure that vacant lot subdivision requirements better-align with the higher-density development that is proposed to be enabled under PC26.	Amend 15.4.2.3 Rules-Lot frontage, lot shape and vehicle crossings to the extent the amendments are consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission and on the basis that they do not apply to concurrent land use and subdivision applications as prescribed in Clause 8 of Schedule 3A of the Housing Supply Act, as follows: 15.4.2.3 Except as provided for in Rule 15.4.2.1A, all vacant lots shall comply with the following: <u>Zone – High Density Residential Zone</u> Lot frontage (excluding rear lots) -20 m Lot shape factor - <u>8m x 15m</u> Vehicle Crossing minimum to maximum - <u>3m to 5.5m.</u>		That the point of submission is rejected High-Density Residential Zone requested by Kāinga Ora (Submitter 79) adjacent to the town centres of Cambridge and Te Awamutu is not appropriate on the basis it represents a building height which would not be commensurate with the level of commercial activity and community services that exist in these centres. The demand for this typology is currently very limited within the district as a smaller urban economy. The updated Market Economics report indicates that there is limited demand for this higher density typology within the context of the local market and the proposed provisions are likely to be too extensive relative to the market size.
79.284	Support in Part	High Density Residential Zone	15.4.2.3	Support the use of lot shape factors to ensure that new lots are of a shape and size that can accommodate a permitted level of development within the MDRZ, to the extent they are consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission, and on the basis that they do not apply to concurrent land use and subdivision applications as prescribed in Clause 8 of Schedule 3A of the Housing Supply Act. However, Kāinga Ora consider that a shape factor of 8m by 15m is more appropriate for the zone. Kāinga Ora considers that a minimum lot frontage requirement is unnecessary given the shape factor sought above. In addition, the MDRS provides for smaller typologies with smaller frontages and the NPS-UD removes the requirement for carparking, which also removes the requirement to include additional frontage for vehicle access. Amendments sought and to ensure that vacant lot subdivision requirements better-align with the higher-density development that is proposed to be enabled under PC26.	Insert shape factor requirements for High Density Residential Zone in the subdivision chapter.		That the point of submission is rejected Submissions requesting changes to the subdivision matters of control, minimum lot size, lot shape, lot frontage and minimum net lot area are not supported as PC26 has not changed the subdivision provisions except in specific circumstances where the MDRS have required it
79.287	Support in Part	High Density Residential Zone	15.4.2.18	Supports the amendment and associated rule. Kāinga Ora however considered that alternative means may be considered where appropriate. Such as the use of stormwater detention/retention, reuse of grey water. Amendments sought to include reference to the new proposed HDRZ.	Amend Rule 15.4.2.18 to include High Density Residential Zone as part of the rules and in the subdivision chapter provisions. 15.4.2.18 All lots in a subdivision and any sites in a development in the Residential, Medium Density Residential, <u>High Density Residential</u> , Commercial and Industrial Zones within the urban limits shall be connected to the following Council infrastructure services: ...		That the point of submission is rejected High-Density Residential Zone requested by Kāinga Ora (Submitter 79) adjacent to the town centres of Cambridge and Te Awamutu is not appropriate on the basis it represents a building height which would not be commensurate with the level of commercial activity and community services that exist in these centres. The demand for this typology is currently very limited within the district as a smaller urban economy. The updated Market Economics report indicates that there is limited demand for this higher density typology within the context of the local market and the proposed provisions are likely to be too extensive relative to the market size.

1.2 Commercial Zone (see s42a report – Topic 1.3 pgs 30-32 and Topic 4.5 pgs 110-111)

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
55.2	Oppose	Section 6 – Commercial Zone	Commercial Zone - 6.4.1.1	Amend rules for Commercial Zone to enable 'community corrections activities' as a permitted activity. Intensification and population growth in urban areas create more demand for these facilities. Specifically with the higher population, the proportion of people needing these facilities will increase. It is important that provision is made to enable non-custodial community corrections sites to establish, operate and redevelop, within appropriate areas.	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 ... (ab) <u>Community corrections activities</u>	FS8 - support	That the point of submission is rejected This request is not supported on the basis that the Commercial Zone is primarily intended to provide for retail, office and commercial service needs of the centre, along with residential in the mixed-use context (above ground-level). There is a question as to how this request would practically work, in the context of the Commercial Zone framework. The Waipa Plan is yet to be aligned with the National Planning Standards
70.111	Support	Section 6 – Commercial Zone	6.3	The Enabling Housing Act is not limited to residential zones and councils required to ensure district plans provide for intensification in urban non-residential zones. Amendments to the Commercial Zone are therefore required to comply with s77N RMA. The submitter considers policy support for retirement villages in the Commercial Zone is required (as also set out in other points of submission made by the submitter).	Seeks that the following policies are incorporated into Section 6 – Commercial Zone: <u>Provision of housing for an ageing population</u> <u>1. Provide for a diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the particular needs and characteristics of older persons in [add] zone, such as retirement villages.</u> <u>2. Recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, including that they:</u> <u>a. May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services.</u> <u>b. Have unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.</u> Delete or amend other Commercial Zone objectives and policies for consistency. <u>Larger sites</u> <u>Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within the Medium Density Residential Zone by providing for more efficient use of those sites.</u> <u>Density standards</u> <u>Enable the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments.</u>		That the point of submission is rejected While the Enabling Housing Act is not limited to changes to the residential zone, the commercial zone is not appropriate for comprehensive developments including retirement villages due to its existing scale and activities. PC26 provides for comprehensive development of sites, listing retirement villages specifically, as a restricted discretionary activity within the MDRZ which adjoins the commercial zone. This is considered appropriate considering their potential scale and intensity.
73.111	Support	Section 6 – Commercial Zone	6.3	The Enabling Housing Act is not limited to residential zones and councils required to ensure district plans provide for intensification in urban non-residential zones. Amendments to the Commercial Zone are therefore required to comply with s77N RMA. The submitter considers policy support for retirement villages in the Commercial Zone is required (as also set out in other points of submission made by the submitter).	Seeks that the following policies are incorporated into Section 6 – Commercial Zone: <u>Provision of housing for an ageing population</u> <u>1. Provide for a diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the particular needs and characteristics of older persons in [add] zone, such as retirement villages.</u> <u>2. Recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, including that they:</u> <u>a. May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services.</u> <u>b. Have unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.</u> Delete or amend other Commercial Zone objectives and policies for consistency.		That the point of submission is rejected While the Enabling Housing Act is not limited to changes to the residential zone, the commercial zone is not appropriate for comprehensive developments including retirement villages due to its existing scale and activities. PC26 provides for comprehensive development of sites, listing retirement villages specifically, as a restricted discretionary activity within the MDRZ which adjoins the commercial zone. This is considered appropriate considering their potential scale and intensity.

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
					<p><u>Larger sites</u> <u>Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within the Medium Density Residential Zone by providing for more efficient use of those sites.</u></p> <p><u>Density standards</u> <u>Enable the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments.</u></p>		
79.21	Amend	Section 6 – Commercial Zone	Section 6	Amendments are sought to apply a height variation control over the Te Awamutu and Cambridge Town centres to enable a proportionate height of buildings to that sought within the HDRZ, including consequential amendments to the Town Centre Zone provisions as-required to give effect to the relief sought in the Kāinga Ora submission. The proposed height variation control (or overlay) is included in Appendix 3.	Amendments are sought to apply a height variation control over the Te Awamutu and Cambridge Town centres to enable a proportionate height of buildings to that sought within the High Density Residential Zone requested by the submitter (in other points of submission), including consequential amendments to the Town Centre Zone provisions as-required to give effect to the relief sought in the Kāinga Ora submission. The proposed height variation control (or overlay) is included in Appendix 3 of the submission.	FS5 – support FS6 - support	That the point of submission is rejected Further assessment of Policy 3(d) has concluded that as part of PC26 no further changes are recommended to the Commercial Zone to increase height
79.45	Support in part	Section 6 – Commercial Zone	Section 6- Commercial; Volume 3- Planning Maps	Amendments are sought to apply a height variation control over the Te Awamutu and Cambridge Town centres to enable a proportionate height of buildings to that sought within the HDRZ, including consequential amendments to the Town Centre Zone provisions as required to give effect to the relief sought in the Kāinga Ora submission.	Apply a height variation control over the Cambridge Town centre (Commercial Zone) to enable a proportionate height of buildings (24.50m) to that sought within the HDRZ, including consequential amendments to the Commercial Zone provisions as required to give effect to the relief sought in the Kāinga Ora submission. The proposed Height control (or overlay) is included in Appendix 3 to the submission.		That the point of submission is rejected Further assessment of Policy 3(d) has concluded that as part of PC26 no further changes are recommended to the Commercial Zone to increase height
79.46	Support in part	Section 6 – Commercial Zone	Section 6- Commercial; Volume 3- Planning Maps	Amendments are sought to apply a height variation control over the Te Awamutu and Cambridge Town centres to enable a proportionate height of buildings to that sought within the HDRZ, including consequential amendments to the Town Centre Zone provisions as required to give effect to the relief sought in the Kāinga Ora submission.	Apply a height variation control over the Te Awamutu Town centre (Commercial Zone) to enable a proportionate height of buildings (24.50m) to that sought within the HDRZ, including consequential amendments to the Commercial Zone provisions as required to give effect to the relief sought in the Kāinga Ora submission. The proposed Height control (or overlay) is included in Appendix 3 to the submission.		That the point of submission is rejected Further assessment of Policy 3(d) has concluded that as part of PC26 no further changes are recommended to the Commercial Zone to increase height
79.73	Support in part	Section 6 – Commercial Zone	All	A high density residential zone should be incorporated into the District Plan and applied within a 400m walkable catchment of both Cambridge and Te Awamutu town centres of up to 6 storeys to give effect to Policy 3(d) of the NPS-UD.	Make amendments to Town Centre maximum building heights consequential to introducing a High Density Residential Zone as required to ensure a proportionate built form within the Te Awamutu and Cambridge centres.		That the point of submission is rejected Further assessment of Policy 3(d) has concluded that as part of PC26 no further changes are recommended to the Commercial Zone to increase height
79.103	Support in part	Section 6 – Commercial Zone	Section 6; Planning Maps	Seeks the introduction of a HDRZ to be included in the District Plan and applied within a 400m - 800m walkable catchment of the Cambridge Town Centre.	Consequential amendments to Town Centre maximum building heights required to ensure a proportionate built form within the Cambridge centre. Proposed heights are identified in Appendix 3 to the submission and identify a 'Business Height Variation Overlay' of 24.5m.		That the point of submission is rejected Further assessment of Policy 3(d) has concluded that as part of PC26 no further changes are recommended to the Commercial Zone to increase height

1.3 Compat Housing Overlay (see s42a report – Topic 1.4 pgs 32 to 34)

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submission	Response
47.24	Support	Compact Housing	2A.4.2.54	Supports the requirement to provide at least 3.5m separation from other buildings on the site where there is more than one building on a site. This will assist in providing space for emergency service personnel to operate around a building in a fire or other emergency.	Retain 2A.4.2.54 as notified.		The point of submission is rejected Retention of 2A.4.2.54 not supported. Recommended to be deleted as part of the Compact Housing provisions were retained in error and are recommended to be deleted.
53.14	Oppose	Compact Housing	2A.4.2.54	The current compact housing rules require a minimum lot area of 2000m ² and a minimum of 7 dwellings. This is now consistent with medium density development. Compact housing should allow 70% site coverage. Need to be amended in favour of rules that support a higher density, such as providing for apartment buildings. Council need to consider the areas where a higher density is appropriate and a higher percentage of site coverage and up to 4 stories should be encouraged in areas close to the town centres or reserve areas. Compact housing is missing from the activity status table. Rubbish trucks will generally not access private developments unless the road is vested. Rule 2A.4.2.54(j) does not have value unless the road is vested in Council.	The current compact housing areas become High Density Zones that permit a higher level of site coverage. Suggested rule amendment: Rule - Compact housing 2A.4.2.54 Compact housing made up of seven or more dwellings within the compact housing area overlay shall have a minimum area of 2,000m ² and shall meet the following requirements: (a) ... (b) Where there is more than one building on a site, it shall be separated from other buildings on the site by at least 3.5m; and (c) ... (j) A place for refuse and recycling material that is accessible to a two-axled truck shall be provided; and (k) Dwellings that are parallel to, or adjoin the road boundary of the site shall have a front door that faces the road. (l) That a minimum 30-degree roof pitch is provided; (m) A maximum of four stories, and 16m in height.		That the point of submission is rejected Part of the Compact Housing provisions were retained in error and are recommended to be deleted.
68.6	Amend	Compact Housing	2A.4.1	There does not appear to be an obvious pathway for higher density residential development in the MDRZ. Compact housing is not identified in 2A.4.1.1 Activity Status Table as a specific listed activity nor is it listed in the 'catch-all' Discretionary Activity Rule 2A.4.1.4. While there is a footnote for Rule 2A.4.2.54 stating that activities that fail to comply with this rule will require resource consent for a discretionary activity it would be helpful if this was also included in the activity status table.	There does not appear to be an obvious pathway for higher density residential development in the MDRZ. It would be helpful if Compact Housing was also included in the activity status table.		That the point of submission is rejected Part of the Compact Housing provisions were retained in error and are recommended to be deleted.
68.7	Amend	Compact Housing	2A.4.2.54	The compact housing performance standards are more aligned with the medium density residential standards than high density outcomes. The compact housing overlay should provide for higher density outcomes than currently provided for. Provided robust urban design criteria can be met then this policy overlay should enable higher density outcomes.	Amend Rule 2A.4.2.54 Compact Housing performance standards to enable: •Add increased height limit of 15 metres to enable 4-5 storey apartment buildings within compact housing overlay areas; •Add increased building coverage of up to 70% of the net site area; •Remove 2,000m ² minimum area threshold; and •Any other modifications to accommodate higher density outcomes following a comprehensively designed master planning process and urban design input. It is intended that we will provide further evidence on this as part of the hearing.		That the point of submission is rejected Part of the Compact Housing provisions were retained in error and are recommended to be deleted.
79.6	Oppose	Compact Housing	Section 2A	Seeks the deletion of the 'Compact Housing Overlay'. Kāinga Ora opposes the compact housing overlay and its associated land use activity and provisions. The overlay and provisions are particularly onerous and less enabling than the MDRS and would therefore be considered a Qualifying Matter under s77(j). It is also considered that the s32 analysis has not assessed the Compact Housing Overlay appropriately as required by the Enabling Act to consider the costs/benefits that the overlay would have on restricting higher density development	Seeks the deletion of the 'Compact Housing Overlay'.		Amendment supported Part of the Compact Housing provisions were retained in error and are recommended to be deleted.

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submission	Response
79.27	Oppose	Compact Housing	Various	The compact housing overlay and provisions are particularly onerous and less enabling than the MDRS and would therefore be considered a Qualifying Matter. The s32 analysis has not assessed the Compact Housing Overlay appropriately as required by the Enabling Act to consider the costs that the overlay would have on restricting development.	Delete the Compact Housing Overlay and its associated provisions, including the definition in its entirety.	FS5 – support FS6 - support	That the point of submission is accepted Part of the Compact Housing provisions were retained in error and are recommended to be deleted.
79.78	Support in Part	Compact Housing	Section 2- Residential Zones, 2.1 Introduction	Supports the deletion of reference to compact housing and its associated land use activity and provisions. The MDRS (as it applies to 'relevant residential zones') enables those development typologies and therefore the activity is no longer required.	Supports the deletion of reference to compact housing and its associated land use activity and provisions.		That the point of submission is accepted Part of the Compact Housing provisions were retained in error and are recommended to be deleted.
79.82	Support	Compact Housing	Policy 2.3.2.4 Building Setback	Supports the removal of reference in Policy 2.3.2.4 to compact housing for consistency throughout the district plan.	Supports the removal of reference in Policy 2.3.2.4 to compact housing for consistency throughout the district plan.		Support noted.
79.88	Oppose In part	Compact Housing	2.4.2.19	Opposes reference to compact housing and its associated land use activity and provisions. The MDRS enables those development typologies and therefore the activity is no longer required.	Delete reference to compact housing and its associated land use activity and provisions.		That the point of submission is accepted Part of the Compact Housing provisions were retained in error and are recommended to be deleted.
79.198	Oppose	Compact Housing	2A.3.5.6	Opposes compact housing and therefore all associated provisions.	Delete Policy-Maximum building length 2A.3.5.6		That the point of submission is accepted Part of the Compact Housing provisions were retained in error and are recommended to be deleted.
79.202	Oppose in part	Compact Housing	2A.3.7.1	The compact housing overlay and provisions are particularly onerous and less enabling than the MDRS and would therefore be considered a Qualifying Matter under s.77(J). The s.32 analysis has not assessed the Compact Housing Overlay appropriately. The development of housing in itself would not cause reverse sensitivity effects. The policy is not clear as to what reverse sensitivity effects are required to be addressed. The MDRS setbacks and District Plan noise provisions are sufficient to address effects on adjoining non-residential activities.	Include policy 2A.3.7.1 as notified with the following amendments: Policy - Comprehensive design of compact housing, four or more dwellings, retirement village accommodation and associated care facilities, rest homes, and visitor accommodation. 2A.3.7.1 To ensure that developments of four or more dwellings, compact housing, retirement village accommodation, and associated care facilities, rest homes and visitor accommodation are comprehensively designed by: (a)... (h) Addressing reverse sensitivity effects; and (i)....	FS2 - Oppose	That the point of submission is accepted in part Part of the Compact Housing provisions were retained in error and are recommended to be deleted. Reverse sensitivity effects are considered a valid resource management consideration and are not recommended to be deleted.
79.203	Oppose in part	Compact Housing	All	The compact housing overlay and provisions are particularly onerous and less enabling than the MDRS and would therefore be considered a Qualifying Matter under s.77(J). The s.32 analysis has not assessed the Compact Housing Overlay appropriately.	Delete all references to 'compact housing overlay' and associated provisions, including any spatial reference and application in PC26.		That the point of submission is accepted Part of the Compact Housing provisions were retained in error and are recommended to be deleted.
79.231	Oppose	Compact Housing	2A.4.1.3(e); various	The compact housing overlay applies within urban areas in proximity to centres and imposes standards more restrictive than the MDRS which have not been sufficiently justified under S77J-L of the Housing Supply Act. Any such development would simply be considered as 4+ dwellings.	Delete compact housing and the overlay from the District Plan.		That the point of submission is accepted Part of the Compact Housing provisions were retained in error and are recommended to be deleted.
79.255	Oppose	Compact Housing	2A.4.2.54; various	Opposes compact housing and its associated land use activity and provisions. The existing overlay applies within urban areas in proximity to centres, and imposes standards more-restrictive than the MDRS standards which has not been sufficiently justified under S77J-L of the Housing Supply Act. Kāinga Ora considers that the activity	Delete Rule 2A.4.2.54 and provisions associated with compact housing and the overlay from the District Plan. Consequential renumbering will be required		That the point of submission is accepted Part of the Compact Housing provisions were retained in error and are recommended to be deleted.

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submission	Response
				and associated overlay are therefore no longer required and are inefficient. Any such development would simply be considered as 4+ dwellings.			
79.309	Oppose in part	Compact Housing	Various	Opposes compact housing and its associated land use activity and provisions. The existing overlay applies within urban areas in proximity to centres, and imposes standards more-restrictive than the MDRS standards which has not been sufficiently justified under S77J-L of the Housing Supply Act. Kāinga Ora considers that the activity and associated overlay are therefore no longer required and are inefficient. Any such development would simply be considered as 4+ dwellings. The remaining activities (i.e., retirement villages etc) can be considered on their merits and do not need to be restricted to such an overlay location.	Delete compact housing and the overlay from the District Plan and include the assessment criteria as notified, to the extent they remain consistent with the relief sought in the overall Kāinga Ora submission.		That the point of submission is accepted Part of the Compact Housing provisions were retained in error and are recommended to be deleted.
79.310	Oppose in Part	Compact Housing	21.1.2A.3	Opposes compact housing and its associated land use activity and provisions. The existing overlay applies within urban areas in proximity to centres, and imposes standards more-restrictive than the MDRS standards which has not been sufficiently justified under S77J-L of the Housing Supply Act. Kāinga Ora considers that the activity and associated overlay are therefore no longer required and are inefficient. Any such development would simply be considered as 4+ dwellings. The remaining activities (i.e., retirement villages etc) can be considered on their merits and do not need to be restricted to such an overlay location.	Amend 21.1.2A.3 to delete 'compact housing overlay'.		That the point of submission is accepted Part of the Compact Housing provisions were retained in error and are recommended to be deleted.

2 Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS) (see s42a report Topic 2)

2.1 General Opposition (see s42a report – Topic 2.1 pgs 35 to 36)

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submission	Response
1.1	Oppose	Opposition to Intensification Planning Instrument-Proposed Plan Change 26	All	Concentration of property will lead to developed sized accommodation. It will ruin the amenity and community aspects of Cambridge. The visual impact on Cambridge will be significant. The investment in infrastructure will be significant and there is no definition on who will pay for it. There is inadequate provisions for car parking. Housing intensification will create significantly more vehicle movements. The proposed plan change has been implemented by central government without any consideration for the impact on local communities.	Reject PC26.		Opposition noted It is outside of Councils jurisdiction to respond to this request.
2.1	Oppose	Opposition to Intensification Planning Instrument-Proposed Plan Change 26	All	Housing intensification will block views, sunlight and infringe on privacy. It will drop house values and decrease the quality of life for existing residents and ruin the look and character of Cambridge.	Oppose PC26.		Opposition noted
3.1	Oppose	Opposition to Intensification Planning Instrument-Proposed Plan Change 26	All	Opposes housing intensification.	Oppose PPC26.		Opposition noted

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submission	Response
4.1	Oppose	Opposition to Intensification Planning Instrument-Proposed Plan Change 26	All	The plan change will lower the standard of living in Waipā. Compact living will place a burden on infrastructure and parking. Over time intensification will be visually unappealing.	Oppose PPC26.		Opposition noted
5.1	Oppose	Opposition to Intensification Planning Instrument-Proposed Plan Change 26	All	Intensification is unnecessary will be detrimental to the beauty of the town and promote a poor standard of living.	Oppose PPC26.		Opposition noted
6.1	Oppose	Opposition to Intensification Planning Instrument-Proposed Plan Change 26	All	Rain water will have nowhere to go when intensification occurs.	To build in a city and not in a country town.		Opposition noted The qualifying matter overlays and planning rules address the management of rainwater. The infrastructure assessments undertaken will provide a tool to assess the capacity of the stormwater as intensification occurs.
9.1	Oppose	Opposition to Intensification Planning Instrument-Proposed Plan Change 26	All	The potential devastating effects of PC26 will compromise the health and wellbeing of all neighbouring affected parties blocking out all natural light and viewing corridors. The scale of developments will be oppressive, overwhelming and have a closed in effect, restrict airflow, create security and burglary risk. High density living will be an eye sore and has potential to create excessive noise and will increase the number of traffic movements and result in an increased number of cars parked on the street. High density living will place demand on core infrastructure and increased carbon footprints and emissions. This plan change will increase property value thus increasing rates. This plan change will destroy character and historic precincts and the traits people love about our district.	Strongly objects to PC26 as it will compromise the district's health and wellbeing.		Opposition noted
10.1	Oppose	Opposition to Intensification Planning Instrument-Proposed Plan Change 26	All	Effects such as lack of sunlight, clean air, noise control, possibility of animals, high density of car parking will negatively affect standards of living in the Waipā region.	Opposes PPC26.		Opposition noted
14.1	Oppose	Opposition to Intensification Planning Instrument-Proposed Plan Change 26	All	Intensification has the potential to overload stormwater, water and wastewater infrastructure. The proposed plan changes will also erode the residential character and good urban design in Cambridge, Kihikihi, and Te Awamutu.	No decision sought - submitter opposes PC26.		Opposition noted Impervious coverage and site coverage rules are designed to control impacts on infrastructure. In addition, to address the potential risks of overloading the stormwater infrastructure, Waipa have the qualifying matter overlays.
15.1	Oppose	Opposition to Intensification Planning Instrument-Proposed Plan Change 26	All	The height of the housing intensification will reduce privacy for neighbours, and off-street parking availability. Intensification will also increase road traffic, reduce safety for cyclists, and negatively impact the mental health and wellbeing of residents. Developers should also incur the costs of upgrading infrastructure. Finally, failing to preserve the intimate community of our town will be detrimental to the strength of the community.	Add additional consent requirements and try to uphold the character of Cambridge.		Opposition noted It is outside of Councils jurisdiction to respond to this request.
16.1	Oppose	Opposition to Intensification Planning Instrument-Proposed Plan Change 26	All	Te Awamutu does not have the water and roading infrastructure to cope with this intensification.	Council to continue to oppose these plans.		Opposition noted W&WW – the density limits proposed by WDC are intended to limit development to maintain demand within the limits of current planned strategic infrastructure and without the need for additional.
17.1	Oppose	Opposition to Intensification Planning Instrument-Proposed Plan Change 26	All	Opposes the high density 3 storey buildings being built in Cambridge whether they are in a new subdivision or replacing removed houses.	Intensification should be built where the existing houses are old and in bad condition.		Opposition noted

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submission	Response
22.1	Oppose	Opposition to Intensification Planning Instrument-Proposed Plan Change 26	All	Opposes PC26 because it is not good for rural towns.	Council to reject PC26.		Opposition noted It is outside of Councils jurisdiction to respond to this request.
23.1	Oppose	Opposition to Intensification Planning Instrument-Proposed Plan Change 26	All	Opposes proposed PC26.	To say no to proposed PC26.		Opposition noted It is outside of Councils jurisdiction to respond to this request.
24.1	Oppose	Opposition to Intensification Planning Instrument-Proposed Plan Change 26	All	Our drainage systems are not capable to sustain the housing intensification. Parking will also be an issue with more cars parked on berms. There has also been a lack of public input for this plan change.	More information and detail of the plan change is needed on what it would mean for neighbourhoods that would be changed forever should the plan be forced through.		Opposition noted Council is unable to consider car parking impacts in relation to residential development.
27.1	Oppose	Opposition to Intensification Planning Instrument-Proposed Plan Change 26	All	A content and thriving environment has a lot to do with the surrounding beauty of where we live and we feel it is the responsibility for council to provide rules and regulations to allow this to happen. At the moment Cambridge has a vibe that could easily be lost if sections were filled to the boundary with 3 story apartments blocking peoples sun and pleasant views.	Seeks that council vote against the governments proposed rule change regarding the Residential Zone Intensification.		Opposition noted It is outside of Councils jurisdiction to respond to this request.
28.4	Support in Part	Opposition to Intensification Planning Instrument-Proposed Plan Change 26	All	Overall I support this plan change, but some additions should be implemented.	The council should investigate the possibility of returning a negative response to the legislation.		Opposition noted It is outside of Councils jurisdiction to respond to this request.
29.4	Support in Part	Opposition to Intensification Planning Instrument-Proposed Plan Change 26	All	Overall I support this plan change, but some additions should be implemented.	The council should investigate the possibility of returning a negative response to the legislation.		Opposition noted It is outside of Councils jurisdiction to respond to this request.
31.1	Oppose	Opposition to Intensification Planning Instrument-Proposed Plan Change 26	All	Intensification would remove the appeal of living in the little towns in Waipā district. There will be less space between neighbours. There is not the infrastructure to cope with development, there are a lot of new housing developments going in already.	The council should remove the right for landowners to build three houses, three storeys high without a land consent.		That the point of submission is rejected It is outside of Councils jurisdiction to respond to this request.
33.1	Oppose	Opposition to Intensification Planning Instrument-Proposed Plan Change 26	All	Uncontrolled building development within the existing community will put strain on existing amenities and destroy the environmental aesthetics of streets. Intensification will cause undress stress on current property owners who have little to no say on nearby developments. Larger more unified development would be a more sensible solution.	We are very concerned about such reckless development within Cambridge which can destroy the fabric of the neighbourhood, amenities etc. and I would implore you to consider the complex issues these new regulations will raise in greater detail.		Opposition noted
36.1	Oppose	Opposition to Intensification Planning Instrument-Proposed Plan Change 26	All	Most parts of the residential zones in Cambridge, Te Awamutu and Kihikihi will not have the capacity in their infrastructure to support this kind of housing intensification. The unique character in the towns will be significantly changed. I wish Cambridge to retain its character and not have existing properties adversely affected by increased residential intensification.	I support the deletion of the new density standards amendments.		That the point of submission is rejected It is outside of Councils jurisdiction to respond to this request.
52.1	Oppose	Opposition to Intensification Planning Instrument-Proposed Plan Change 26	All	The council should oppose this mandate so that Cambridge can develop in an orderly way that fits with its heritage and location.	Oppose this mandate and to ensure that the Government is aware of this. Join with other Councils in order to oppose this legislation.		Opposition noted It is outside of Councils jurisdiction to respond to this request.

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submission	Response
58.1	Oppose	Opposition to Intensification Planning Instrument-Proposed Plan Change 26	All	Intensification changes the character of Cambridge. Allowing 3x3 units encroaches on neighbours' privacy and sunlight etc. and present infrastructure needs upgrading.	Opposes the increase in housing density spoiling the character of Cambridge. Seeks that two units be allowed to be built instead of three.		That the point of submission is rejected It is outside of Councils jurisdiction to respond to this request.
58.2	Oppose	Opposition to Intensification Planning Instrument-Proposed Plan Change 26	All	There needs to be regulation to provide on-site parking as some streets are already parked up.	Require on-site parking.		That the point of submission is rejected It is outside of Councils jurisdiction to respond to this request.
66.1	Oppose	Opposition to Intensification Planning Instrument-Proposed Plan Change 26	All	Intensification will cause rapid increases in population, and there is no consideration for how Cambridge High School will cope with additional students. Also, with no expectation for developers to consider off-street parking, street parking will be overwhelmed and there will be health and safety implications for the community.	Limit the developments to a maximum of 2 houses per lot with compulsory off-street parking requirements, or require resource consent for exceptions.		That the point of submission is rejected It is outside of Councils jurisdiction to respond to this request.
75.1	oppose	Opposition to Intensification Planning Instrument-Proposed Plan Change 26	All	Te Awamutu Community Board wishes to support Council in their attempt to minimise the impact of PC26. This mandate from central government is not supported by our community of Te Awamutu and Kihikihi. Our community believes due to the blanket approach it will lower property values, block sunlight, and have an adverse impact on our core infrastructure, parks, and recreation.	The Te Awamutu Community Board would like to formally support the Councils efforts to minimise the impact of this amendment to the Resource Management Act on our district. We support the recommendation being made by Council to maintain some control over where mandatory intensification occurs within residential zones through the possibilities listed as Option Three in the internal Issues and Options Report on the Amendment Act- Council Meeting 5 April 2022.		Support noted (for opposition).
78.1	Oppose	Opposition to Intensification Planning Instrument-Proposed Plan Change 26	All	Oppose intensification that allows construction of 3 homes 3 stories high. Further infill will be detrimental and cause infrastructure become overloaded.	To oppose where possible plan change 26, particularly any clauses which will allow the building of up to 3 houses 3 storeys high on any one site. The present planning laws appear to meet current needs for additional development and council should attempt to maintain the status quo. I support the council view that these changes are not suitable for the district.		That the point of submission is rejected It is outside of Councils jurisdiction to respond to this request.

2.2 General Support (see s42a report – Topic 2.2 pg 36)

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
12.1	Support	Support for Intensification Planning Instrument - Proposed Plan Change 26	All	A review of and retreat from the current low-intensity model is long overdue. The low-intensity model wastes space, and there is an increasing need for modern multi-storey housing close to the CBD. Housing intensification within the CBD would allow for ease of access for the elderly who may not wish to drive.	Approval of the plan change.		Support noted.
20.1	Support	Support for Intensification Planning Instrument - Proposed Plan Change 26	All	Support the plan change and allow more houses to be built which will increase supply. Increasing housing density will also stop productive farmland being taken over.	To proceed with the intent of the proposed plan change and allow more housing intensification.		Support noted.

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
21.1	Support	Support for Intensification Planning Instrument - Proposed Plan Change 26	All	Maintaining the status quo will effectively mean that irreplaceable farmland will be lost to urban sprawl. The further our cities spread, the greater distances people have to travel, which means more roads, infrastructure, and higher rates. The district also desperately needs housing for the growing population.	This proposal needs to be adopted as it stands as soon as possible.		Support noted.
26.1	Support	Support for Intensification Planning Instrument - Proposed Plan Change 26	All	The council has greatly overstated the impacts of this legislation, specifically with regard to the impact on the Waipā townships. We cannot continue with the urban sprawl eating into the productive farmland that surrounds Te Awamutu, Cambridge and Kihikihi.	The adoption of PC26.		Support noted.
43.1	Support	Support for Intensification Planning Instrument - Proposed Plan Change 26	All	Supports in principle the use of MDRS where residential intensification is considered necessary in Cambridge.	Support in principle the use of MDRS where residential intensification is considered necessary in Cambridge.		Support noted.
43.2	Support	Support for Intensification Planning Instrument - Proposed Plan Change 26	Objectives 2A.3.1 and 2A.3.2	Intensification should be proportionate to the needs for additional growth, the role and function of the district's centres and achieving well functioning urban environments. Where intensification is considered necessary in Cambridge, the MDRS should be used.	Supports objectives 2A.3.1 and 2A.3.2.		Support noted.
48.1	Support	Support for Intensification Planning Instrument - Proposed Plan Change 26	All	The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand has made a submission on the provisions for zones, which is supported by Summerset. Summerset supports the inclusion of changes that are provided by the MDRS provision of the Enabling Housing Supply Act.	Supports the inclusion of changes that are provided by the MDRS provision of the Enabling Housing Supply Act.		Support noted.
48.2	Support	Support for Intensification Planning Instrument - Proposed Plan Change 26	All	The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand has made a submission on the provisions for zones, which is supported by Summerset. Summerset supports the inclusion of changes that are provided by the MDRS provision of the Enabling Housing Supply Act.	Summerset requests the Council engages constructively with the Retirement Villages Association in relation to Council's housing intensification plan change.		Support noted. That the point of submission is accepted in part .
50.1	Support in Part	Support for Intensification Planning Instrument - Proposed Plan Change 26	Qualifying Matters - All	For unsubdivided and undeveloped Medium Density Residential Zoned land the qualifying matters set aside (infrastructure (wastewater), and stormwater) should be matters that are resolved at the time of subdivision of existing unsubdivided land. Financial contributions are set out in section 18 of PPC26 to achieve this. Therefore, the Qualifying Matters can be removed from greenfields Medium Density Residential Zoned land.	That the plan change be adopted in a way that is consistent with the RMA Amendment and the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020.		That the point of submission is rejected It is considered appropriate to retain it at this point because of the potential downstream capacity effects (e.g., for wastewater). However, Council proposes to periodically review and uplift those parts of the Infrastructure Constraint Overlay where greenfields development has taken place / been completed, and appropriate provision has been made for infrastructure. This would need to be undertaken as a separate plan change process.
50.3	Support	Support for Intensification Planning Instrument - Proposed Plan Change 26	Map 39	The medium density residential zone has been set out in the maps. The zone gives effect to the RMA Amendment and the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020.	Supports the Te Awamutu Medium Density Zone.		Support noted.
51.1	Support	Support for Intensification Planning Instrument - Proposed Plan Change 26	All	The submitters support the overall plan change which identifies robust qualifying matters that will appropriately modify the application of the MDRS in Waipā.	Submitter supports the overall plan change 26.		Support noted.

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
51.7	Support	Support for Intensification Planning Instrument - Proposed Plan Change 26	All	The submitters support the overall plan change which identifies robust qualifying matters that will appropriately modify the application of the MDRS in Waipā.	Subject to other submission points made by the submitters, the plan change be approved.		Support noted.
60.1	Support	Support for Intensification Planning Instrument - Proposed Plan Change 26	All	Supports the proposed plan change for higher-density housing. This is supported by the evidence-based conclusions from the New Zealand Infrastructure Commission report of March 2022. There is a lack of housing in New Zealand and this proposed plan change will help address housing supply issues. The current local planning rules are excessive and inadequate.	Support the plan change to be approved.		Support noted.
62.1	Support	Support for Intensification Planning Instrument - Proposed Plan Change 26	All	Supports the proposed plan change, supported by the evidence-based conclusions from the New Zealand Infrastructure Commission report of March 2022 (attached to the submission). There is a lack of housing in New Zealand and this proposed plan change will help address housing supply issues.	Support the plan change to be approved.		Support noted.
63.1	Support	Support for Intensification Planning Instrument - Proposed Plan Change 26	All	Generally supportive of the proposed changes and provisions put forward by Council. The Medium Density Residential Standards should only be modified to accommodate qualifying matters, and should be modified only to the extent required to accommodate these matters. Qualifying matters should be supported by a strong evidence base to ensure a robust application.	Generally supportive of the proposed changes and provisions put forward by Council.		Support noted.
69.1	Support	Support for Intensification Planning Instrument - Proposed Plan Change 26	All	I support modifying the MDRS as Cambridge does not have the capacity in the infrastructure to support intensification. Without the right infrastructure, intensification has the potential to adversely affect the Waikato River etc. I also have concerns regarding increased rates to support the infrastructure needed, and the impact this will have on town character.	Cambridge should only have two houses (not three) on each site to ensure the infrastructure can support forecasted growth and Council maintains the current standard of control on issues like site coverage, height and setbacks that impact sunlight, privacy and views.		Support noted.
76.1	Support	Support for Intensification Planning Instrument - Proposed Plan Change 26	All	Support the overall plan change that seeks to accommodate housing supply and address impacts of climate change.	Support the overall plan change.		Support noted.
76.2	Support	Support for Intensification Planning Instrument - Proposed Plan Change 26	All	Support the intention to enable utilisation of land efficiently to build additional housing supply within existing residential areas that are located within proximity to commercial/retail nodes, recreational areas and public transport, whilst addressing the impacts of climate change.	Support the proposed residential zoning in areas identified as Residential and Medium Density Residential and seek for proposed rezoning to be retained.		Support noted.
79.106	Support in part	Support for Intensification Planning Instrument - Proposed Plan Change 26	All	Supports the introduction of a Medium Density Residential Zone into the District Plan.	Supports the introduction of a Medium Density Residential Zone into the District Plan.		Support noted.

2.3 Spatial Extent (see s42a report – Topic 2.3 pg 37)

Sub point	Position	Topic	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Sub	Response
2.3	Oppose	Spatial Extent of MDRZ		Decrease in quality of life for existing residents, block views, sunlight and infringe on privacy	Limit high density housing to areas under construction on Hamilton Road etc.		Support noted (for opposition).
7.1	Oppose	Spatial Extent of MDRZ	All	Allowing three story developments will change the character of Waipā. It will impose unexpected shading and privacy issues for neighbours and place increased demand on infrastructure. Council should zone specific areas as medium density, not the entire townships. This way residents know that this kind of	Zone specific areas as medium density, not the entire townships.		That the point of submission is rejected It is outside of Councils jurisdiction to respond to this request.

Sub point	Position	Topic	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Sub	Response
				development is likely and the infrastructure can be planned accordingly.			
8.1	Oppose	Spatial Extent of MDRZ	All	If this plan is to continue living enjoyment would be greatly affected. Te Awamutu does not have the capacity or resources to build more intensified housing.	Review each residential section on its own merits.		That the point of submission is rejected Council has assessed each relevant residential zone and incorporated the MDRS into each zone as required by the NPS-UD.
11.1	Support in Part	Spatial Extent of MDRZ	All	Intensification will block natural sunlight which isn't fair for single story houses.	Developments would be better off in a new subdivision where new and capable infrastructure, roads with parking, bus stops, green space and playgrounds can be implemented, where developers would be bearing some of the costs of upgrading infrastructure.		That the point of submission is rejected Council has assessed each relevant residential zone and incorporated the MDRS into each zone as required by the NPS-UD.
13.7	Support in Part	Spatial Extent of MDRZ	All	Karapiro, Pirongia, and Ohaupo are not "relevant residential zones" as defined in s 2 of the RMA since they, individually, have fewer than 5,000 residents. This means the IPI is not required to incorporate the MDRS in those locations. However, they are within "urban environments" as defined in the NPS-UD. I submit that the hearings panel is legally required to see that this exercise is undertaken now before it makes its recommendations on the IPI.	Investigate the compliance of the zoning in Karapiro, Pirongia, Ohaupo and any other settlements within an urban environment (as defined in the NPS-UD) for compliance with the policy 3 of the NPS-UD. Where the zoning is not in accordance with policy 3 in those settlements, amend the zoning accordingly.		That the point of submission is rejected . Council has assessed each relevant residential zone and incorporated the MDRS into each zone as required by the NPS-UD.
18.2	Oppose	Spatial Extent of MDRZ	All	Opposes the high density 3 storey buildings being built in Cambridge whether they are in a new subdivision or replacing removed houses.	Selected areas should be intensified near town centres, commercial or replacing old bad condition houses that are not close to good quality houses.		That the point of submission is rejected It is outside of Councils jurisdiction to respond to this request.
19.1	Support in Part	Spatial Extent of MDRZ	All	Intensification will cause the Cambridge town centre to struggle with attracting businesses and patrons.	No intensification should be allowed within the Cambridge ward's green belt or in the centre of Cambridge. Intensification should only be allowed in new subdivisions.		That the point of submission is rejected It is outside of Councils jurisdiction to respond to this request.
35.1	Oppose	Spatial Extent of MDRZ	All	Taking infrastructure into account should be a priority, more buildings means more pressure on existing services. Bringing many more people into a town where public transport is nonexistent really limits the options for new residents.	Please be very specific about the areas that will not be subject to the plan changes.		No specific relief sought No recommended changes are to be adopted as the Introduction of Section 2A and planning maps are specific about the areas that will be subject to the plan change.
37.1	Support in part	Spatial Extent of MDRZ	All	Intensification has the potential to spoil the ambience that people may move to semi-rural towns for. It will also reduce privacy, sunlight, and green spaces. Intensification will also lead to greater likelihood of flooding, and there are car parking issues to consider as well.	Up to two houses up to two stories high would be more acceptable with higher density in selected areas which wouldn't impact existing established one level housing.		That the point of submission is rejected It is outside of Councils jurisdiction to respond to this request.
44.1	Oppose	Spatial Extent of MDRZ	All	Housing intensification up to three levels will increase damp homes and cause a reduction of sunlight. Damp winters and reduced sunlight could limit lawn or planting growth which could be overcome with solid ground cover however this will increase storm water issues. Intensification will cause a loss of privacy.	Consider issues of property shading / reduction of sunlight, the damp that 3 storey houses will cause, stormwater issues, and loss of privacy when making the final decisions related to housing intensification.		No specific relief sought These issues have been assessed as Council is able to under the NPS-UD.
70.126	Support in Part	Spatial Extent of MDRZ	Planning Maps	The submitter has particular interest in how the plan change is located to its current village site at Cambridge Road. The site is zoned Medium Density Residential and is subject to a 'Structure Plan Area' and qualifying matters 'Stormwater Constraint' and 'Infrastructure Constraint'. The submitter supports the zoning of its current site.	Seeks the retention of the Medium Density Residential zoning of the submitter's current site at 1881 Cambridge Road, Cambridge.		Support noted.
79.18	Amend	Spatial extent of MDRZ	Section 2A	The spatial application of the Infrastructure Constraints overlay is extensive. As a result, the reduction in enabled density of up to two dwellings per site for land located within the overlay reduces the permitted density of development that the MDRS enables and requires. The implications of this have not been sufficiently assessed or justified in accordance with ss77J and 77L of the Housing Supply Act.	Seeks that up to three dwellings per site is a permitted activity in the MDRZ, consistent with Schedule 3A of the Housing Supply Act, and that four or more dwellings per site be included as a restricted discretionary activity inclusive of (but not limited to) matters of discretion and assessment criteria requiring infrastructure capacity assessment at the point of connection	FS2 - oppose	That the point of submission is rejected Council has assessed each relevant residential zone and incorporated the MDRS into each zone as required by the NPS-UD. Council has applied qualifying matters where relevant and has reviewed these. Further modelling has confirmed the acceptable number of dwellings per lot. Removal of the overlay would result in uncertainty and a 'first in first served' development environment with limited controls on early development. The infrastructure considered to be a valid qualifying matter to apply to the MDRS to give effect to Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato—the Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River (s77I(c)).

Sub point	Position	Topic	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Sub	Response
79.40	Support in part	Spatial extent of MDRZ	Volume 3 - Planning Maps and Section 2A Medium Density Residential	Generally supports the areas identified for rezoning to the Medium Density Residential Zone ("MDRZ").	Supports the areas identified for Medium Density Residential Zone.		Support noted.
79.44	Support in part	Spatial extent of MDRZ	Volume 3 - Planning Maps and Section 2 - Residential	Generally supports the areas identified for rezoning to the Medium Density Residential Zone ("MDRZ").	Retain the remaining areas proposed for MDRZ other than what has been sought for change to High Density Residential Zone in the submission.		Support noted.
79.77	Support in part	Spatial Extent of MDRZ	Planning Maps	Generally supports the spatial extent of the MDRZ and by extension, of the Residential Zone that remains.	Generally supports the spatial extent of the MDRZ and by extension, of the Residential Zone that remains.		Support noted.
79.99	Support in part	Spatial Extent of MDRZ	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone and Planning Maps	Generally supports the proposed spatial extent of the Medium Density Residential Zone.	Generally supports the proposed spatial extent of the Medium Density Residential Zone.		Support noted.
79.105	Support in part	Spatial Extent of MDRZ	Planning Maps	Generally supports the proposed spatial extent of the Medium Density Residential Zone.	Retain the remaining areas zoned for Medium Density Residential Zone as notified, that are not sought for change by Kāinga Ora to High Density Residential Zone.		Support noted.

2.4 Chapter 2A (see s42a report – Topic 2.4 pgs 37 to 39)

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
13.1	Oppose	Medium Density Residential Standards - Schedule 3A	All	The introduction statement only mentions one of the tasks which are legally required by the IPI.	The hearings panel take into account that the introduction to PC26 only mentions one of the tasks required by the IPI.		No specific relief sought Assessment of PC26 against relevant legal requirements has been outlined in the s32 and the s42a report.
32.1	Amend	Medium Density Residential Standards - Schedule 3A	All	PC26, and particularly chapters 2A and 15, seek to incorporate the MDRS. Given the limited timeframe available to council to prepare PC26, it may be necessary to make further amendments to the provisions to ensure that requirements of Schedule 3A are incorporated accurately and is workable in the context of the Waipā District Plan.	Such further amendments to PC26 that are necessary to accurately and effectively incorporate the requirements of Schedule 3A of the Act.	FS8 - support	No specific relief sought Following incorporation of proposed changes section 3A will be reviewed to ensure it is workable.
47.19	Support in Part	Medium Density Residential Standards - Schedule 3A	2A.4.2.4	Firefighting access requirements and building setback controls are managed through the New Zealand Building Code (NZBC) and it important that these controls are brought to the attention of plan users (i.e. developers) early on in the resource consent process so that they can incorporate the NZBC requirements early on in their building design.	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>	FS8 – support in part	That the point of submission is rejected The advice note from FENZ is not required, risk of missing provisions.
63.9	Support	Medium Density Residential Standards - Schedule 3A	2A.3.1 and 2A.3.2	Supports the implementation of the objectives in accordance with the MDRS standards.	Retain Objectives 2A.3.1 and 2A.3.2 as notified.		That the point of submission is accepted

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
63.10	Support	Medium Density Residential Standards - Schedule 3A	2A.3.2.1, 2A.3.2.3, 2A.3.2.5, 2A.3.2.6, and 2A.3.2.7	Supports the implementation of the policies in accordance with the MDRS standards.	Retain Policies 2A.3.2.1, 2A.3.2.3, 2A.3.2.5, 2A.3.2.6, and 2A.3.2.7 as notified.		That the point of submission is accepted
63.12	Support	Medium Density Residential Standards - Schedule 3A	Rule 2A.4.1.1 (b)	Supports the implementation of the density standards in accordance with the MDRS standards.	Retain Rule 2A.4.1.1(b) as notified.		That the point of submission is accepted
63.13	Support	Medium Density Residential Standards - Schedule 3A	Rule 2A.4.2.1	Supports the maximum height for buildings located within the Medium Residential Zone as this is in accordance with the MDRS requirements.	Retain Rule 2A.4.2.1 as notified.		That the point of submission is accepted
63.18	Support	Medium Density Residential Standards - Schedule 3A	Rule 15.4.1.1 (l)	Supports the implementation of the subdivision provisions in accordance with the MDRS standards.	Retain Rule 15.4.1.1(l) as notified.		That the point of submission is accepted
68.1	Support in Part	Medium Density Residential Standards - Schedule 3A	All	The submitter owns significant landholdings within and adjoining the C5 growth cell in Cambridge. Growth Cell C5 contains land which is currently zoned Deferred Residential in the DP. A private plan change application is being prepared to enable significant residential development capacity. A master plan and structure plan is currently being prepared and Appendix One within this submission shows the proposed plan change extent. This submission is therefore not necessarily opposed to the intent of PC26, and in fact the landowner will look to incorporate the new section 2A 'Medium Density Residential Zone' and modified residential standards where appropriate, however the proposed qualifying matter overlays and rezoning of the entire C5 growth cell to the Medium Density Residential Zone are not supported.	The submission does not seek relief to have the landowners proposed rezoning approach addressed or specific provisions for the C5 structure plan area incorporated as part of PC26 however it more so seeks to provide Council notice that the landowner intends to request a private plan change that extends beyond the outcomes sought in PC26 with a more bespoke approach to rezoning. The submission encourages Council to consider how PC26 might further support landowners / developers that wish to preserve a lower density than provided for in the MDRZ, where these areas are identified through a comprehensively planned structure plan process.		No specific relief sought C5 has been mapped in the Infrastructure Constraint Overlay in error. This error has been corrected, reducing the extent of the Infrastructure Constraint Overlay.
72.1	Amend	Medium Density Residential Standards - Schedule 3A	All	Generally opposes the approach that has been taken in the application of the Amendment Act. One area (Karapiro) has been identified as being located in the Residential zone. Three areas (Cambridge, Kihikihi and Te Awamutu) have been identified as being located in a new Medium Density Residential zone.	Amendments should be made to better align the Residential and Medium Density zone provisions with the requirements in the Amendment Act and the NPS-UD		That the point of submission is rejected Assessment of PC26 against relevant legal requirements has been outlined in the s32 and the s42a report.
72.6	Amend	Medium Density Residential Standards - Schedule 3A	All	Generally opposes the approach that has been taken to the application of the Amendment Act. One area (Karapiro) has been identified as being located in the Residential Zone. Three areas (Cambridge, Kihikihi and Te Awamutu) have been identified as being located in a new Medium Density Residential Zone.	Amendments should be made to better align the Residential and Medium Density zone provisions with the requirements of the Amendment Act and the NPS-UD.		That the point of submission is rejected Assessment of PC26 against relevant legal requirements has been outlined in the s32 and the s42a report.
79.5	Amend	Medium Density Residential Standards - Schedule 3A	Section 2A	Amendments are sought to ensure the MDRZ provisions are consistent with Policy 6(b) of the NPSUD and that intensification in accordance with the planned built form of the MDRZ is not an adverse effect of itself. A range of amendments are also proposed to ensure consistency with Kāinga Ora submission and relief sought in relation to the proposed 'Qualifying Matter' overlays that would reduce permitted levels of intensification (up to three dwellings per site) otherwise-required under Schedule 3A of the Housing Supply Act, and the removal of duplicated standards and/or onerous requirements which are otherwise-managed through assessment criteria or not required in light of the Housing Supply Act.	Amendments are sought to ensure the MDRZ provisions are consistent with Policy 6(b) of the NPSUD and that intensification in accordance with the planned built form of the MDRZ is not an adverse effect of itself.		That the point of submission is accepted Specific changes are addressed in other submission points requesting specific amendments.

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
79.156	Support in part	Medium Density Residential Standards - Schedule 3A	2A.3.1	Supports the inclusion of Objective 2A.3.1 required under Schedule 3A of the Housing Supply Act.	Include Objective 2A.3.1 as notified.		Support noted
79.157	Support in part	Medium Density Residential Standards - Schedule 3A	2A.3.2	Supports the inclusion of Objective 2A.3.2 required under Schedule 3A of the Housing Supply Act.	Include Objective 2A.3.2 as notified.		Support noted
79.158	Support in part	Medium Density Residential Standards - Schedule 3A	2A.3.2 .1	Supports the inclusion of Policy 2A.3.2.1 required under Schedule 3A of the Housing Supply Act.	Include Policy 2A.3.2.1 as notified.		Support noted
79.161	Support in part	Medium Density Residential Standards - Schedule 3A	2A.3.2 .3	Supports the inclusion of those provisions required under Schedule 3A of the Housing Supply Act.	Include Policy 2A.3.2.3 as notified.		Support noted
79.163	Support in part	Medium Density Residential Standards - Schedule 3A	2A.3.2 .5	Supports the inclusion of those provisions required under Schedule 3A of the Housing Supply Act.	Include Policy 2A.3.2.5 as notified.		Support noted
79.164	Support in part	Medium Density Residential Standards - Schedule 3A	2A.3.2 .6	Supports the inclusion of those provisions required under Schedule 3A of the Housing Supply Act.	Include Policy 2A.3.2.6 as notified.		Support noted
79.165	Support in part	Medium Density Residential Standards - Schedule 3A	2A.3.2 .7	Supports the inclusion of those provisions required under Schedule 3A of the Housing Supply Act.	Include Policy 2A.3.2.7 as notified.		Support noted
79.237	Support	Medium Density Residential Standards - Schedule 3A	2A.4.1 A	Supports the inclusion of the public and limited notification provisions required under Clause 5 of Schedule 3A of the Housing Supply Act.	Include 2A.4.1A Public and Limited Notification as notified.		Support noted
79.266	Support in Part	Medium Density Residential Standards - Schedule 3A	15.4.1.1(e)	The submitter questions whether the identification of the activity as a restricted discretionary activity is an error, and matters of control are listed and there are as notified, no controlled activities under (b) to (e) inclusive, within the subdivision activity table. Kāinga Ora seeks that the activity is 'controlled', consistent with Clause 7 of Schedule 3A of the Housing Supply Act, by providing for subdivision applications as a controlled activity within the MDRZ and new HDRZ.	Amend 15.4.1.1 (e) as a controlled activity.		That the point of submission is rejected This is addressed by section 15.4.1.1(l) of PC26 which outlines specific activity status rules for subdivision in the MDRZ based on the requirements of the Amendment Act. This allows for a Controlled status subdivision for proposals meeting the specific standards outlined under the Amendment Act.
79.273	Support	Medium Density Residential Standards - Schedule 3A	15.4.1 A	Supports the notification provisions as it is consistent with the notification requirements under Clause 5 of Schedule 3A of the Housing Supply Act and those notification provisions within the MDRZ as proposed under PC26.	Include the notification provisions in 15.4.1A as notified.		That the point of submission is accepted in part
79.277	Support	Medium Density Residential Standards - Schedule 3A	15.4.2.1A	Supports the rule as notified as it is consistent with the requirements under clause 8 of Schedule 3A of the Housing Supply Act by excluding subdivision around existing or proposed dwellings from compliance with the lot area rules under rule 15.4.2.1 and 15.4.2.3.	Supports Rule 15.4.2.1A as notified.		Support noted
79.133	Oppose	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - All	All	Opposes the assumption that new developments and subdivisions result in poor amenity outcomes by virtue of the act they are new. The issue statement should be amended to relate to the methods employed to address the stated issues, and ensure it does not conflict with MDRZ and reflect that the NPS-UD and MDRS anticipates effects of development as a result of change in density and urban form and enabled.	Amendments are sought to ensure the MDRZ provisions are consistent with Policy 6(b) of the NPS-UD and that intensification in accordance with the planned built form of the MDRZ is not an adverse effect of itself.		No specific relief sought. Specific relief addressed in later submission points.
79.136	Oppose	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - All	All	Opposes the assumption that new developments and subdivisions result in poor amenity outcomes by virtue of the act they are new. The issue statement should be amended to relate to the methods employed to address the stated issues, and ensure it does not conflict with MDRZ and reflect that the NPS-UD and MDRS anticipates effects of development as a result of change in density and urban form and enabled.	References to the anticipated character and form of development in the zone should use terminology consistent with the NPS-UD and MDRS in Housing Supply Act.		No specific relief sought. Specific relief addressed in later submission points.

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
79.137	Oppose	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - All	All	Opposes the assumption that new developments and subdivisions result in poor amenity outcomes by virtue of the act they are new. The issue statement should be amended to relate to the methods employed to address the stated issues, and ensure it does not conflict with MDRZ and reflect that the NPS-UD and MDRS anticipates effects of development as a result of change in density and urban form and enabled.	Amendments are sought to ensure the MDRZ provisions are consistent with Policy 6(b) of the NPS-UD and that intensification in accordance with the planned built form of the MDRZ is not an adverse effect of itself.		No specific relief sought Specific relief addressed in later submission points.
79.155	Support in part	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - All	All	Supports the provisions 2A.2.16-2A.2.19 and the need to ensure that non-residential activities within residential zones are appropriate and do not conflict with the amenity values to be expected in such zones.	References to the anticipated character and form of development in the zone should use terminology consistent with the NPS-UD and MDRS in Housing Supply Act.		No specific relief sought Specific relief addressed in later submission points.
10.4	Oppose	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - 2A.4.1A Public and Limited Notification	2A.4.1 A	Effects such as lack of sunlight, clean air, noise control, possibility of animals, high density of car parking will negatively affect standards of living in the Waipā region.	Will iwi be fully consulted and will council identify any Māori land prior to any developments.		No specific relief sought Consultation has been outlined in the s32 and is ongoing with iwi due to the statutory timeframes to implement PC26.
27.3	Oppose	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - 2A.4.1A Public and Limited Notification	2A.4.1 A	Opposes 3 storey apartments being able to be built without consultation with affected parties. At least a resource consent gives some safety to ratepayers.	Opposes 3 storey apartments being able to be built without consultation with affected parties. At least a resource consent gives some safety to ratepayers.		That the point of submission is rejected This request is outside of Councils jurisdiction to address. Tier 1 local authorities must implement the MDRS.
28.1	Support in Part	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - 2A.4.1A Public and Limited Notification	2A.4.1 A	Neighbours should receive notice before construction of housing intensification takes place.	The council should be required to provide advance notice to neighbours of construction.		That the point of submission is rejected This request is outside of Councils jurisdiction to address.
29.1	Support in Part	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - 2A.4.1A Public and Limited Notification	2A.4.1 A	Neighbours should receive notice before construction of housing intensification takes place.	The council should be required to provide notice to neighbours of construction.		That the point of submission is rejected This request is outside of Councils jurisdiction to address.
2.2	Oppose	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Activity Status Tables - 2A.4.1.1 Permitted Activities		Ability of government to tell a community a 3 storey home can be built next to single family homes with no consent.	Change PC26 so that housing consent has to be obtained.		That the point of submission is rejected This request is outside of Councils jurisdiction to address. Tier 1 local authorities must implement the MDRS.
20.2	Support	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Activity Status Tables - 2A.4.1.1 Permitted Activities		Three stories and three homes is a lot, so maybe we should manage this to 2 storeys and 2 residential units per title.	Manage housing development to 2 storeys and 2 residential units per title.		That the point of submission is rejected This request is outside of Councils jurisdiction to address. Tier 1 local authorities must implement the MDRS.
27.2	Oppose	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Activity Status Tables - 2A.4.1.1 Permitted Activities	2A.4.1	Opposes 3 storey apartments being able to be built without consultation with affected parties. At least a resource consent gives some safety to ratepayers.	Opposes 3 storey apartments being able to be built without consultation with affected parties. At least a resource consent gives some safety to ratepayers.		That the point of submission is rejected This request is outside of Councils jurisdiction to address. Tier 1 local authorities must implement the MDRS.
38.26	Support	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Activity Status Tables - 2A.4.1.1 Permitted Activities	2A.4.1 .1(o)	Supports the rule being carried over to the Medium Density Residential Zone.	Retain Rule 2A.4.1.1 (o).		Support noted
39.1	Oppose	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Activity Status Tables - 2A.4.1.1 Permitted Activities	All	The proposed plan change doesn't fit with the rural character of the Waipā district. There is still a need for resource consent to ensure that roading traffic is managed well, each unit has adequate sunlight, as well as any neighbouring houses, and each unit has a north-facing outdoor area for healthy living.	Enable up to two, two story residential units to be built in residential zones in Cambridge, Te Awamutu, and Kihikihi, when resource consent has been obtained, and all the standards are met.		That the point of submission is rejected This request is outside of Councils jurisdiction to address. Tier 1 local authorities must implement the MDRS.
40.1	Oppose	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Activity Status	All	The proposed plan change doesn't fit with the rural character of the Waipā district. There is still a need for resource consent to ensure that roading traffic is	Enable up to two, two storey residential units to be built in residential zones in Te Awamutu, Kihikihi and		That the point of submission is rejected

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
		Tables – 2A.4.1.1 Permitted Activities		managed well, each unit has adequate sunlight, as well as any neighbouring houses, and each unit has a north-facing outdoor area for healthy living.	Cambridge when resource consent has been obtained, and all the standards are met.		This request is outside of Councils jurisdiction to address. Tier 1 local authorities must implement the MDRS.
42.1	Support in Part	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Activity Status Tables – 2A.4.1.1 Permitted Activities	All	Submitter lives near a site approved to be developed with two storey homes and is concerned that a developer of any subdivision might apply to council to amend an already approved proposal to build three storey dwellings.	Should plan change 26 succeed then the submitter would like to see no amendments to already approved projects, if it means allowing 3 storey dwellings at 83 Swayne Road development.		That the point of submission is rejected This request is outside of Councils jurisdiction to address. Tier 1 local authorities must implement the MDRS.
49.6	Support	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Activity Status Tables – 2A.4.1.1 Permitted Activities	Proposed Section 2A.4.1	Waikato-Tainui support the inclusion of provision of a Permitted Activity for up to 2 dwellings per site within the Infrastructure Constraint Qualifying Matter Overlay, a Restricted Discretionary Activity for developments of more than two dwellings within the overlay and a Permitted Activity for up to 3 dwellings per site outside the overlay. Waikato-Tainui support the justification for applying Te Ture Whaimana as a qualifying matter to make MDRS less enabling.	Retain Rules 2A.4.1.1(b) and (c).		Support noted
65.6	Amend	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Activity Status Tables – 2A.4.1.1 Permitted Activities	2A.4.1.1(e)	Often when subdividing a site, a garage or shed is left on the vacant lot. It is often required to store building material with the construction of a new dwelling, however as accessory buildings are only permitted if a residential dwelling is on the site, this should be removed to allow to have a shed or garage on a vacant lot.	Delete part Activity Status Table 2A.4.1.1 (e) (e) Accessory buildings to any permitted activity.	FS8 - support	That the point of submission is rejected Deleting this has repercussions in addition to that requested by the submitter. The current requirement is considered suitable to ensure control of accessory buildings.
68.8	Support in Part	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Activity Status Tables – 2A.4.1.1 Permitted Activities	2A.4.1.1(c)	Rule 2A.4.1.1(c) provides for up to two dwellings per site within the Infrastructure Constraint Qualifying Matter Overlay as a permitted activity, however this baseline may not actually be appropriate in all circumstances. There may be potential for PC26 to incorporate additional controls where certain criteria applies to help protect land identified for lower density residential development in a comprehensively designed Structure Plan.	Encourages Council to consider how PC26 might further support landowners / developers that wish to preserve a lower density than provided for in the MDRZ where these areas are identified through a comprehensively planned structure plan process. No specific relief sought other than to acknowledge that a private plan change for C5 may look to seek a new policy overlay for lower density / higher amenity parts of the development to strengthen the design outcomes.		No specific relief sought As Council is required to implement the MDRS to suitable urban areas, no changes are proposed for future development areas, or deferred zones surrounding these areas. Application and evaluation for lower density developments will have to be made against the relevant rules at the time these parcels of land are unlocked for development.
70.87	Oppose in Part	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Activity Status Tables – 2A.4.1.1 Permitted Activities	2A.4.1.1(b) and (c)	Seeks to amend Rules 2A.4.1.1(b) and (c) as they place unreasonable constraint on development density. The submitter considers density controls should not be used as a proxy to manage infrastructure constraints. A more targeted approach, such as the use of standards, is more appropriate.	Seeks to amend Rule 2A.4.1.1(b) and (c) as follows: (b) Up to three dwellings <u>or retirement units</u> per site outside of the Infrastructure Constraint Qualifying Matter Overlay. (c) Up to two dwellings per site within the Infrastructure Constraint Qualifying Matter Overlay. Add permitted activity standard to address infrastructure constraints. Consequential amendments to 2A.4.1.3(b) and (c) are required		That the point of submission is rejected PC26 provides for comprehensive development of sites, listing retirement villages specifically, as a restricted discretionary activity. This is considered appropriate considering their potential scale and intensity.
73.87	Oppose in Part	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Activity Status Tables – 2A.4.1.1 Permitted Activities	2A.4.1.1(b) and (c)	Seeks to amend Rules 2A.4.1.1(b) and (c) as they place unreasonable constraint on development density. The submitter considers density controls should not be used as a proxy to manage infrastructure constraints. A more targeted approach, such as the use of standards, is more appropriate.	Seeks to amend Rule 2A.4.1.1(b) and (c) as follows: (b) Up to three dwellings <u>or retirement units</u> per site outside of the Infrastructure Constraint Qualifying Matter Overlay. (c) Up to two dwellings per site within the Infrastructure Constraint Qualifying Matter Overlay. Add permitted activity standard to address infrastructure constraints. Consequential amendments to 2A.4.1.3(b) and (c) are required		That the point of submission is rejected PC26 provides for comprehensive development of sites, listing retirement villages specifically, as a restricted discretionary activity. This is considered appropriate considering their potential scale and intensity.
76.2	Support	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Activity Status Tables – 2A.4.1.1 Permitted Activities	2A.4.1.1(b) and (c)	Support Rules 2A.4.1(b) and (c) for up to three dwellings per site outside of the Infrastructure Constraint Qualifying Matter Overlay.	Supports Rules 2A.4.1(b) and (c).		Support noted.

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
79.218	Oppose in part	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Activity Status Tables - 2A.4.1.1 Permitted Activities	2A.4.1.1	Supports the balance of permitted activities in 2A.4.1.1 as notified.	Include the balance of permitted activity in 2A.4.1.1 as notified.		Support noted
79.219	Support in part	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Activity Status Tables - 2A.4.1.2 Controlled Activities	2A.4.1.2	Supports the controlled activities in 2A.4.1.2 as notified.	Include the activities in 2A.4.1.2 as notified, to the extent consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.		Support noted
47.16	Support	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Activity Status Tables - 2A.4.1.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities	2A.4.1	Supports the matters of discretion associated with 2A.4.1.3(b) and (c). Given that Section 21 – Assessment Criteria and Information Requirements sets out the full suite of matters of control / discretion, Fire and Emergency support the cross referencing of Section 21 in Activity Status Table 15.4.1, as relevant.	Retain 2A.4.1 as notified.		Support noted
65.7	Amend	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Activity Status Tables - 2A.4.1.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities	2A.4.1.3 (b)	Within the matters of discretion, this should not include density as there is no effect of density, potentially could mean residential amenity?	Amend 2A.4.1.3(b): Four or more dwellings per site outside of the Infrastructure Constraint Qualifying Matter Overlay. Activities that fail to comply with this rule will require a resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity with discretion being restricted over: • Building location, bulk and design; and • Development density; and • ...		That the point of submission is rejected Disagree, there could be effects from increased density, and this is why there are controls over density.
65.8	Amend	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Activity Status Tables - 2A.4.1.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities	2A.4.1.3 (c)	Within the matters of discretion, this should not include density as there is no effect of density, potentially could mean residential amenity?	Activity Status Table Rule 2A.4.1.3 (c) Three or more dwellings per site within the infrastructure Constraint Qualifying Matter Overlay. Activities that fail to comply with this rule will require a resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity with discretion being restricted over: • Building location, bulk and design; and • Development density; and • ...		That the point of submission is rejected Disagree, there could be effects from increased density, and this is why there are controls over density.
68.5	Amend	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Activity Status Tables - 2A.4.1.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities	2A.4.1.3	Rules 2A.4.1.3(g), 2A.4.1.3(h), 2A.4.1.4(h) and 2A.4.1.5(a) mean that local centres and neighbourhood centres, including activities such as medical centres, offices, restaurants, cafes and other eating places in structure plan areas other than in C2/C3 in Cambridge and T11 in Te Awamutu or within a listed heritage building in Appendix N1-Heritage Items are non-complying activities. This seems an overly onerous activity status given the policy setting and inherent need for commercial activities of this nature to support residential growth. There should be a less onerous pathway for consenting neighbourhood centres that are in general accordance with an approved structure plan.	Amend Rule 2A.4.1.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities by adding specific reference to neighbourhood centres in accordance with an approved Structure Plan as follows: <u>(m) Neighbourhood centres within a growth cell Structure Plan Area, located in general accordance with an approved Structure Plan and limited to the following activities:</u> <u>(i) Café, dining and ancillary activities.</u> <u>(ii) Commercial retail and service activities.</u> <u>(iii) Commercial offices or residential activities, limited to above ground floor.</u> <u>(iv) Early childcare education facilities.</u> <u>Discretion will be restricted to the following matters:</u> • Building location, bulk and design; and • Visual and amenity effects on surrounding properties; <u>and</u> • Location of parking areas and vehicle manoeuvring; and • Impacts on surrounding open space amenity and pedestrian safety; and • Location, colour, size and content of signs; and • Infrastructure effects; and • Alignment with any relevant Urban Design Guidelines approved by Council		That the point of submission is rejected This amendment is better addressed when specific growth cells are unlocked for development and a specific plan change can be made rather than an overall rule to apply to all growth cell structure plans.

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
79.221	Oppose in part	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Activity Status Tables - 2A.4.1.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities	2A.4.1.3	The reference to 'failing to comply with this rule' should be deleted, given it is not a rule but an activity.	Reference to 'failing to comply with this rule' be deleted from 2A.4.1.3.		That the point of submission is rejected The use of the word 'rule' is not considered misleading.
79.223	Oppose in part	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Activity Status Tables - 2A.4.1.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities	2A.4.1.3	Generally, supports the referencing of the established assessment criteria under the operative provisions. However, in light of the NPS-UD and acknowledgement that existing environments will change in response to the planned urban built form character and amenity, the existing matters of discretion need to be reframed to account for this. The matters for discretion and associated assessment criteria can be rationalised to ensure effective and efficient plan-administration.	Amend the matters of discretion for residential dwellings, to refine the scope of any assessment and ensure assessment relates to the planned urban built-form character of the zone consistent with the NPS-UD and the overall Kāinga Ora submission.		No specific relief sought. Specific relief addressed in later submission points.
79.225	Oppose in part	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Activity Status Tables - 2A.4.1.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities	2A.4.1.3	Generally supports the referencing of the established assessment criteria under the operative provisions. However, in light of the NPS-UD and acknowledgement that existing environments will change in response to the planned urban built form character and amenity, the existing matters of discretion need to be reframed to account for this. The matters for discretion and associated assessment criteria can be rationalised to ensure effective and efficient plan-administration. An additional matter for discretion in relation to three waters for four or more dwellings per site seeks to ensure the appropriate assessment is undertaken, given Kāinga Ora's submission points seeking deletion of the infrastructure constraints overlay.	Amend 2A.4.1.3 as follows: 2A.4.1.3 Restricted discretionary activities (a)... (b)... Activities that fail to comply with this rule will require a resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity with discretion being restricted over: - The extent to which the scale, form and appearance of the development is compatible with the planned urban built form character of the neighbourhood. - The extent to which the development delivers quality on-site amenity and occupant privacy that is appropriate for its scale. - The extent to which the development contributes to a safe and attractive public realm and streetscape. - The effects on three waters infrastructure, achieved by demonstrating that at the point of connection the infrastructure has the capacity to service the development. - Building location, bulk and design; and - Development density; and - Landscaping; and - Location of parking areas and vehicle manoeuvring; and - Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design; and - Traffic generation and connectivity; and - Privacy within and between adjoining sites; and - Noise; and - The outcomes of an infrastructure capacity assessment; and - Stormwater disposal; and - Alignment with any relevant Urban Design Guidelines adopted by Council.		That the point of submission is rejected The Infrastructure Constraint qualifying matter is recommended to be deleted The matters of discretion are expanded on in Section 21 of the plan so these expanded matters are not recommended to be adopted in this instance.
79.227	Oppose	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Activity Status Tables - 2A.4.1.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities	2A.4.1.3(c)	Consistent with the submission on 2A.4.1(b) and (c), Kāinga Ora opposes the application of the infrastructure qualifying matter overlay and therefore the activity is no longer required.	Delete 2A.4.1.3(c) and any reference to this provision.		That the point of submission is rejected As outlined in the infrastructure qualifying matter topic, the Infrastructure Constraint qualifying matter is not recommended to be deleted.
30.22	Oppose	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Activity Status Tables - 2A.4.1.4 Discretionary Activities	2A.4.1.4(i)	Policy 2A.3.8.7 "enables" additions to local shops due to the social and community function they serve, but the related rule requires discretionary consent for additions to existing local shops. The category of this rule does not align with the enabling wording of the policy.	Delete rule 2A.4.1.4(i) from the discretionary activity list and add it to the permitted activity list.		Support amendment in part This request has implications beyond the scope of PC26.

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
47.18	Oppose	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Activity Status Tables - 2A.4.1.4 Discretionary Activities	2A.4.1.4	Notes that emergency service facilities are not provided for in the MDRZ and therefore defaults to a non-complying activity. Fire and Emergency therefore seeks that emergency service facilities be included in 2A.4.1.4 as a discretionary activity as fire stations are an integral component of the urban environment and provide for the health, safety and wellbeing of people in the community.	Add new activity as follows: 2A.4.1.4 Discretionary activities <u>(m) emergency service facilities</u>		That the point of submission is accepted This addition to the MDRZ provisions is considered to be logical.
79.232	Support in part	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Activity Status Tables - 2A.4.1.4 Discretionary Activities	2A.4.1.4	It is appropriate to enable a permitted level of development for Papakāinga housing to align with permitted levels of development for residential activities, and Papakāinga should be removed as a discretionary activity.	Include the activities in 2A.4.1.4 as notified with the following changes, to the extent consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora: 2A.4.1.4 Discretionary activities ... (c) Churches, community centres, Papakāinga and marae		That the point of submission is rejected A separate plan change is proposed to address papakāinga development comprehensively throughout the entire Plan.
38.27	Support	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Activity Status Tables - 2A.4.1.5 Non Complying Activities	2A.4.1.5(h)	Supports the rule but notes that it is necessary that the rule refers to all relevant National Grid Yard performance standards, including 2A.4.2.49 (consistent with Rule 2.4.1.5(j) and the reference in 2A.4.2.49 itself).	Amend Rule 2A.4.1.5(h)(iii) as follows: (iii) Any building, structure or earthworks which fail to comply with Rules 2A.4.2.47, and 2A.4.2.48 <u>and</u> 2A.4.2.49.		That the point of submission is accepted Minor and logical update.
79.234	Support in part	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Activity Status Tables - 2A.4.1.5 Non Complying Activities	2A.4.1.5	Supports the activities as notified, to the extent consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.	Include the activities in 2A.4.1.5 as notified, to the extent consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.		Support noted
79.235	Oppose	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Activity Status Tables - 2A.4.1.6 Prohibited Activities	2A.4.1.6	Opposes the identification of fortified sites as a prohibited activity.	Delete 2A.4.1.6(a) fortified sites from 2A.4.1.6 Prohibited Activities in its entirety.		That the point of submission is rejected Fortified Site rules have not been changed by PC26. They remain a Prohibited Activity in the Residential Zone and this has been carried through to the MDRZ.
10.2	Oppose	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Performance Standards	2A.4.2	Effects such as lack of sunlight, clean air, noise control, possibility of animals, high density of car parking will negatively affect standards of living in the Waipā region.	Will sprinkler systems or similar be mandatory.		No amendment necessary The requirement for sprinklers is addressed under the Building Act.
10.3	Oppose	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Performance Standards	2A.4.2	Effects such as lack of sunlight, clean air, noise control, possibility of animals, high density of car parking will negatively affect standards of living in the Waipā region.	Will the disabled be consulted on any final decisions and will properties have to have suitable access.		No amendment necessary Universal access requirements are addressed under the Building Act.
10.4	Oppose	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Performance Standards	2A.4.2	Effects such as lack of sunlight, clean air, noise control, possibility of animals, high density of car parking will negatively affect standards of living in the Waipā region.	Will the 3x3 be suitable for aged and larger families.		No amendment necessary Tier 1 local authorities must implement the MDRS.
13.4	Oppose	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Performance Standards	2A.4.2.36	The courts have ruled multiple times that permitted activity standards must be clear and require no subjective assessment. This standard does not meet the requirement.	Delete standard 2A.4.2.36.		That the point of submission is rejected Provisions are clear. This provision requires that in the MDRZ water bodies and reserves are fronted by either the front or side façade of a dwelling or the activity becomes discretionary.
30.32	Oppose	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Performance Standards	2A.4.2.54(f)	Does not support reducing permitted permeable surface areas as it will increase flow volumes into receiving environments that are already significantly degraded. Increasing impermeable surfaces is inconsistent with best practice stormwater management and policies to protect freshwater ecosystems. An increase in impermeable surfaces should be offset by green infrastructure and low-impact stormwater.	Amend rule 2A.4.2.54(f) to require 30% of the net site area to be permeable.		That the point of submission is rejected The Compact Housing provisions, including 2A.4.2.36, have been retained in error and are recommended to be deleted. We would expect an infrastructure assessment to assess the impermeable area and make recommendations potential stormwater management and mitigation.

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
32.12	Amend	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Performance Standards	2A.4.2.9	The rule relating to impermeable surfaces in the current Residential Zone has been retained in the new Medium Density Residential Zone, including the specific exceptions relating to the Cambridge North Structure Plan Area and the St Kilda Structure Plan Area. However, the alternative standard applying to the St Kilda Structure Plan Area was omitted from the notified plan change.	Reinstate Rule 2.4.42.14 and 2.4.42.15 as Rules 2A.4.2.10 and 2A.4.2.11 (and consequential renumbering) as follows: <u>Rules – Maximum site coverage and permeable surfaces: St Kilda Structure Plan Area Site coverage and impermeable surfaces of residential lots shall not exceed 700m². The balance of the net area of each lot, once site coverage and impermeable surfaces have been taken into account, shall be grassed, planted in trees and or shrubs or otherwise landscaped in a manner that retains the permeable nature of the surface. Activities that fail to comply with Rules 2A.4.2.10 and 2A.4.2.11 will require a resource consent for a discretionary activity.</u> Or: (2) Amend Rule 2A.4.2.9 as follows: 2A.4.2.9 Impermeable surfaces must not exceed: (a) 45% of the net site area in the Cambridge North Structure Plan Area and the St Kilda Structure Plan Area; or (b) 60% of the net site area in the remainder of the Zone (except St Kilda Structure Plan Area).		That the point of submission is accepted Reinstate Rule 2.4.42.14 and 2.4.42.15 as Rules 2A.4.2.10 and 2A.4.2.11 (and consequential renumbering) as follows: <u>Rules – Maximum site coverage and permeable surfaces: St Kilda Structure Plan Area Site coverage and impermeable surfaces of residential lots shall not exceed 700m². The balance of the net area of each lot, once site coverage and impermeable surfaces have been taken into account, shall be grassed, planted in trees and or shrubs or otherwise landscaped in a manner that retains the permeable nature of the surface.</u> <u>Activities that fail to comply with Rules 2A.4.2.10 and 2A.4.2.11 will require a resource consent for a discretionary activity.</u>
32.13	Amend	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Performance Standards	2A.4.2.9	The rule relating to impermeable surfaces in the current Residential Zone has been retained in the new Medium Density Residential Zone, including the specific exceptions relating to the Cambridge North Structure Plan Area and the St Kilda Structure Plan Area. However, the alternative standard applying to the St Kilda Structure Plan Area was omitted from the notified plan change.	In the alternative to Submission 32.12, amend Rule 2A.4.2.9 as follows: 2A.4.2.9 Impermeable surfaces must not exceed: (a) 45% of the net site area in the Cambridge North Structure Plan Area and the St Kilda Structure Plan Area; or (b) 60% of the net site area in the remainder of the Zone (except St Kilda Structure Plan Area).		See submission point 32.12
38.6	Amend	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Performance Standards	2.4.2.36	Supports the retention of the earthworks rule within the residential zone. While transpower is neutral on the minor amendments proposed, it queries the necessity of this change and considers that it is unclear how the change arises as a consequence of implementing the Act. Transpower also notes that the proposed change to numbering of references within the rule (i.e. to 27) do not align with the numbering of the rule, which is shown as retained (i.e. 36); and that the changes are not consistent with the rule proposed in the MRZ (i.e. Rule 2A.4.2.47 still includes "Provided that").	Retain Rule 2.4.2.36, but ensure the references within the rules align with the numbering of the rule itself, and that the drafting is consistent with Rule 2A.4.2.47.		No amendment necessary The changes recommended to rule 2A.4.1.5(h)(iii) align with what is currently in the equivalent Residential Zone rules.
38.28	Support	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Performance Standards	2A.4.2.47	Supports the rule being carried over to the Medium Density Residential Zone. Rule 2A.4.2.47 and Rule 2.4.2.36 should be worded consistently.	Retain Rule 2A.4.2.47 and word it and Rule 2.4.2.36 consistently.		No amendment necessary Provisions consistent.
38.29	Amend	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Performance Standards	2.4.2.36	Rule 2.4.2.36 and Rule 2A.4.2.47 should be worded consistently.	Rule 2A.4.2.47 and Rule 2.4.2.36 should be worded consistently.		No amendment necessary Provisions consistent.
38.30	Support	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Performance Standards	2A.4.2.48	Supports rule 2A.4.2.48 being carried over to the Medium Density Residential Zone. This also ensures that the relevant provisions within the ODP applying to the National Grid Yard are applied within PC26 as a qualifying matter.	Retain Rule 2A.4.2.48.		Support noted
38.31	Support	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Performance Standards	2A.4.2.49	Supports rule 2A.4.2.49 being carried over to the Medium Density Residential Zone. This also ensures that the relevant provisions within the ODP applying to the National Grid Yard are applied within PC26 as a qualifying matter.	Retain Rule 2A.4.2.49.		Support noted

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
47.22	Support	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Performance Standards	2A.4.2.37	Supports the exclusion of use or testing of station and vehicle sirens or alarms used by emergency services from the noise limits in the MDRZ.	Retain 2A.4.2.37 as notified.		Support noted
47.23	Support	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Performance Standards	2A.4.2.53	Supports the exemption of emergency vehicles from this rule.	Retain 2A.4.2.53 as notified.		Support noted
49.15	Amend	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Performance Standards	2A.4.1.1(b)	Waikato-Tainui consider an infrastructure assessment should be required regardless of whether or not the site is within a constraint overlay or not where it is proposed to establish more than two dwellings on a site. This will better implement and achieve Te Ture Whaimana. PC26 does not outline what assessment criteria is required under an infrastructure capacity assessment.	Amend proposed Section 2A to require an infrastructure capacity assessment for all activities of more than two dwellings on a site. And any consequential amendments or alternative relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.		That the point of submission is accepted in part An Infrastructure Capacity Assessment for 3 or more dwellings in the Infrastructure Constraint qualifying matter is required by 2A.4.1.3(c). Less than three dwelling (i.e. 1 or 2) does not require an ICA as the overlay is proposed to be retained.
63.7	Support	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Performance Standards	2A.4.2.40 - 2A.4.2.41	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.	Retain Rules-Noise Insulation: noise sensitive activities (2A.4.2.40 - 2A.4.2.41) as notified.	FS8 - oppose	Support noted
65.9	Amend	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Performance Standards	2A.4.2.9 (b)	The different coverage for the Cambridge North Structure Plan Area is included as part of this rule, but then the St Kilda Structure Plan Area is excluded without stating what the rule for impervious surfaces there is, or being directly followed by the equivalent rule. It also appears that Council forgot to include within the Medium Density Zone section any controls for impermeable surfaces for the St Kilda Structure Plan Area.	Amend as follows: Rule 2A.4.2.9 Impermeable surfaces must not exceed: (a) 45% of the net site area in the Cambridge North Structure Plan Area; or (b) % of the net site area in the St Kilda Structure Plan Area; or (bc) 60% of the net site area in the remainder of the Zone (% to be entered in (b) for the impermeable surfaces control that Council intended to be within the District Plan following PC26).		That the point of submission is accepted See response to submission point 32.12
65.10	Oppose	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Performance Standards	2A.4.2.22	There isn't a clear RMA purpose of Rule 2A.4.2.22. Providing roof pitches of these angles doesn't necessarily equate to quality urban design outcomes. Suggest remove.	Delete in full: Rule 2A.4.2.22 A residential dwelling of 2 or more stories shall have a minimum roof pitch of: (a) 30 degrees in any character area or compact housing area overlay (b) 15 degrees in all other parts of the zone		That the point of submission is accepted in part Reference to the compact housing overlay was retained in error. Pitch of roof restricted in character cluster areas retained. Roof pitch provisions should also remain across the remainder of the zone as these form part of the district's broader urban character.
65.12	Oppose	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Performance Standards	2A.4.2.62	There isn't a clear RMA purpose of Rule 2A.4.2.62. Surely the aesthetic and weatherproof finish of relocated structures is more appropriately covered by the Building Act / Building Code / Building consent process.	Delete in full Rule 2A.4.2.62 A relocated building over 40m² GFA shall meet the following requirements: ---		That the point of submission is rejected The Plan includes policies to support the exterior of relocated building been to a standard that does not detract from residential amenity. This rule supports the implementation of this policy.
67.1	Amend	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Performance Standards	2A.4.2.21	It is considered that this is an excessive requirement, that will result in inefficient outcomes with regards to thermal loss. In particular, this blanket approach doesn't account for orientation of the façade, and whether the loss from such a large area of glazing can be balanced with solar gains from sunlight access.	Amend 2A.4.2.21: 2A.4.2.21 Any residential dwelling facing the street: (a) On a northern orientation must have a minimum of 2015% of the street-facing façade in glazing, and (b) On a southern orientation must have a minimum of 8% of the street-facing façade in glazing. This can be in the form of windows or doors. Orientation of façade shall be determined using the methodology in Appendix O6.		That the point of submission is rejected This provision is a requirement of the MDRS.
67.2	Amend	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Performance Standards	2A.4.2.31	It is considered that this is an excessive requirement, that will result in inefficient outcomes with regards to thermal loss. In particular, this blanket approach doesn't account for orientation of the façade, and whether the loss from such a large area of glazing can be balanced with solar gains from sunlight access.	Amend 2A.4.2.31: 2A.4.2.31 The minimum area of glazing on the front façade(s) of a building that adjoins a reserve shall be 15% for the façade facing a northern orientation, and 8% for		That the point of submission is rejected This requirement aligns with Councils direction to have active facades facing reserves.

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
					<p>the façade facing a southern orientation, using the methodology in Appendix O6.</p> <p>Provided that:</p> <p>(a) Where a site adjoins a reserve, the front façade(s) of a building shall be all the sides of a building that faces the public place; and (b) Where the front façade(s) of a building is not parallel to a reserve, the minimum area of glazing shall only apply to the longest wall facing the public place; and</p> <p>(b) Where the front facade(s) of a building is not parallel to a reserve, the minimum area of glazing shall only apply to the longest wall facing the public place; and</p> <p>(c) Where the front façade(s) of a building is not parallel to a reserve and the façades facing the reserve are of equal length, then the façade at the least acute angle to the public place shall be deemed to be the front façade and the 45% above glazing requirement shall only apply to that façade; and</p> <p>(d) The percentage area of glazing shall be measured as the framed wall opening size to accommodate the entire window.</p> <p>(e) This rule shall not apply to relocated buildings or a garage that is an accessory building.</p>		
70.93	Support in Part	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Performance Standards	2A.2.4 .2 and 2A.4.2 .3	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>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</p> <p>(a) a boundary with a road</p> <p>(b) existing or proposed internal boundaries within a site</p> <p>(c) site boundaries where there is an existing common wall between 2 buildings on adjacent sties or where a common wall is proposed</p> <p>(d) boundaries adjoining the Commercial Zone, Industrial Zone or Deferred Zones.</p>		<p>That the point of submission is rejected</p> <p>This request is not supported as these provisions are from the MDRS and the MDRS have made the height to boundary provisions more permissive.</p>
70.95	Support in Part	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Performance Standards	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.	Amend rule 2A.4.2.6 as required following review of qualifying matter areas.		<p>That the point of submission is rejected</p> <p>The qualifying matters referred to in 2A.4.2.6 are not recommended to be modified.</p>
70.96	Support in Part	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Performance Standards	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.	Amend Rule 2A.4.2.6 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>That the point of submission is rejected</p> <p>It would be confusing if the activity status of retirement villages and construction of buildings for them were to have different activity statuses.</p>
70.97	Support in Part	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Performance Standards	2A.4.2 .7 and 2A.4.2 .8	Seeks the removal of Rule 2A.4.2.8 as it does not align with clause 14 of the MDRS and building coverage is not directly relevant to the stormwater qualifying matter (the impermeable surface standard should be used instead).	<p>Seeks that Rule 2A.4.2.8 is deleted as follows:</p> <p>2A.4.2.7 The maximum building coverage must not exceed 50% of the net site area.</p> <p>2A.4.2.8 On sites located within the Stormwater Qualifying Matter and the River / Gully Proximity Qualifying Matter Overlays, the maximum building coverage must not exceed 40% of the net site area.</p>		<p>That the point of submission is rejected</p> <p>Retain River/Gully Proximity Qualifying Matter. This links to s6matters – preservation of natural character (s6a), protection of areas of significant vegetation (s6c) and s6e as well as NPS FM and Te Ture Whaimana</p> <p>Seek amendment to matters of discretion that for activities that fail to comply with Rule 2A.4.2.7 to include ‘Effects on the function and associated amenity values of the adjacent reserve, where applicable’</p> <p>Seek amendment to assessment criteria 24.1.2A.9 to add criteria related to:</p> <p>The extent to which any increase in the level of site coverage will affect or has the potential to affect adjoining reserve function, amenity values and biodiversity values.</p>

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
							The extent to which any increase in the level of site coverage will affect the biodiversity values of the site (or similar rule to protect existing biodiversity values) The extent to which any increase in the level of site coverage will affect the water quality and instream habitats of rivers and waterbodies in the water catchment that the site is within. this is a planning question, however as indicated in previous responses, the infrastructure assessment would manage impervious areas and potential mitigation
70.99	Oppose in Part	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Performance Standards	2A.4.2.9	Opposes Rule 2A.4.2.9 (Impermeable surfaces standards) as a 60% impermeable surface standard is likely to bar the practical achievement of the 50% building coverage standard. the submitter considers the impermeable surface standard is a better tool to regulate the stormwater qualifying matter, except that it should provide for technical solutions (such as retention and detention).	Seeks that Rule 2A.4.2.9 is amended to provide a 70% impervious surface standard.		That the point of submission is rejected The pipe capacity (10 year + RCP 6) and flood hazard modelling (100 year +RCP 6) provides the basis for the qualifying overlays. An infrastructure assessment will inform technical solutions.
70.106	Oppose	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Performance Standards	2A.4.2.22	The submitter opposes Rule 2A.4.2.22 (roof pitch standard) as the MDRS do not include this standard.	Delete Rule 2A.4.2.22.		That the point of submission is accepted in part Reference to the compact housing overlay was retained in error. Pitch of roof restricted in character cluster areas retained. Roof pitch provisions should also remain across the remainder of the zone as these form part of the district's broader urban character.
70.109	Oppose	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Performance Standards	2A.4.2.31 - 2A.4.2.36	Rules 2A.4.2.31 – 2A.4.2.35 do not align with the MDRS provisions.	Delete Rules 2A.4.2.31 – 2A.4.2.36.		That the point of submission is rejected These rules support the Qualifying Matters to preserve the natural character of rivers and their margins, open space for public use, maintenance and enhancement of public access to and along rivers. Critical rules to support good urban design and open space network outcomes.
72.27	Oppose	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Performance Standards	2A.4.2.46	It is not appropriate for the Plan to include a restriction on the volume of earthworks which would unnecessarily limit residential development. Regional resource consents may separately be required for significant earthworks.	Delete 2A.4.2.46 Rule-Earthworks.		That the point of submission is rejected Regional Council and District Councils can both have earthworks provisions evaluate the effects of earthworks from their differing areas of focus.
73.93	Support in Part	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Performance Standards	2A.2.4.2 and 2A.4.2.3	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.	Seeks to amend Rule 2A.4.2.3 as follows to include additional exclusions from this standard: 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 (d) boundaries adjoining the Commercial Zone, Industrial Zone or Deferred Zones.	FS8 – support in part	That the point of submission is rejected This request is not supported as these provisions are from the MDRS and the MDRS have made the height to boundary provisions more permissive.
73.95	Support in Part	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Performance Standards	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.	Amend rule 2A.4.2.6 as required following review of qualifying matter areas.		That the point of submission is rejected The qualifying matters are not recommended to be altered.
73.96	Support in Part	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Performance Standards	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.	Amend Rule 2A.4.2.6 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).	FS8 - oppose	That the point of submission is rejected It would be confusing if the activity status of retirement villages and construction of buildings for them were to have different activity statuses.

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
73.97	Support in Part	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Performance Standards	2A.4.2.7 and 2A.4.2.8	Seeks the removal of Rule 2A.4.2.8 as it does not align with clause 14 of the MDRS and building coverage is not directly relevant to the stormwater qualifying matter (the impermeable surface standard should be used instead).	Seeks that Rule 2A.4.2.8 is deleted as follows: 2A.4.2.7 The maximum building coverage must not exceed 50% of the net site area. 2A.4.2.8 On sites located within the Stormwater Qualifying Matter and the River / Gully Proximity Qualifying Matter Overlays, the maximum building coverage must not exceed 40% of the net site area.		That the point of submission is rejected Retain River/Gully Proximity Qualifying Matter. This links to s6matters – preservation of natural character (s6a), protection of areas of significant vegetation (s6c) and s6e as well as NPS FM and Te Ture Whaimana
73.99	Oppose in Part	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Performance Standards	2A.4.2.9	Opposes Rule 2A.4.2.9 (Impermeable surfaces standards) as a 60% impermeable surface standard is likely to bar the practical achievement of the 50% building coverage standard. the submitter considers the impermeable surface standard is a better tool to regulate the stormwater qualifying matter, except that it should provide for technical solutions (such as retention and detention).	Seeks that Rule 2A.4.2.9 is amended to provide a 70% impervious surface standard.		That the point of submission is rejected The pipe capacity (10 year + RCP 6) and flood hazard modelling (100 year +RCP 6) provides the basis for the qualifying overlays. An infrastructure assessment will inform technical solutions.
73.106	Oppose	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Performance Standards	2A.4.2.22	The submitter opposes Rule 2A.4.2.22 (roof pitch standard) as the MDRS do not include this standard.	Delete Rule 2A.4.2.22.		Support amendment in part Reference to the compact housing overlay was retained in error. Pitch of roof restricted in character cluster areas retained. Roof pitch provisions should also remain across the reminder of the zone as these form part of the district's broader urban character.
73.109	Oppose	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Performance Standards	2A.4.2.31 - 2A.4.2.36	Rules 2A.4.2.31 – 2A.4.2.35 do not align with the MDRS provisions.	Delete Rules 2A.4.2.31 – 2A.4.2.36.		That the point of submission is rejected These rules support the Qualifying Matters to preserve the natural character of rivers and their margins, open space for public use, maintenance and enhancement of public access to and along rivers. Critical rules to support good urban design and open space network outcomes.
76.3	Support	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Performance Standards	2A.4.2.1	Supports the Building Height Rule 2A.4.2.1.	Supports Building Height Rule 2A.4.2.1.	FS7 – support in part	Support noted
76.4	Support	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Performance Standards	2A.2.4.2	Supports Height in Relation to Boundary Rule 2A.2.4.2.	Supports Height in Relation to Boundary Rule 2A.2.4.2.		Support noted
76.5	Support	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Performance Standards	2A.4.2.4	Supports Setbacks Rule 2A.4.2.4.	Supports Setbacks Rule 2A.4.2.4.		Support noted
76.6	Support	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Performance Standards	2A.4.2.7 and 2A.4.2.8	Supports Building Coverage Rule 2A.4.2.7 and 2A.4.2.8.	Supports Building Coverage Rule 2A.4.2.7 and 2A.4.2.8.		Support noted
76.7	Support	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Performance Standards	2A.4.2.9	Supports Impermeable Surface Rule 2A.4.2.9.	Supports Impermeable Surface Rule 2A.4.2.9.		Support noted
79.89	Oppose	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Performance Standards	2.4.2.51	Opposes any rules that differentiate relocated buildings from dwellings or residential activities. The matters within rule 2.4.2.51 can be addressed through the building consent process.	Delete Rule 2.4.2.51 Relocated buildings in its entirety.		That the point of submission is rejected This rule is in the Residential Zone and is largely unchanged by PC26. Objectives and Policies in the ODP and in PC26 support controls on relocated buildings.

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
79.104	Support in part	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Performance Standards		Seeks the introduction of a HDRZ to be included in the District Plan and applied within a 400m walkable catchment of the Te Awamutu Town Centre.	Consequential amendments to Town Centre maximum building heights are required to ensure a proportionate built form within the Te Awamutu centre. Proposed heights are identified in Appendix 3 to the submission and identify a 'Business Height Variation Overlay' of 24.5m.		That the point of submission is rejected Retention of the existing Commercial Zone height and density requirements is appropriate, within the commercial "non-centres" zones (excluding Cambridge and Te Awamutu town centres and Leamington suburban centre), given that there is capacity available, and this will more than provide for the long-term market demand. There may be an opportunity for some refinement of "centre" commercial zones to facilitate some additional intensification within the centre and immediately adjacent the centre (refer to 9.51 – 9.5.2) in an effort to provide for increased choice and typology and to better differentiate the Cambridge and Te Awamutu town centres from the other general commercial zones across the district
79.246	Oppose in part	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Performance Standards	2A.4.2.8	A 10% reduction in building coverage to 40% as proposed in 2A.4.2.8 is not efficient or effective, where there are other alternative methods and options that have not been explored to address the issues.	Amendments sought to Rules - Building Coverage as follows: Rules - Building Coverage 2A.4.2.7 ... 2A.4.2.8 On sites located within the Stormwater Qualifying Matter and the River / Gully Proximity Qualifying Matter Overlays, the maximum building coverage must not exceed 40% of the net site area. Activities that fail to comply with this Rule 2A.4.2.7 to 2A.4.2.8 will require a resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity....		That the point of submission is rejected Retain River/Gully Proximity Qualifying Matter. This links to s6matters – preservation of natural character (s6a), protection of areas of significant vegetation (s6c) and s6e as well as NPS FM and Te Ture Whaimana. Intention of reduction isn't solely about stormwater management. The pipe capacity (10 year + RCP 6) and flood hazard modelling (100 year +RCP 6) provides the basis for the qualifying overlays. An infrastructure assessment will inform technical solutions.
79.247	Oppose in part	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Performance Standards	2A.4.2.7	Supportive of the building coverage under 2A.4.2.7, which is consistent with the Enabling Housing Supply Act. As the standard is consistent with the MDRS building coverage metric it should be highlighted in the same manner as the other standards.	Supports Rules - Building Coverage 2A.4.2.7 and as the standard is consistent with the MDRS building coverage metric, it should be highlighted in the same manner as other standards.		Amendment supported 2A.4.2.7 is an MDRS standard so should be highlighted.
79.248	Support in part	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Performance Standards	2A.4.2.9	Supports the standard as notified and the need to manage impervious surfaces generally across the zone and associated stormwater.	Include the activities in Rule-Impermeable surfaces 2A.4.2.9 as notified, to the extent consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.		Support noted
79.249	Oppose	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Performance Standards	2A.4.2.22	Opposes this standard as it is restrictive and specific which does not enable a variety of roof lines to add interest to the streetscape.	Delete Rules – Roof Pitch 2A.4.2.22: 2A.4.2.22 A residential dwelling of 2 or more stories shall have a minimum roof pitch of: (a) 30 degrees in any character area or compact housing area overlay (b) 15 degrees in all other parts of the zone		That the point of submission is accepted in part Reference to the compact housing overlay was retained in error. Pitch of roof restricted in character cluster areas. No reason to restrict roof pitches in all other areas. Amend rule 2A.4.2.22 as follows: 2.4.2.22 A residential dwelling of 2 or more stories shall have a minimum roof pitch of: (a) 30 degrees in any character <u>cluster</u> area. or compact housing area overlay (b) 15 degrees in all other parts of the zone
79.250	Support	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Performance Standards	2A.4.2.31 - 2A.4.2.35	Supports the standard as notified. It will ensure an appropriate interface to public spaces, promoting passive surveillance while ensuring privacy for residential occupants is achieved and secure specific design outcomes in structure plan areas.	Include Rules - Neighbourhood amenity and safety 2A.4.2.31, 2A.4.2.32, 2A.4.2.33, 2A.4.2.34 and 2A.4.2.35 as notified.		Support noted
79.251	Support in Part	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Performance Standards	2A.4.2.36	Supportive of this standard. However, the orientation and location of the buildings on the site are dependent on the shape, size and topography of the site which may not enable development to achieve this standard. For this reason, Kāinga Ora consider that non-compliance should be assessed as a restricted discretionary activity with discretion limited to design and layout of the proposed dwellings.	Include Rule-Design and Layout of Development adjoining Water bodies and Reserves 2A.4.2.36 as notified with non-compliance with the standard amended to be a restricted discretionary activity: Rule - Design and layout of development adjoining water bodies and reserves 2A.4.2.36 Within the Medium Density Residential Zone, the design and layout of development shall ensure that water bodies and reserves are fronted by either the front or side façade of a dwelling.		That the point of submission is rejected Retain as discretionary activity. Critical rule to support good urban design and open space network outcomes. Matters for consideration shouldn't be restricted.

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
					Activities that fail to comply with this rule will require a resource consent for a <u>restricted discretionary activity, with the discretion being restricted over: Design and layout of the proposal in relation to the adjoining water body.</u> These matters will be considered in accordance with the <u>assessment criteria in Section 21.</u>		
79.252	Support in Part	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Performance Standards	2A.4.2.39	Support the standards as notified, and the need to ensure that activities within the zone do not generate excessive levels of noise that would compromise residential amenity.	Include Rule-Construction noise 2A.4.2.39 as notified.		Support noted
79.253	Support in Part	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Performance Standards	2A.4.2.46	The threshold for earthworks does not enable the anticipated level of development on sites within the medium density residential zone. Kāinga Ora request that the earthworks rules are amended to enable up to three dwellings on a site without requiring consent for earthworks. Provision should also be made for activities that exceed the earthworks threshold being considered as a Restricted Discretionary Activity.	Amend Rule -Earthworks 2A.4.2.46 to enable a level of earthworks to facilitate up to three dwellings per site, supported by an additional note advising that sediment control guidelines should be adhered to.		That the point of submission is accepted in part The earthworks limits should be increased to account for additional development potential as a permitted activity. The limits are recommended to be tripled.
79.254	Oppose in Part	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Performance Standards	2A.4.2.46	The threshold for earthworks does not enable the anticipated level of development on sites within the medium density residential zone. Kāinga Ora request that the earthworks rules are amended to enable up to three dwellings on a site without requiring consent for earthworks. Provision should also be made for activities that exceed the earthworks threshold being considered as a Restricted Discretionary Activity.	Amend Rules - Earthworks 2A.4.2.46 as follows: 2A.4.2.46 Earthworks shall not exceed a total volume of 250m³ or a total area of 21000m² in a single activity or in cumulative activities in any calendar year, provided that this rule shall not apply to earthworks incidental to an approved resource consent or building consent. Advice Notes: 1. 5. <u>Earthworks should adhere to TR 2009/02 Erosion and sediment control: guidelines for soil disturbing activities, Waikato Regional Council.</u>		That the point of submission is accepted in part The earthworks provisions have not been altered as a part of PC26. It is noted that these rules only apply to earthworks not associated with a building or land use consent so would not apply to any development of buildings in the MDRZ. The Additional advice note is supported. Add advice note to Rule - Earthworks 2A.4.2.46 as follows: Advice Notes: 1. 5. <u>Earthworks should adhere to TR 2009/02 Erosion and sediment control: guidelines for soil disturbing activities, Waikato Regional Council.</u>
79.256	Oppose	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Performance Standards	2A.4.2.62; various	Opposes standards for relocated buildings. The standard seeks to manage matters that are more appropriately addressed through the Building Act and are not valid resource management issues. This is neither efficient nor effective as there is the potential for resource consents to be triggered on the basis of Building Act matters that do not directly address specific 'environmental' effects. Any building relocating on a site would be a new building and subject to the various activities and standards within the zone.	Delete the 'relocated buildings' provisions as they are more-appropriately managed through the Building Act.		That the point of submission is rejected The Plan includes policies to support the exterior of relocated building been to a standard that does not detract from residential amenity. This rule supports the implementation of this policy.
47.20	Support in Part	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Performance Standards – Setback Modifications	2A.4.2.6	Supports the matters of discretion listed in 2A.4.2.6.	Fire and Emergency support the matters of discretion listed in 2A.4.2.6		Support noted
47.21	Support in Part	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Performance Standards – Setback Modifications	2A.4.2.10	Firefighting access requirements are managed through the NZBC, however it important that these controls are brought to the attention of plan users (i.e. developers) in the resource consent process so that they can incorporate the NZBC requirements early on in their building design.	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>	FS8 – support in part	That the point of submission is rejected The advice note from FENZ is not required, risk of missing provisions.

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
53.6	Oppose	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Performance Standards – Setback Modifications	2A.4.2.6	A 4m boundary setback from a reserve pushes the dwelling further back from public space, therefore reducing the effectiveness of any passive surveillance and creating a reduced interface to the reserve.	Reduce the 4m reserve setback in Rule 2A.4.2.6 to be consistent with internal boundary setbacks. Suggested Rule amendment: 2A.4.2.6 The minimum building setback depth listed above is modified in the following locations: (a) Along boundaries adjoining a state highway, a setback of 7.5 <u>4</u> metres is required; (b) On sites adjoining a road where the Character Street policy overlay area applies, a front yard setback of 6 <u>4</u> metres is required; (c) On sites adjoining a reserve, a setback of 4 <u>1.5</u> metres is required along the boundary adjoining the reserve; (d) On sites adjoining the Te Awa Cycleway, a setback of 5 metres is required along the boundary of the site adjoining the cycleway; (e) On sites adjoining arterial roads, a setback of 4 metres is required along the boundary adjoining the arterial road; and (f) On sites adjoining a Significant Natural Area (SNA), setback of 20 <u>10</u> metres is required along the boundary of the SNA.	FS1 - oppose	That the point of submission is rejected Retain 4m setback. In addition to urban design, this supports mature trees. Support minimum of 4m being required for this purpose.
53.8	Oppose	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Performance Standards – Setback Modifications	2A.4.2.6	Why is an increased setback from public open space proposed where residential density is proposed to increase? This is conflicting with Crime Prevention through Environmental Design which is a key component of good urban design.	Suggested Rule amendment: 2A.4.2.6 The minimum building setback depth listed above is modified in the following locations: (a) Along boundaries adjoining a state highway, a setback of 7.5 <u>4</u> metres is required; ---		That the point of submission is rejected Retain 4m setback. In addition to urban design, this supports mature trees. Support minimum of 4m being required for this purpose.
53.15	Oppose	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Performance Standards – Setback Modifications	2A.4.2.4	The PC 26 document prepared by Waipā DC refers to Front, Side & Rear Yards rather than Road and Internal setbacks as referred to in the rest of the District Plan. It would be good to change these references to be consistent across the board.	Amend the Yard references in Rule 2A.4.2.4 to refer to Road and internal boundary setbacks.	FS8 - oppose	That the point of submission is rejected These terms are derived from the MDRS.
53.16	Support in Part	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Performance Standards – Setback Modifications	2A.4.2.9	Why does Cambridge North have a maximum impermeable surface that is less than elsewhere within the district? A minimum 45% impermeable surface with 50% site coverage means after the 50% coverage is reached, on 5% remains for driveway areas etc., meaning almost every Lot would require Resource Consent if building to the maximum site coverage permitted by the plan. What solution has been put forward for Cambridge North in regard to stormwater?	Further clarification on how stormwater will be managed within Cambridge North.		No amendments requested Cambridge North has unique challenges identified during its own structure plan and discharge consent process with limited infrastructure capacity, flat grades, high water tables.
79.238	Oppose in part	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Performance Standards – Setback Modifications	2A.4.2.6	The setback requirements for 2A.4.2.6 (a) - (e) are overly restrictive for environments that would benefit from streetscape presence, activation and overlooking. Arterial roads and state highways are not necessarily precluded from having pedestrian paths along them and so special circumstances on setbacks should not be applied to sites adjoining these.	Delete 2A.4.2.6(b) - (d) as shown in the tracked amendments in the submission: 2A.4.2.6 The minimum building setback depth listed above is modified in the following locations: (b) On sites adjoining a road where the Character Street policy overlay area applies, a front yard setback of 6 metres is required; (c) On sites adjoining a reserve, a setback of 4 metres is required along the boundary adjoining the reserve; (d) On sites adjoining the Te Awa Cycleway, a setback of 5 metres is required along the boundary of the site adjoining the cycleway; (f)...		That the point of submission is accepted in part Setback to state highway refined as follows: 2A.4.2.6 (a) Along boundaries adjoining a state highway, a setback of 7.5 metres is required <u>for dwellings and sleepouts</u> . No amendments to other setbacks recommended (character streets, reserves, Te Awa Cycleway, arterial roads, SNAs) Setbacks along roads in part necessary to protect existing street trees and to enable new large specimen street trees to grow to maturity. This is essential to creating a public sphere that contribute to well-functioning urban environments envisaged in NPS-UD. Te Awa Cycleway is of national importance. Setback critical to protect amenity and in some location to ensure retention of sightlines for walkers and cyclists using the Te Awa to avoid collisions. Justification for the setbacks to SNAs and character street setback are provided in the s42a.

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
79.239	Oppose in part	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Performance Standards - Setback Modifications	2A.4.2.6	The setback requirements for 2A.4.2.6 (a) - (e) are overly restrictive for environments that would benefit from streetscape presence, activation and overlooking. Arterial roads and state highways are not necessarily precluded from having pedestrian paths along them and so special circumstances on setbacks should not be applied to sites adjoining these. The setbacks have not been sufficiently justified under s.77J-L of the Housing Supply Act due to the limitations they place on MDRS-enabled development.	The setback requirements for 2A.4.2.6 (a) - (e) are overly restrictive for environments that would benefit from streetscape presence, activation and overlooking. Arterial roads and state highways are not necessarily precluded from having pedestrian paths along them and so special circumstances on setbacks should not be applied to sites adjoining these.		That the point of submission is rejected Setbacks will enable potential enhancements in streetscape activation and passive surveillance while retaining sufficient space for large street trees to grow to maturity. Benefits of street trees identified XYST technical assessment.
79.240	Oppose in part	Section 2A - Medium Density Residential Zone - Performance Standards - Setback Modifications	2A.4.2.6	The setback have not been sufficiently justified under S77J-L of the Housing Supply Act.	Amend 2A.4.2.6 as follows: 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: ... Consistency of front yard building setback and effects on established character along the identified Character Street, where applicable; and Effects on the function and associated amenity values of the adjacent reserve, where applicable; and Effects on the amenity values of the Te Awa Cycleway, where applicable.		That the point of submission is rejected Setbacks are recommended to be retained. Setbacks along roads in part necessary to protect existing street trees and to enable new large specimen street trees to grow to maturity. This is essential to creating a public sphere that contribute to well-functioning urban environments envisaged in NPS-UD. Te Awa Cycleway is of national importance. Setback critical to protect amenity and in some location to ensure retention of sightlines for walkers and cyclists using the Te Awa to avoid collisions. Justification for the setbacks to SNAs and character street setback are provided in the s42a.
79.107	Support in part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Introduction	2A.1.1 Introduction	The zone description and introduction should contain an overall statement outlining what it seeks to enable, to reflect the evolving character as recognised in Policy 6(b) of the NPS-UD and the zone description in the National Planning Standards.	Amend 2A.1.1 Introduction as follows to reflect the 'planned urban character' anticipated within the zone: 2A.1 Introduction 2A.1.1 The Medium Density Residential Zone of the District is where most people in Waipā live. It is principally located in Waipā's Urban Areas comprising the two main towns of Cambridge and Te Awamutu, together with Kihikihi as a functional part of the Te Awamutu Urban Area. <u>Over time, the appearance of neighbourhoods within this zone will change, with development of typically up to three storeys in a variety of sizes and forms, including detached dwellings, terrace housing and low-rise apartments. This supports increasing the capacity and choice of housing. The density of this zone is expected to be a minimum of twenty five to thirty five dwellings per hectare (net once public spaces and infrastructure have been provided for).</u>		That the point of submission is accepted in part The density mentioned links in with the work Waipa and other Councils in the region have undertaken in the Future Proof study, which has taken into account the NPS-UD. Therefore, the following changes are recommended to the introduction in section 2A.1.1.1 The Medium Density Residential Zone of the District is where most people in Waipā live. It is principally located in Waipā's Urban Areas comprising the two main towns of Cambridge and Te Awamutu, together with Kihikihi as a functional part of the Te Awamutu Urban Area. <u>Over time, the appearance of neighbourhoods within this zone will change, with development of typically up to three storeys in a variety of sizes and forms, including detached dwellings, terrace housing and low-rise apartments. This supports increasing the capacity and choice of housing.</u> The density of this zone is expected to be a minimum of twenty five to thirty-five dwellings per hectare (net once public spaces and infrastructure have been provided for).
79.108	Support in part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Introduction	2A.1.1 Introduction	Specific reference to an expected density should be removed, noting that the density of future development within the zone should be guided by the objectives, policies and performance standards.	Delete any reference to expected density of the Medium Density Residential Zone and do not prescribe any minimum density requirements per hectare in any of the urban zones in the District Plan.		That the point of submission is rejected The density mentioned links in with the work relevant Waikato Councils have undertaken in the Future Proof study, which has taken into account the NPS-UD.
79.109	Support in part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Introduction	All	Specific reference to an expected density should be removed, noting that the density of future development within the zone should be guided by the objectives, policies and performance standards.	Do not prescribe any minimum density requirements per hectare in any of the urban zones in the District Plan.		That the point of submission is rejected The density mentioned links in with the work relevant Waikato Councils have undertaken in the Future Proof study, which has taken into account the NPS-UD.
13.2	Support in part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.3.3(d)	As drafted, this policy could be read as opposing all development in those	Amend 2A.3.3.3(d) to read: Recognising the mix of villas, bungalows and art deco housing <u>alongside other housing</u> in parts of Te Awamutu.		That the point of submission is rejected This provision is already recommended to be altered by Lifescapes as follows:

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
				parts of Te Awamutu. This goes beyond what the objective requires and is inconsistent with the policies in the NPS-UD.			(d) Recognising <u>Maintaining</u> the mix of villas, bungalows and and other early – mid-20th century housing types within identified character clusters in parts of Te Awamutu; (32.3)
13.3	Support in part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.6	Cambridge, Te Awamutu and Kihikihi are not the district's only urban environments as defined in the NPS-UD. For example, Ohaupo meets the definition of an urban environment.	Amend objective 2A.3.6 to read: To enable a wide range of housing options in Cambridge, Te Awamutu, and Kihikihi, and other urban developments in the District.		That the point of submission is rejected The relevant urban areas to apply the MDRS to have been identified as only including Cambridge, Te Awamutu and Kihikihi.
30.2	Support	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3	Increased urban densities will exceed the capacity of existing wastewater and stormwater systems and they cannot function in a manner which gives effect to Te Ture Whaimana without substantial ongoing investment.	WRC supports the objectives and policies to protect and improve the health and wellbeing of the Waikato River.		Support noted
30.3	Oppose	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.3	These objectives and policies do not take into account Policy 6 of the NPS-UD which recognises amenity values may change, and that of themselves are not an effect.	Amend 2A.3.3 to delete reference to "maintain existing amenity" and replace with text that acknowledges that amenity may change over time.		That the point of submission is accepted Amend Policy 2A.3.3 as follows: Objective – key elements of Medium Density residential character To maintain and <u>where appropriate</u> enhance the existing elements of the <u>Medium Density</u> Residential Zone that give each town its own character <u>while recognising that the character and amenity of these towns may change over time.</u>
30.4	Oppose	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.3.1	These objectives and policies do not take into account Policy 6 of the NPS-UD which recognises amenity values may change, and that of themselves are not an effect.	Amend 2A.3.3.1 to delete reference to "maintain existing amenity" and replace with text that acknowledges that amenity may change over time.		That the point of submission is accepted in part The changes to the proceeding part of this policy (2A.3.3.) recognise the changing nature of the towns amenity and character. Amend 2A.3.3.1 correspondingly as follows 2A.3.3.1 To maintain <u>and where appropriate</u> enhance Cambridge's character by. ...
30.5	Oppose	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.3.2	These objectives and policies do not take into account Policy 6 of the NPS-UD which recognises amenity values may change, and that of themselves are not an effect.	Amend 2A.3.3.2 to delete reference to "maintain existing amenity" and replace with text that acknowledges that amenity may change over time.		That the point of submission is accepted in part The changes to the proceeding part of this policy (2A.3.3.) recognise the changing nature of the towns amenity and character. Amend 2A.3.3.2 correspondingly as follows 2A.3.3.2 To maintain <u>and where appropriate</u> enhance Kihikihi's character by. ...
30.6	Oppose	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.3.3	These objectives and policies do not take into account Policy 6 of the NPS-UD which recognises amenity values may change, and that of themselves are not an effect.	Amend 2A.3.3.3 to delete reference to "maintain existing amenity" and replace with text that acknowledges that amenity may change over time.		That the point of submission is accepted in part The changes to the proceeding part of this policy (2A.3.3.) recognise the changing nature of the towns amenity and character. Amend 2A.3.3.3 correspondingly as follows 2A.3.3.3 To maintain <u>and where appropriate</u> enhance Te Awamutu's character by. ...
30.7	Oppose	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.5	Intensification will make it almost impossible to "maintain" existing amenity values within and around dwellings. These objectives and policies do not take into account Policy 6 of the NPS-UD which recognises amenity values may change, and that of themselves are not an effect.	Amend 2A.3.5 to delete reference to "maintain existing amenity" and replace with text that acknowledges that amenity may change over time.		That the point of submission is rejected This objective applies when a development does not meet permitted standards and requires the development to either maintain or enhance the amenity values of the site through design of the development. This is considered a suitable expectation for non-permitted development.

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
30.9	Support	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies		2A.3.7.1 Supports reference to crime prevention through environmental design (CPETD) principles, multi-modal transport options, integration with existing transport network and retaining trees.	Supports reference in Objective 2A.3.7.1 to CPETD principles, multi-modal transport options, integration with existing transport network and retaining trees.		Support noted
30.16	Support	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies		2A.3.5.2 Supports this policy as it encourages more use of public walkways and cycleways, resulting in lower carbon emissions.	Supports policy 2A.3.5.2.		Support noted
30.17	Support in Part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies		2A.3.5.2 Supports this policy and would also like to see safety considerations to encourage further use.	Amend 2A.3.5.2 to "To ensure that buildings on sites adjoining reserves and public walkways or cycleways do not detract from the amenity, <u>safety</u> , or function of those spaces."		That the point of submission is accepted This applies to passive surveillance and sightlines along Te Awa Cycleway and other proposed shared use trails.
30.18	Support in Part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies		2A.3.7 Supports reference to crime prevention through environmental design (CPETD) principles because they provide actual and perceived safety outcomes, and therefore encourage walking and cycling.	Supports objective 2A.3.7.		Support noted
30.19	Support in Part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies		2A.3.7 Would like to see reference to multi-modal transport options as part of linking to the transport network.	Amend 2A.3.7 to include "...integrated with the transportation network, <u>including multi-modal transport options</u> ." or words to similar effect.		That the point of submission is accepted Links to objectives of higher order planning documents.
30.20	Support in Part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies		2A.3.8 and associated policies Intensification will increase population and create transport issues if easy access to day-to-day need without using a car is not provided for. Also, continuing to encourage on-site parking is detrimental to meeting transport emissions goals.	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.	FS8 - support	That the point of submission is accepted in part The objective on non-residential activities (2A.3.8) it considered to both allow and control non-residential activities in the MDRZ adequately. Reference to provision of car parking should be amended in the following locations: 2.4.1.3(e) 2A.3.4.5 2A.3.4.21 2A.3.8.3 2A.4.1.3(b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (h) 2A.4.2.56(d) 21.1.2A.5(c) 21.1.2A.9(d) 21.1.2A.21(b) 21.1.2A.22(b)
30.21	Oppose	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies		2A.3.8 and associated policies Continuing to encourage on-site parking is detrimental to meeting national and regional transport emissions goals.	Delete references to providing on-site parking.		That the point of submission is accepted Reference to provision of car parking should be amended in the following locations: 2.4.1.3(e) 2A.3.4.5 2A.3.4.21 2A.3.8.3 2A.4.1.3(b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (h) 2A.4.2.56(d) 21.1.2A.5(c) 21.1.2A.9(d) 21.1.2A.21(b) 21.1.2A.22(b)

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response	
30.30	Support in Part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies		2A.2 and 2A.3 - various provisions	Recommends that provisions in the issues and objectives and policies sections of Section 2A make explicit the types of issues that could come with increased flow peaks and prolonged flows. Examples are listed in the Submission.	Add detail to provisions in the issues and objectives and policies sections of Section 2A to outline potential effects of increased impermeable surfaces.		That the point of submission is rejected This will be addressed via an advice note. This may also need a planning response to address activities
30.31	Support	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies		2A.3.4.5 and 2A.3.4.6	Supports the inclusion of minimum permeable surface areas throughout the plan to reduce adverse effects of additional stormwater run-off associated with intensification.	Retain minimum permeable surface areas throughout the plan.		Support noted The infrastructure qualifying matter and the stormwater qualifying matter overlays are provided to mitigate the adverse effects of intensification on flood hazard and pipe capacity and align with Te Ture Whaimana
38.13	Support	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies		2A.3.1	Supports the objective, and in particular the recognition of wellbeing and health and safety. The objective reflects Schedule 3A, Part 1, clause (6)(1)(a) of the RMA.	Retain Objective 2A.3.1.		Support noted
38.14	Amend	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies		2A.3.2	Given the "relevant residential zone" within the ODP is the Medium Density Residential Zone, it is more appropriate for the objective to explicitly refer to this zone.	Amend Objective 2A.3.2 as follows: A relevant residential zone The Medium Density Residential Zone provides for a variety of housing types and sizes ...	FS8 - oppose	That the point of submission is rejected This objective is transposed from the Amendment Act.
38.15	Support	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies		2A.3.2.1	Within the MRZ, existing qualifying matters may limit the amount of permitted development possible on an allotment and there is a need to reference qualifying matters, as they directly influence the capacity for intensification and residential development. Rather than amending this policy to address this, make changes to Policy 2A.3.2.4.	Retain Policy 2A.3.2.1, subject to amendments being made to Policy 2A.3.2.4.		That the point of submission is rejected Other amendments linked to this request are not supported.
38.16	Support	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies		2A.3.2.2	Generally supports the policy, but notes that the application of qualifying matters may mean that the target density is not able to be achieved in some areas. Rather than amending this policy to address this, make changes to Policy 2A.3.2.4.	Retain Policy 2A.3.2.2, subject to amendments being made to Policy 2A.3.2.4.		That the point of submission is rejected Other amendments linked to this request are not supported.
38.17	Amend	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies		2A.3.2.3	The application of qualifying matters may mean that the target density is not able to be achieved in some areas. Rather than amending this policy to address this, make changes to Policy 2A.3.2.4. It is more appropriate for the policy to explicitly refer to the MRZ, than "relevant residential zone".	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 all relevant residential zones in the district plan the Medium Density Residential Zone, except...	FS8 - oppose	That the point of submission is rejected This objective is transposed from the Amendment Act.
38.18	Amend	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies		2A.3.2.4	The application of qualifying matters is also relevant to the direction in Policies 2A.3.2.1, 2A.3.2.2 and 2A.3.2.3 and changes to reflect this should be made to Policy 2A.3.2.4. The use of "enable" is	Amend Policy 2A.3.2.4 as follows: To enable the modification of modify the Medium Density Residential Standards under Policy 2A.3.2.3, or the level of density anticipated under Policies 2A.3.2.1, 2A.3.2.2 and 2A.3.2.3, only to the extent necessary to accommodate a qualifying matter applying to that site.		That the point of submission is rejected Other amendments linked to this request are not supported.

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
				potentially confusing, given the policy is essentially about limitations.			
38.19	Support	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.4.4	Supports the policy explicitly noting that height may be limited by a qualifying matter.	Retain Policy 2A.3.4.4		Support noted
47.5	Support	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.1	Supports the Medium Density Residential Standards objective and policy framework insofar that it requires Council to provide for a well-functioning urban environment and enables all people and communities to provide for their health and safety, now and into the future.	Retain 2A.3.1 notified.		Support noted
47.6	Support	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.2.6	Supports policy 2A.3.2.6 insofar that it requires housing to be designed to meet the day-to-day needs of residents. This policy framework would include consideration of, and the requirement to provide an adequate firefighting water supply and adequate emergency access and egress in the event of an emergency.	Retain 2A.3.2.6 as notified.		Support noted
47.7	Support in Part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.4	Supports the policy framework that seeks to address neighbourhood amenity and safety through the management of building setbacks from road and side boundaries.	Fire and Emergency support the policy framework that seeks to address neighbourhood amenity and safety through the management of building setbacks from road and side boundaries.		Support noted
47.8	Support in Part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.4.3	There is an increased risk of fire spreading and Fire and Emergency personnel access can be inhibited as a result of reduced boundary setbacks. Supports the acknowledgement in policy 2A.3.4.3 that recognises the need to provide ongoing access to the rear of the site and enable building maintenance from within the site. Fire and Emergency consider that this policy should go further to address the importance of maintaining consistent setbacks between buildings to provide for adequate access for residents as well as for emergency services.	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.	FS5 – oppose FS6 – oppose FS8 - oppose	That the point of submission is rejected Addition does not make sense in location indicated.
47.9	Support in Part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.4.5	Supports 2A.3.4.5 as it seeks to ensure that all sites have sufficient open space. Fire and Emergency however consider that this policy should go further to address the importance of	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	FS5 – oppose FS6 – oppose FS8 - oppose	That the point of submission is rejected Addition does not make sense in location indicated.

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
				maintaining a maximum site coverage to ensure that resident access as well as emergency service access is provided for in the Medium Density Residential Zone.	maintaining a maximum site coverage requirement for buildings in the Medium Density Residential Zone.		
47.10	Support	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.4.21	Supports 2A.3.4.21 insofar that Residential Based Visitor Accommodation is enabled on the basis that on-site parking and vehicle manoeuvring areas are provided and adverse effects related to traffic generation, and access are mitigated to the extent that they do not result in adverse effects on residential amenity or on the surrounding transport network.	Retain 2A.3.4.21 as notified.		Support noted
47.11	Support in Part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.5.3	Considers that this policy framework should be amended to ensure building setbacks provide for both resident and emergency services access and egress.	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 and emergency services access, and the building does not unduly dominate outdoor living areas on adjoining sites.	FS8 - oppose	That the point of submission is rejected Addition does not make sense in location indicated.
47.12	Support	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.7	Supports the policy framework insofar that it seeks to ensure that compact housing, retirement village accommodation and associated care facilities, rest homes and visitor accommodation are comprehensively designed.	Retain 2A.3.7 as notified.		Support noted
47.13	Support	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.7.1	Supports 2A.3.7.1(i) which requires developers to mitigate adverse effects relating to traffic generation and access and 2A.3.7.1(j) being appropriately serviced and coordinated with infrastructure provision and integrated with the transport network.	Retain 2A.3.7.1 as notified.		Support noted
47.14	Support	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.8	Fire stations need to be strategically located within and throughout communities to maximise their coverage and response times. To this extent, Fire and Emergency support objective 2A.3.8 as it seeks to provide for the establishment of non-residential activities that provide for the health and well-being of the community and have a functional and compelling need to locate within a Medium Density Residential Zone.	Retain 2A.3.8 as notified.		Support noted
47.15	Oppose	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.8.2	Requests that emergency service facilities be provided for within Policy 2A.3.8.2. It is	Amend 2A.3.8.2 as follows: To enable activities that provide for the health and well-being of the community and that service or support an		That the point of submission is rejected Addition does not make sense in location indicated.

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
				considered that subsequent policy 2A.3.8.3 provides Council the ability to assess whether any future emergency service facility is of a scale and design suitable for the Medium Density Residential Zone.	identified local need. Examples include education facilities, childcare and preschool facilities, <u>emergency service facilities</u> , places of worship, facilities that provide respite care, community centres, marae and hospitals. New activities shall not be established on rear sites, and sites located on cul-de-sacs, or that have access to strategic roads unless provided for in a structure plan.		
56.9	Support	Section 2A Medium Density Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.4.10, 2.3.2.11	Fonterra supports the deletion of Policy 2.3.2.11 provided that an identical policy (with the ODP wording) is included within the new Residential Medium Density Zone provisions proposed as Section 2A.	Delete Policy 2.3.2.11 from Section 2 Residential Zone as notified; and Retain new Policy 2A.3.4.10 in Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone.		That the point of submission is accepted Support for deletion and insertion noted
56.10	Support in Part	Section 2A Medium Density Zone - Objectives and Policies	Section 2A	Supports the insertion of Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone to the extent that it gives effect to the RMA-EHS and NPS-UD, insofar as it relates to residential zoned land in the vicinity of the Fonterra sites at Hautapu and Te Awamutu.	Supports the insertion of Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone to the extent that it gives effect to the RMA-EHS and NPS-UD, insofar as it relates to residential zoned land in the vicinity of the Fonterra sites at Hautapu and Te Awamutu .		Support noted
63.11	Support	Section 2A Medium Density Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.4.9	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.	Retain Policy 2A.3.4.9 as notified.	FS8 - oppose	Support noted
65.1	Oppose	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.3.4(b)	Mimicry of heritage structures isn't always the most appropriate response for new structures/additions. It can dilute the integrity of the heritage character values of the heritage feature. Suggest amending to allow a diverse range of styles.	Seeks that 2A.3.3.4(b) be deleted: Policy 2A.3.3.4 To maintain and enhance the identified character of each character cluster by: b) For new buildings or relocated buildings maintaining a similar style, form, building materials and colour to other dwellings within the cluster; and		That the point of submission is rejected The Plan includes policies to support the exterior of relocated building been to a standard that does not detract from residential amenity. This rule supports the implementation of this policy.
65.2	Oppose	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.3.4(c)	It is not clear what this policy is trying to achieve, to relocate a building would need to go through a building consent sign off and as such they would need to be up to a certain standard.	Seeks that 2A.3.3.4(c) be deleted: Policy 2A.3.3.4 To maintain and enhance the identified character of each character cluster by: ... c) For relocated buildings ensuring that any maintenance and/or reinstatement work is undertaken; and		That the point of submission is rejected The Plan includes policies to support the exterior of relocated building been to a standard that does not detract from residential amenity. This rule supports the implementation of this policy.
65.3	Amend	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.4	This objective use of word "maintain" doesn't appear right. The existing residential character and amenity will be changing as a result of this zone change and how do you enhance safety? The policies which follow this objective are in relation to amenity and there is nothing round 'safety'.	Amend Objective 2A.3.4: Objective 2A.3.4 To establish cohesive and liveable environments within maintain amenity values and enhance safety in the Medium Density Residential Zone.		That the point of submission is accepted in part The maintenance of amenity values in the MDRZ is accepted as subject to change. This has been addressed throughout section 2A. Safety can be enhanced through consideration of CPTED. Recommend amending Objective 2A.3.4 as follows: To maintain recognise amenity values—and enhance safety in the Medium Density Residential Zone.

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
65.4	Amend	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies		2A.3.6 The objective is for the Medium Density Residential Zone, however the objective just lists the three main towns. Suggest this references the zones.	Amend Objective 2A.3.6 as follows: To enable a wide range of housing options in <u>the Medium Density Residential Zone Cambridge, Te Awamutu and Kihikihi.</u>		That the point of submission is rejected These are the towns that PC26 has established are applicable for the MDRS so it is appropriate to list them.
65.5	Amend	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies		2A.3.8 Within denser residential environments it is beneficial to have some non-residential activities including dairies, laundrettes and childcare facilities and these should not be restricted.	Amend Objective 2A.3.8 as follow: To restrict the establishment of non-residential activities in the Medium Density Residential Zone, except for visitor accommodation, activities within listed heritage items, areas specifically identified on structure plans for this purpose, and those activities that provide for the health and well-being of the community, and have a functional and compelling need to locate within a Medium Density Residential Zone <u>such as dairies, laundrettes and childcare facilities</u>		That the point of submission is rejected It is not considered efficient to list these inclusions, the general description is more suitable.
68.3	Amend	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies		2A.3.8.1 Policy 2A.3.8.1 seeks to maintain the MDRZ for residential activities by ensuring that commercial activities are "avoided" unless provided for in a structure plan or policy overlay, however, this policy should also link back to the "functional and compelling need" exception in Objective 2A.3.8. This would provide a broader pathway for appropriate commercial activities to be accommodated.	Amend Policy 2A.3.8.1 as follows: Policy - Maintain residential function 2A.3.8.1 To maintain the Medium Density Residential Zone for residential activities by ensuring that: (a) Industrial activities and commercial activities are avoided within the Medium Density Residential Zone except as provided for in a structure plan or policy overlay <u>where it can be demonstrated there is a functional and compelling need to locate within a Medium Density Residential Zone;</u> and (b)....		That the point of submission is rejected This request is provided for in the Policy following that listed to be amended (2A.3.8.2).
68.4	Amend	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies		2A.3.8.4 Policy 2A.3.8.4 recognises local shops as identified within structure plan areas that service the needs of the surrounding community. However, some structure plan areas will support significant development capacity and will likely require more than just local shops such as neighbourhood centres. The relief sought is to explicitly refer to neighbourhood centres in the policy.	Amend Policy 2A.3.8.4 as follows: Policy - Non-residential activities in structure plan areas 2A.3.8.4 To recognise the local shops <u>or neighbourhood centres</u> as identified within structure plan areas, that service the needs of the surrounding community. Retail activities or services provided within these locations shall provide for the daily needs of people and be located within a walkable catchment.		That the point of submission is rejected Reference to local shops is considered to apply to neighbourhood centres etc and the wording matches a similar policy in the Residential Zone.
70.52	Support	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies		2A.3.1 Supports Objective 2A.3.1 as it aligns with Objective 1 of the MDRS.	Retain Objective 2A.3.1 as notified.		Support noted
70.53	Support	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies		2A.3.2 Supports Objective 2A.3.2 as it aligns with Objective 2 of the MDRS.	Retain Objective 2A.3.2 as notified.		Support noted
70.54	Support	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies		2A.3.2.1 Supports Policy 2A.3.2.1 as it aligns with Policy 1 of the MDRS.	Retain Policy 2A.3.2.1 as notified.		Support noted
70.55	Oppose	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies		2A.3.2.2 Opposes the inclusion of the policy that sets an expectation for minimum density as it is not included in the MDRS. Density expectations are appropriately reflected in Policies 2A.3.2.1 and 2A.3.2.3, and Policy 2A.3.2.2 signals acceptability of lesser densities.	Delete Policy 2A.3.2.2.		That the point of submission is rejected The density mentioned links in with the work relevant Waikato Councils have undertaken in the Future Proof study, which has taken into account the NPS-UD.

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
70.56	Support in Part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.2.3	Supports Policy 2A.3.2.3 as it aligns with Policy 2 of the MDRS. However, it should be amended to refer to the Medium Density Residential Zone as that is the only "relevant residential zone" in this District.	Amend Policy 2A.3.2.3 as notified to replace "all relevant residential zones" with "Medium Density Zone".		That the point of submission is rejected This objective is transposed from the NPS-UD.
70.57	Support	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.2.4	Supports the recognition that the MDRS should only be modified to the extent necessary to accommodate a qualifying matter. This concept is very important given the broad qualifying matters identified in this District.	Retain Policy 2A.3.2.4 as notified.		Support noted
70.58	Support	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.2.5	Supports Policy 2A.3.2.5 as it aligns with Policy 3 of the MDRS.	Retain Policy 2A.3.2.5 as notified.		Support noted
70.59	Support	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.2.6	Supports Policy 2A.3.2.6 as it aligns with Policy 4 of the MDRS.	Retain Policy 2A.3.2.6 as notified.		Support noted
70.60	Support	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.2.7	Supports Policy 2A.3.2.7 as it aligns with Policy 5 of the MDRS.	Retain Policy 2A.3.2.7 as notified.		Support noted
70.61	Oppose	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.3	Opposes Objective 2A.3.3 and the direction to "maintain and enhance the existing elements of the Residential Zone" as it does not recognise that the existing character of the residential zones needs to change over time to provide for the diverse and changing needs of the community. The Objective is inconsistent with the NPSUD and MDRS.	Delete Objective 2A.3.3.		That the point of submission is rejected Objective is recommended to be amended to address maintenance of amenity concerns.
70.62	Oppose	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.3.1 - 2A.3.3.4	Opposes Policies 2A.3.3.1 - 2A.3.3.4 as they place limitations and restrictions on residential developments. Such limitations are contrary to the intent of the Enabling Housing Amendment Act. The policies do not recognise that the existing character of the residential zones needs to change over time to provide for the diverse and changing needs of the community and are inconsistent with the NPSUD and MDRS.	Delete Policies 2A.3.3.1 - 2A.3.3.4.		That the point of submission is rejected These policies link with the qualifying matters in the MDRZ.
70.63	Oppose	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.4	Opposes Objective 2A.3.4 and the direction to "maintain amenity" as it does not recognise that the existing character of the residential zones needs to change over time to provide for the diverse and changing needs of the community. The Objective is inconsistent with the NPSUD and MDRS.	Delete Objective 2A.3.4.		That the point of submission is rejected Recommend amending Objective 2A.3.4 as follows: To maintain amenity values establish cohesive and livable environments and enhance safety in the Medium Density Residential Zone.

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
70.64	Oppose in Part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies		2A.3.4.1 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	Delete policy 2A.3.4.1. If retained, amend Policy to identify the specific qualifying matters that require modification of the road boundary setback.		That the point of submission is accepted in part Amend policy to make more sense as follows: 2A.3.4.1 All buildings shall be designed and setback from roads in a manner which complies with the Medium Density Standards, unless a qualifying matter <u>such as Nationally Significant Infrastructure (State Highway Network)</u> applies.
70.65	Oppose	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies		2A.3.4.3 Opposes Policy 2A.3.4.3 as it is inconsistent with the MDRS setback standards which do not require "a degree of separation between buildings" with common walls being anticipated.	Delete Policy 2A.3.4.3.		That the point of submission is rejected This policy does not override permitted setbacks but would apply when setbacks in the MDRZ are infringed. The MDRZ require side setbacks.
70.66	Oppose	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies		2A.3.4.4 Opposes Policy 2A.3.4.4 as it does not recognise that the heights are a permitted standard, and Policy 5 MDRS requires developments not meeting permitted activity status to be provided for.	Delete Policy 2A.3.4.4.		That the point of submission is rejected This policy does not override permitted heights but would apply when the height limit in the MDRZ is infringed. The MDRZ includes a maximum height limit.
70.67	Oppose	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies		2A.3.4.5 The policy does not recognise that building coverage is a permitted standard, and Policy 5 MDRS requires developments not meeting permitted activity status to be provided for.	Delete Policy 2A.3.4.5.		That the point of submission is rejected This policy does not override permitted building coverage standards but would apply when the permitted building coverage standards in the MDRZ are infringed. The MDRZ includes a maximum site coverage limit.
70.69	Oppose	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies		2A.3.4.15 Opposes Policy 2A.3.4.15 as it considers that the use of the term "avoid" in this context is not justified and does not allow for appropriate management of earthworks effects.	Delete Policy 2A.3.4.15 or amend to address to "avoid, remedy or mitigate".		That the point of submission is rejected Recommend amending Policy 2A.3.4.15 as follows: To ensure that earthworks are carried out in a manner that avoids <u>where practicable, or otherwise mitigates unacceptable</u> adverse effects between properties and on water bodies.
70.70	Oppose	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies		2A.3.5 Opposes Objective 2A.3.5 as it does not recognise that amenity values change over time to provide for the diverse and changing needs of the community. The Objective is inconsistent with the NPSUD and MDRS.	Delete Objective 2A.3.5.		That the point of submission is rejected This objective applies when a development does not meet permitted standards and requires the development to either maintain or enhance the amenity values of the site through design of the development. This is considered a suitable expectation for non-permitted development.
70.71	Oppose in Part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies		2A.3.5.1 The Policy should recognise that the MDRS setback standards provide for appropriate privacy and visual dominance outcomes.	Amend policy to clarify that compliance with the MDRS setback standard will meet the policy intention.		No amendments requested This policy would be applied if a development did not meet permitted setbacks or did not meet other permitted standards that might 'overly dominate' outdoor living areas on adjoining sites.
70.72	Oppose in Part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies		2A.3.5.3 The Policy should apply only where there is a breach of the MDRS setback standards.	Amend policy to clarify that it applies where the MDRS setback standard is not complied with. Replace "minimal loss" with "appropriate levels of".		That the point of submission is rejected In the case of a Discretionary or Non-Complying Activity this policy could apply even where setbacks are met if the proposed development impacts other matters mentioned in the Policy such as privacy, sunlight, noise etc. The policy is not intended to apply to only applications that infringe minimum setbacks.
70.73	Oppose in Part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies		2A.3.5.4 The MDRS do not regulate daylight and solar gain.	Delete Policy 2A.3.5.4.		That the point of submission is rejected

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
							The MDRS include daylight angle provisions (height in relation to boundary).
70.74	Support in Part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.5.5	The Policy should recognise that the MDRS outdoor living standards provide for appropriate outdoor living outcomes and to provide for communal outdoor living spaces.	Delete Policy 2A.3.5.5 or amend to address the submitter's concerns.		That the point of submission is accepted in part This policy does not override permitted outdoor living standards but would apply when the outdoor living standards are infringed. It is permitted to cumulatively group outdoor living areas in the MDRZ, and this is not clear in the policy. The policy is recommended to be amended to accommodate communal outdoor living areas as follows: 2A.3.5.5 Each dwelling on a site shall have a useable and easily accessible outdoor living area <u>for individual or communal use</u> .
70.75	Oppose in Part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.5.6	The MDRS do not regulate building length. The submitter agrees that the policy can address the extent to which articulation, modulation and materiality addresses adverse visual dominance effects associated with the building length.	Amend heading "Maximum building length" to "Building length". Amend Policy 2A.3.5.6 to address the submitter's concerns.		That the point of submission is rejected This heading corresponds with others throughout the Plan.
70.76	Support	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.6	Supports the objective that enables a wide range of housing options consistent with the NPSUD and the Enabling Housing Act.	Retain Objective 2A.3.6 as notified.		Support noted
70.77	Support	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.6.1	Supports the policy as it provides policy support for retirement villages that are comprehensively designed and utilise shared spaces.	Retain Policy 2A.3.6.1 as notified.		Support noted
70.81	Oppose	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.7.2	For the reasons set out in the submitter's submission in relation to Objective 2A.3.7 and Section 2A.1.8, the submitter opposes the requirement to "encourage sound urban design responses and development that aligns with the planned outcome within structure plan areas".	Delete Policy 2A.3.7.2.		That the point of submission is rejected It is considered that structure planning remains a valid approach for carrying out Council's functions under sections 30 and 31 of the RMA.
70.82	Support	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3	An ageing population specific objective should be included that recognises and enables the housing and care needs of the ageing population.	Seeks that a new Objective is inserted in the Objectives for the Medium Density Residential Zone section that provides for the housing and care needs of the ageing population. <u>2A.3.3 Ageing population</u> <u>Recognise and enable the housing and care needs of the ageing population.</u>		That the point of submission is rejected This request is already addressed by PC26. A policy to enable development for an ageing population is proposed in the MDRZ (2A.3.6.5) the objective sitting above this policy refers to providing housing options.
70.83	Support	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3	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	Seeks that a new Policy is included in the Policies of the Medium Density Residential Zone section, as follows: <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>		That the point of submission is rejected This objective is covered in part by the objectives and policies in PC26, including 2A.3.2, 2A.3.2.1, 2A.3.6, 2A.3.6.1, 2A.3.7.1.

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
				variety of housing types with a mix of densities.			
70.84	Support	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.2	A policy regarding the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites should be included in the District Plan.	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: <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>		That the point of submission is rejected This objective is covered in part by the objectives and policies in PC26, including 2A.6.6.1 and 2A.3.7.1.
70.85	Support	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.2	It would be appropriate to enable the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments.	Seeks that a new Policy is included in the Policies of the Medium Density Residential Zone section, as follows: <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>		That the point of submission is rejected Although in practice density standards set a permitted baseline it appears problematic to have a policy to enable this.
72.18	Oppose	Section 2A Medium Density Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.3	Objective 2A.3.3 does not adequately reflect the Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS). It seeks to provide quality amenity but does not recognise the changing nature of residential environments. This objective should be updated to be consistent with the Amendment Act and the intent of the Act which is to enable residential development and to recognise the changing nature of the built environment.	Amend 2A.3.3 as shown (or words to similar effect): <u>To maintain and enhance the existing elements of the Residential Zone that give each town its own character while recognising that the character and amenity of these areas will change over time.</u>		That the point of submission is accepted in part Amend Policy 2A.3.3 as follows: Objective – key elements of Medium Density residential character To maintain and <u>where appropriate</u> enhance the existing elements of the <u>Medium Density Residential Zone</u> that give each town its own character <u>while recognising that the character and amenity of these towns may change over time.</u>
72.19	Oppose	Section 2A Medium Density Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.4	Objective 2A.3.4 overlaps with 2A.3.5 and can be consolidated as further explained below.	Delete 2A.3.4 Objective-Neighbourhood amenity and safety.		That the point of submission is rejected Recommend amending Objective 2A.3.4 as follows: <u>To maintain amenity values establish cohesive and livable environments and enhance safety in the Medium Density Residential Zone.</u>
72.20	Oppose	Section 2A Medium Density Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.5	Amendments are proposed to clarify that the intention is to encourage high amenity values rather than maintain amenity values. Metlifecare supports this amendment as it is consistent with policy 6(b) of the NPS UD.	Amend 2A.3.5 as shown (or words to similar effect): Amend 2A.3.5 as shown (or words to similar effect): <u>2A.3.5 –Objective –On-site and neighbourhood amenity values</u> <u>To enhance safety maintain and enhance and encourage high amenity values within and around dwellings and sites in the Medium Density Residential Zone through the location, layout and design of dwellings and buildings, while recognising the functional and operational requirements of activities.</u>		That the point of submission is rejected This objective specifically applies to on-site amenity and applies when a development does not meet permitted standards and requires the development to either maintain or enhance the amenity values of the site through design of the development. This is considered a suitable expectation for non-permitted development.
72.22	Support	Section 2A Medium Density Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.7	2A.3.7 Objective are appropriate considerations when considering the design and development of residential development.	Retain 2A.3.7 Objective-Comprehensive design and development as notified.		Support noted
72.23	Support in Part	Section 2A Medium Density Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.7.1	Policy 2A.3.7.1 recognises the specific requirements of retirement villages and identifies the relevant effects that should be considered as part of any resource consent application. Minor amendments	Amend 2A.3.7.1 as shown (or words to similar effect): To ensure that compact housing, retirement village accommodation and associated care facilities, rest homes and visitor accommodation are comprehensively designed by: (a) Ensuring that developments effectively relate to the		That the point of submission is accepted in part Minor amendments are accepted, however addition of 'where relevant' not needed as 'where appropriate' precedes this. Unsure what the functional and operation needs statement adds to what is already in provision, so this is also not supported.

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
				are proposed for clarity and to recognise that these considerations should take place while recognising the specific requirements of retirement villages due to their functional and operational needs.	street, existing buildings, and adjoining developments in the neighbourhood <u>and the planned built form of the area</u> ; and (b) Avoiding long continuous <u>unbroken</u> lengths of building <u>wall</u> ; and (c) Maximising the potential for passive solar gain; and (d) Providing for sufficient private <u>or communal</u> space for the reasonable recreation, service and storage needs of residents; and (e) Retaining existing trees and landscaping within the development where this is practical; and (f) Where appropriate provide for multi-modal transport options and provide for links with existing road, pedestrian and cycleways <u>(where relevant)</u> ; and (g) Incorporating CPTED principles; and (h) Addressing reverse sensitivity effects; and (i) Mitigating adverse effects related to traffic generation, access, noise, vibration, and light spill; and (j) Being appropriately serviced and co-ordinated with infrastructure provision and integrated with the transport network. <u>While recognising the functional and operational needs of retirement village development.</u>		
73.52	Support	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.1	Supports Objective 2A.3.1 as it aligns with Objective 1 of the MDRS.	Retain Objective 2A.3.1 as notified.		Support noted
73.53	Support	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.2	Supports Objective 2A.3.2 as it aligns with Objective 2 of the MDRS.	Retain Objective 2A.3.2 as notified.		Support noted
73.54	Support	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.2.1	Supports Policy 2A.3.2.1 as it aligns with Policy 1 of the MDRS.	Retain Policy 2A.3.2.1 as notified.		Support noted
73.55	Oppose	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.2.2	Opposes the inclusion of the policy that sets an expectation for minimum density as it is not included in the MDRS. Density expectations are appropriately reflected in Policies 2A.3.2.1 and 2A.3.2.3, and Policy 2A.3.2.2 signals acceptability of lesser densities.	Delete Policy 2A.3.2.2.		That the point of submission is rejected The density mentioned links in with the work relevant Waikato Councils have undertaken in the Future Proof study, which has taken into account the NPS-UD.
73.56	Support in Part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.2.3	Supports Policy 2A.3.2.3 as it aligns with Policy 2 of the MDRS. However, it should be amended to refer to the Medium Density Residential Zone as that is the only "relevant residential zone" in this District.	Amend Policy 2A.3.2.3 as notified to replace "all relevant residential zones" with "Medium Density Zone".		That the point of submission is rejected This objective is transposed from the Amendment Act.
73.57	Support	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.2.4	Supports the recognition that the MDRS should only be modified to the extent necessary to accommodate a qualifying matter. This concept is very important given the broad qualifying matters identified in this District.	Retain Policy 2A.3.2.4 as notified.		Support noted
73.58	Support	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.2.5	Supports Policy 2A.3.2.5 as it aligns with Policy 3 of the MDRS.	Retain Policy 2A.3.2.5 as notified.		Support noted
73.59	Support	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.2.6	Supports Policy 2A.3.2.6 as it aligns with Policy 4 of the MDRS.	Retain Policy 2A.3.2.6 as notified.		Support noted

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
73.60	Support	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies		2A.3.2.7 Supports Policy 2A.3.2.7 as it aligns with Policy 5 of the MDRS.	Retain Policy 2A.3.2.7 as notified.		Support noted
73.61	Oppose	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies		2A.3.3 Opposes Objective 2A.3.3 and the direction to "maintain and enhance the existing elements of the Residential Zone" as it does not recognise that the existing character of the residential zones needs to change over time to provide for the diverse and changing needs of the community. The Objective is inconsistent with the NPSUD and MDRS.	Delete Objective 2A.3.3.		That the point of submission is rejected Recommended to amend Policy 2A.3.3 as follows: To maintain and enhance the existing elements of the <u>Medium Density Residential Zone</u> that give each town its own character <u>while recognising that the character and amenity of these towns will change over time.</u>
73.62	Oppose	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies		2A.3.3.1 - 2A.3.3.4 Opposes Policies 2A.3.3.1 - 2A.3.3.4 as they place limitations and restrictions on residential developments. Such limitations are contrary to the intent of the Enabling Housing Amendment Act. The policies do not recognise that the existing character of the residential zones needs to change over time to provide for the diverse and changing needs of the community and are inconsistent with the NPSUD and MDRS.	Delete Policies 2A.3.3.1 - 2A.3.3.4.		That the point of submission is rejected These policies link with the qualifying matters in the MDRZ.
73.63	Oppose	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies		2A.3.4 Opposes Objective 2A.3.4 and the direction to "maintain amenity" as it does not recognise that the existing character of the residential zones needs to change over time to provide for the diverse and changing needs of the community. The Objective is inconsistent with the NPSUD and MDRS.	Delete Objective 2A.3.4.		That the point of submission is rejected Recommend amending Objective 2A.3.4 as follows: To maintain amenity values <u>establish cohesive and livable environments</u> and enhance safety in the Medium Density Residential Zone.
73.64	Oppose in Part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies		2A.3.4.1 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	Delete policy 2A.3.4.1. If retained, amend Policy to identify the specific qualifying matters that require modification of the road boundary setback.	FS8 - oppose	That the point of submission is accepted in part Amend policy to make more sense as follows: 2A.3.4.1 All buildings shall be designed and setback from roads in a manner which complies with the Medium Density Standards, unless a qualifying matter <u>such as Nationally Significant Infrastructure (State Highway Network)</u> applies.
73.65	Oppose	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies		2A.3.4.3 Opposes Policy 2A.3.4.3 as it is inconsistent with the MDRS setback standards which do not require "a degree of separation between buildings" with common walls being anticipated.	Delete Policy 2A.3.4.3.		That the point of submission is rejected This policy does not override permitted setbacks but would apply when setbacks in the MDRZ are infringed. The MDRZ require side setbacks.

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
73.66	Oppose	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies		2A.3.4.4 Opposes Policy 2A.3.4.4 as it does not recognise that the heights are a permitted standard, and Policy 5 MDRS requires developments not meeting permitted activity status to be provided for.	Delete Policy 2A.3.4.4.		That the point of submission is rejected This policy does not override permitted heights but would apply when the height limit in the MDRZ is infringed. The MDRZ includes a maximum height limit.
73.67	Oppose	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies		2A.3.4.5 The policy does not recognise that building coverage is a permitted standard, and Policy 5 MDRS requires developments not meeting permitted activity status to be provided for.	Delete Policy 2A.3.4.5.		That the point of submission is rejected This policy does not override permitted building coverage standards but would apply when the permitted building coverage standards in the MDRZ are infringed. The MDRZ includes a maximum site coverage limit.
73.69	Oppose	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies		2A.3.4.15 Opposes Policy 2A.3.4.15 as it considers that the use of the term "avoid" in this context is not justified and does not allow for appropriate management of earthworks effects.	Delete Policy 2A.3.4.15 or amend to address to "avoid, remedy or mitigate".		That the point of submission is rejected Recommend amending Policy 2A.3.4.15 as follows: To ensure that earthworks are carried out in a manner that avoids <u>where practicable, or otherwise mitigates unacceptable</u> adverse effects between properties and on water bodies.
73.70	Oppose	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies		2A.3.5 Opposes Objective 2A.3.5 as it does not recognise that amenity values change over time to provide for the diverse and changing needs of the community. The Objective is inconsistent with the NPSUD and MDRS.	Delete Objective 2A.3.5.		That the point of submission is rejected This objective specifically applies to on-site amenity and applies when a development does not meet permitted standards and requires the development to either maintain or enhance the amenity values of the site through design of the development. This is considered a suitable expectation for non-permitted development.
73.71	Oppose in Part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies		2A.3.5.1 The Policy should recognise that the MDRS setback standards provide for appropriate privacy and visual dominance outcomes.	Amend policy to clarify that compliance with the MDRS setback standard will meet the policy intention.		No amendments requested This policy would be applied if a development did not meet permitted setbacks or did not meet other permitted standards that might 'overly dominate' outdoor living areas on adjoining sites.
73.72	Oppose in Part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies		2A.3.5.3 The Policy should apply only where there is a breach of the MDRS setback standards.	Amend policy to clarify that it applies where the MDRS setback standard is not complied with. Replace "minimal loss" with "appropriate levels of".		That the point of submission is rejected In the case of a Discretionary or Non-Complying Activity this policy could apply even where setbacks are met if the proposed development impacts other matters mentioned in the Policy such as privacy, sunlight, noise etc. The policy is not intended to apply to only applications that infringe minimum setbacks.
73.73	Oppose in Part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies		2A.3.5.4 The MDRS do not regulate daylight and solar gain.	Delete Policy 2A.3.5.4.		That the point of submission is rejected The MDRS include daylight angle provisions (height in relation to boundary).
73.74	Support in Part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies		2A.3.5.5 The Policy should recognise that the MDRS outdoor living standards provide for appropriate outdoor living outcomes and to provide for communal outdoor living spaces.	Delete Policy 2A.3.5.5 or amend to address the submitter's concerns.		That the point of submission is accepted in part This policy does not override permitted outdoor living standards but would apply when the outdoor living standards are infringed. It is permitted to cumulatively group outdoor living areas in the MDRZ, and this is not clear in the policy. The policy is recommended to be amended to accommodate communal outdoor living areas as follows: 2A.3.5.5 Each dwelling on a site shall have a useable and easily accessible outdoor living area <u>for individual or communal use</u> .
73.75	Oppose in Part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies		2A.3.5.6 The MDRS do not regulate building length. The submitter agrees that the policy can address the extent to which articulation, modulation and	Amend heading "Maximum building length" to "Building length". Amend Policy 2A.3.5.6 to address the RVA's concerns.		That the point of submission is rejected This heading corresponds with others throughout the Plan.

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
				materiality addresses adverse visual dominance effects associated with the building length			
73.76	Support	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.6	Supports the objective that enables a wide range of housing options consistent with the NPSUD and the Enabling Housing Act.	Retain Objective 2A.3.6 as notified.		Support noted
73.77	Support	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.6.1	Supports the policy as it provides policy support for retirement villages that are comprehensively designed and utilise shared spaces.	Retain Policy 2A.3.6.1 as notified.		Support noted
73.79	Oppose in Part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.7	Opposes the reference to "urban design principles" as it is unclear what these encompass and may be inconsistent with the MDRS.	Amend Objective 2A.3.7 to delete any reference to urban design principles.		That the point of submission is rejected This requests a fundamental change to the way design guidelines are contained and referenced in the Plan that appears to go beyond what PC26 has proposed in relation to design guidelines which is limited to the addition of the MDRZ and amendments to DG1.
73.81	Oppose	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.7.2	For the reasons set out in the submitter's submission in relation to Objective 2A.3.7 and Section 2A.1.8, the submitter opposes the requirement to "encourage sound urban design responses and development that aligns with the planned outcome within structure plan areas".	Delete Policy 2A.3.7.2.		That the point of submission is rejected It is considered that structure planning remains a valid approach for carrying out Council's functions under sections 30 and 31 of the RMA.
73.82	Support	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3	An ageing population specific objective should be included that recognises and enables the housing and care needs of the ageing population.	Seeks that a new Objective is inserted in the Objectives for the Medium Density Residential Zone section that provides for the housing and care needs of the ageing population. <u>2A.3.3 Ageing population</u> <u>Recognise and enable the housing and care needs of the ageing population.</u>		That the point of submission is rejected This request is already addressed by PC26. A policy to enable development for an ageing population is proposed in the MDRZ (2A.3.6.5) the objective sitting above this policy refers to providing housing options.
73.83	Support	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3	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.	Seeks that a new Policy is included in the Policies of the Medium Density Residential Zone section, as follows: <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>	FS8 - support	That the point of submission is rejected This objective is covered in part by the objectives and policies in PC26, including 2A.3.2, 2A.3.2.1, 2A.3.6, 2A.3.6.1, 2A.3.7.1.
73.84	Support	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.2	A policy regarding the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites should be included in the District Plan.	Seeks that a new Policy is included in the Policies of the Medium Density Residential Zone section that recognises the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites: <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>	FS8 - oppose	That the point of submission is rejected This objective is covered in part by the objectives and policies in PC26, including 2A.6.6.1 and 2A.3.7.1.
73.85	Support	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.2	It would be appropriate to enable the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments.	Seeks that a new Policy is included in the Policies of the Medium Density Residential Zone section, as follows: <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>	FS8 - oppose	That the point of submission is rejected Although in practice density standards set a permitted baseline it appears problematic to have a policy to enable this.

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
79.159	Oppose	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies		2A.3.2.2 Development should be guided by the performance standards as well as the policies and objectives to ensure that efficient land use can be achieved without the limitation of minimum target densities.	Remove Policy 2A.3.2.2 in its entirety.		That the point of submission is rejected The density mentioned links in with the work relevant Waikato Councils have undertaken in the Future Proof study, which has taken into account the NPS-UD.
79.160	Oppose	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies		All Development should be guided by the performance standards as well as the policies and objectives to ensure that efficient land use can be achieved without the limitation of minimum target densities.	Do not include any minimum target density in the urban zones of the Plan.		That the point of submission is rejected The density targets link in with the work relevant Waikato Councils have undertaken in the Future Proof study, which has taken into account the NPS-UD.
79.162	Oppose	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies		2A.3.2.4 Opposes the reference to modification of the MDRS as this should be undertaken through the process of this plan change instead of being included as a provision.	Delete Policy 2A.3.2.4 in its entirety and make consequential renumbering changes.		That the point of submission is rejected This policy only reinforces how the qualifying matters can modify the MDRS.
79.166	Oppose in part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies		2A.3.3 The submitter does not support terminology which requires certain features to be both 'maintained and enhanced'. This implies that both outcomes must be achieved at the same time. The character of a residential environment changes over time through development and the objective and associated policies would constrain implementation of the MDRS and zone purpose.	Amend Objective 2A.3.3 as follows: <u>To maintain and enhance ensure that the planned urban built form outcomes of the zone are consistent with and complement</u> the existing elements of the Residential Zone that give effect to its own character.		That the point of submission is accepted in part Recommended to amend Policy 2A.3.3 as follows: To maintain and enhance the existing elements of the <u>Medium Density Residential Zone</u> that give each town its own character <u>while recognising that the character and amenity of these towns will change over time.</u>
79.167	Oppose in part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies		2A.3 The submitter does not support terminology which requires certain features to be both 'maintained and enhanced'. This implies that both outcomes must be achieved at the same time. The character of a residential environment changes over time through development and the objective and associated policies would constrain implementation of the MDRS and zone purpose.	References to the anticipated character and form of development in the zone should use terminology consistent with the NPS-UD and MDRS in Housing Supply Act.		No specific changes requested. Amendments to the use of the phrase 'maintain amenity' have been recommended throughout PC26.
79.168	Oppose in part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies		2A.3.3.1 The submitter does not support terminology which requires certain features to be both 'maintained and enhanced'. This implies that both outcomes must be achieved at the same time. Consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission, character 'streets' and 'clusters' are opposed in the Medium Density Residential Zone.	Amend 2A.3.3.1 as follows: Policy-Cambridge 2A.3.3.1 To maintain and, <u>where appropriate</u> enhance Cambridge's character by: (a)... ... (e) Maintaining the mix of villa, cottage and bungalow type housing within the identified character clusters; and (f)...		That the point of submission is accepted in part The changes to the proceeding part of this policy (2A.3.3.) recognise the changing nature of the towns amenity and character. Amend 2A.3.3.1 correspondingly as follows 2A.3.3.1 To maintain <u>and where appropriate</u> enhance Cambridge's character by. ...
79.169	Oppose in part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies		All The submitter does not support terminology which requires certain features to be both 'maintained and enhanced'. This implies that both outcomes must be achieved at the same	References to the anticipated character and form of development in the zone should use terminology consistent with the NPS-UD and MDRS in Housing Supply Act.		No specific changes requested. Amendments to the use of the phrase 'maintain amenity' have been recommended throughout PC26.

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
				time. Consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission, character 'streets' and 'clusters' are opposed in the Medium Density Residential Zone.			
79.171	Oppose in part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.3.2	The submitter does not support terminology which requires certain features to be both 'maintained and enhanced'. This implies that both outcomes must be achieved at the same time.	Amend Policy 2A.3.3.2 Kihikihi as follows: 2A.3.3.2 To maintain and, <u>where appropriate</u> enhance Kihikihi's character by: (a)...		That the point of submission is accepted in part The changes to the proceeding part of this policy (2A.3.3.) recognise the changing nature of the towns amenity and character. Amend 2A.3.3.1 correspondingly as follows 2A.3.3.2 To maintain <u>and where appropriate</u> enhance Kihikihi's character by. ...
79.172	Oppose in part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	All	The submitter does not support terminology which requires certain features to be both 'maintained and enhanced'. This implies that both outcomes must be achieved at the same time.	References to the anticipated character and form of development in the zone should use terminology consistent with the NPS-UD and MDRS in Housing Supply Act.		No specific changes requested. Amendments to the use of the phrase 'maintain amenity' have been recommended throughout PC26.
79.173	Oppose in part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.3.3	Kāinga Ora does not support terminology which requires certain features to be both 'maintained and enhanced'. This implies that both outcomes must be achieved at the same time. Consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission, character 'streets' and 'clusters' are opposed in the Medium Density Residential Zone.	Amend Policy 2A.3.3.3 Te Awamutu as follows: 2A.3.3.3 To maintain and, <u>where appropriate</u> enhance Te Awamutu's character by: (a)... ... (d) Recognising the mix of villas, bungalows and art deco housing in parts of Te Awamutu; and (e)...		That the point of submission is accepted in part The changes to the proceeding part of this policy (2A.3.3.) recognise the changing nature of the towns amenity and character. Amend 2A.3.3.1 correspondingly as follows 2A.3.3.3 To maintain <u>and where appropriate</u> enhance Te Awamutu's character by. ...
79.174	Oppose in part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.3.3	The submitter does not support terminology which requires certain features to be both 'maintained and enhanced'. This implies that both outcomes must be achieved at the same time. Consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission, character 'streets' and 'clusters' are opposed in the Medium Density Residential Zone.	References to the anticipated character and form of development in the zone should use terminology consistent with the NPS-UD and MDRS in Housing Supply Act.		No specific changes requested. Amendments to the use of the phrase 'maintain amenity' have been recommended throughout PC26.
79.179	Oppose	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.4	Objective 2A.3.4 conflicts with Policy 6(d) of the NPS-UD that acknowledges the amenity values of existing neighbourhoods will change as a result of intensification.	Amend 2A.1.24 as follows: 2A.3.4 To maintain amenity values and enhance safety in the Medium Density Residential Zone. To ensure development within the Medium Density Residential Zone achieves a level of amenity and safety for residents that is consistent with the planned urban built form outcomes of the zone.		That the point of submission is rejected Recommend amending Objective 2A.3.4 as follows: <u>To maintain amenity values establish cohesive and livable environments</u> and enhance safety in the Medium Density Residential Zone.
79.180	Oppose	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	All	Objective 2A.3.4 conflicts with Policy 6(d) of the NPS-UD that acknowledges the amenity values of existing neighbourhood will change as a result of intensification.	References to the anticipated character and form of development in the zone should use terminology consistent with the NPS-UD and MDRS in Housing Supply Act.		No specific changes requested. Amendments to the use of the phrase 'maintain amenity' have been recommended throughout PC26.
79.181	Oppose in part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.4.1	The submitter opposes the reference to qualifying matters relating to setbacks from the road boundary. Kāinga Ora supports the implementation of setbacks to reflect the standards set out though the	Include Policy 2A.3.4.1 as amended, to the extent consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission.		That the point of submission is rejected Recommend amending policy as follows: 2A.3.4.1 All buildings shall be designed and setback from roads in a manner which complies with the Medium Density Standards, unless a

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
				Enabling Housing Supply Act, to the extent consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission.			qualifying matter such as Nationally Significant Infrastructure (State Highway Network) applies.
79.183	Oppose in part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.4.3	Generally supports the intent of Policy 2A.3.4.3, with the exception of the 'perimeter block' reference which is just one of a range of dwelling typologies possible. The policy can be simplified to reference separation between 'detached' buildings. The advice note is inconsistent with the 'boundary activity' and 'deemed permitted' activities under the RMA. The note also pre-empts an assessment of effects and will depend on the specifics of the development.	Amend Policy 2A.3.4.3 Building Setback: side boundaries as follows: 2A.3.4.3 To maintain a degree of separation between detached 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 a reasonable level of sunlight and daylight, provide ongoing access to the rear of the site and enable building maintenance from within the site by maintaining a consistent setback between buildings on different sites. Advice Note: In some cases affected parties consents will not be sufficient to address the matters raised in these policies.		That the point of submission is accepted in part The addition of the word 'detached' would exclude attached buildings so this is not supported. The wording except where perimeter block development is proposed is also agreed to not make sense. The amendments to sunlight and advice note are not supported as these change the intent of the policy. Amend Policy 2A.3.4.3 as follows: <i>Policies - Building setback: side boundaries</i> 2A.3.4.3 To maintain a degree of separation between buildings when viewed from the road (except where perimeter block development is proposed) , (79.183) 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 from within the site by maintaining a consistent setback between buildings on different sites. Advice Note: In some cases affected parties consents will not be sufficient to address the matters raised in these policies.
79.184	Support in part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.4.4	Generally supports Policy 2A.3.4.4 to the extent consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission.	Include Policy 2A.3.4.4 Height of buildings as notified, to the extent it is consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission and relief sought.		Support noted
79.185	Support in part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.4.5	Generally supports Policy 2A.3.4.5 to the extent consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission.	Include Policy 2A.3.4.5 Site coverage and permeable surfaces as notified, to the extent it is consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission and relief sought.		Support noted
79.186	Support in part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.4.6	Generally supports Policy 2A.3.4.6 to the extent consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission.	Include Policy 2A.3.4.6 as notified, to the extent it is consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission and relief sought.		Support noted
79.187	Oppose	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.4.7	Opposes the provisions associated with relocated buildings as the requirements can be addressed under the Building Act. The proposed approach does not encourage the adaptive reuse of existing buildings or account for off-site manufactured buildings.	Delete Policy-Relocated Buildings 2A.3.4.7		That the point of submission is rejected The ODP includes controls on relocated buildings which have been carried through to the MDRZ.
79.188	Oppose	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.4.8	Amendments are proposed, consistent with the Kāinga Ora submission on 2A.2.4, to ensure the policy does not conflict with objectives and policies in the MDRZ that otherwise reflect that the NPS-UD and MDRS anticipates effects of development as a result of change in density and urban form are enabled.	Amend Policy 2A.3.4.8 as follows: Policy - Maintaining low ambient noise environment 2A.3.4.8 To ensure that noise emissions and vibration from all activities, including construction, are consistent with the low ambient noise environment anticipated in the Medium Density Residential Zone.		That the point of submission is rejected The MDRZ is still anticipated to have a low ambient noise environment.
79.189	Oppose in part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.4.10	It is simpler to require new buildings to be acoustically treated. Requiring treatment for bedroom additions does not acknowledge existing uses.	Amend Policy 2A.3.4.10 as follows: Policy- Residential development in the vicinity of the Te Awamutu Dairy Manufacturing site 2A.3.4.10 To maintain anticipated levels of residential amenity and to reduce the potential for reverse sensitivity	FS2 - oppose	That the point of submission is rejected Although it is agreed that it would be easier to just require new buildings to be acoustically treated, however, bedroom spaces are more susceptible to noise, especially night-time noise so this provision is considered to be logical and should remain.

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
					effects on the Te Awamutu Dairy Manufacturing site by requiring new dwellings or bedroom additions to be acoustically treated.		
79.190	Support in part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.4.11	The use of the term 'avoid' is contrary to the directive under Environmental Defence Society v New Zealand King Salmon Company Ltd 92014) NZSC 38 ("King Salmon") concerning the term 'avoid'. As the policy uses 'avoid', there cannot be any exceptions to what is tantamount to a prohibited activity. The policy is unclear what would be appropriate mitigation. Council should ensure the use of 'avoid' in this context is appropriate with the wider policy framework and is not contrary to other enabling provisions.	Amend Policy 2A.3.4.11 as follows, to be consistent with the King Salmon judgement and ensure the use of 'avoid' in this context is appropriate with the wider policy framework and is not contrary to other wider enabling provisions: Policies - Signs 2A.3.4.11 To maintain the residential ensure the planned urban form character and amenity of the Medium Density Residential Zone, by avoiding managing inappropriate signage (including those unrelated to the site and billboards), while providing for signs except for temporary signs and small scale signs associated with a home occupation undertaken on the site where the sign is located.		That the point of submission is rejected The signage rules are not proposed to be altered as part of PC26, and changes to the rules in the MDRZ would make them inconsistent with the remainder of the Plan.
79.191	Support in part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.4.12	Policy 2A.3.4.12 can be deleted as it uses the term 'avoid', and be incorporated into policy 2A.3.4.11.	Delete Policy 2A.3.4.12 as notified and amalgamate with 2A.3.4.11.		That the point of submission is rejected The signage rules are not proposed to be altered as part of PC26, and changes to the rules in the MDRZ would make them inconsistent with the remainder of the Plan
79.192	Support in part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.4.14	Policy 2A.3.4.14 can be amended to avoid the term 'avoid' while still in keeping with the intent of the policy.	Amend Policy 2A.3.4.14 as follows: Discourage Signs that are illuminated moving or flashing, or are likely to create a visual hazard or interfere with the safe and efficient use of roads shall be avoided.		That the point of submission is rejected The signage rules are not proposed to be altered as part of PC26, and changes to the rules in the MDRZ would make them inconsistent with the remainder of the Plan.
79.193	Support in part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.4.15	In the context of potential effects on water quality and Te Ture Whaimana, avoidance of effects is preferable. Amendments are proposed to ensure that the term is used in a manner consistent with 'King Salmon'.	Amend Policy 2A.3.4.15 as follows: To ensure that earthworks are carried out in a manner that avoids where practicable, or otherwise mitigates unacceptable adverse effects between properties and on water bodies.		That the point of submission is rejected The earthworks rules are not proposed to be altered as part of PC26, and changes to the rules in the MDRZ would make them inconsistent with the remainder of the Plan.
79.194	Oppose	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.4.19	The definition of 'fortified sites' is problematic in that any site that includes a fence or gate with a lock or similar would be considered a fortified site.	Seeks that fortified sites as an activity, Policy 2A.3.4.19 and associated 'fortified sites' provisions in their entirety be deleted.		That the point of submission is rejected The definition of fortified sites in the ODP outlines the characteristics of fortified sites which could not be confused with normal residential fencing or security systems.
79.196	Oppose in part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.4.21	Opposes Policy 2A.3.4.21 which conflicts with Policy 6(b) of the NPS-UD, that acknowledges the amenity values of existing neighbourhood will change as a result of intensification.	Include Policy 2A.3.4.21 as notified with the amendments as follows, consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission: Policy - Residential Based Visitor Accommodation 2A.3.4.21 Residential Based Visitor Accommodation is enabled where the scale of the activity is such that it: (a) Maintains local residential character, including the The scale and design of buildings and their location on the site is consistent with the planned urban built form and character of the zone; and (b)...		That the point of submission is accepted in part The suggested rewording does not fit with the proceeding provisions, recommended rewording 2A.3.4.21 as follows: 2A.3.4.21 Residential Based Visitor Accommodation is enabled where the scale of the activity is such that it: (a) Maintains local residential character, while recognising that this may change over time, including the scale and design of buildings and their location on the site; and ...
79.197	Oppose in part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.5	Opposes Objective 2A.3.5 which conflicts with Policy 6(b) of the NPS-UD, that acknowledges the amenity values of existing	Include Objective 2A.3.5 as notified with the amendments as follows, consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission: Objective-On-site amenity values		That the point of submission is rejected This objective specifically applies to on-site amenity and applies when a development does not meet permitted standards and requires the development to either maintain or enhance the amenity values of the

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
				neighbourhoods will change as a result of intensification.	2A.3.5 To maintain and enhance ensure that development is consistent with the planned urban built form outcomes of amenity values within and around dwellings and sites in the Medium Density Residential Zone, and achieves an appropriate level of on and off-site amenity by managing through the location, layout and design of dwellings and buildings.		site through design of the development. This is considered a suitable expectation for non-permitted development.
79.199	Support in part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.6	Supports in part the objective as notified with amendments to remove 'options' and focus more on the mix of typologies and sizes that should be enabled.	Include Objective 2A.3.6 as notified with the following amendments: Objective - Providing a range of housing options 2A.3.6 To enable a wide range of housing typologies and sizes options in Cambridge, Te Awamutu and Kihikihi.		That the point of submission is rejected The changes achieve the same intent of the original Objective, and the original Objective is preferred.
79.200	Oppose in part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.6.1	Shared open spaces should not be preferred to private open spaces as this is not necessarily an efficient use of urban land in all instances.	Include Policy 2A.3.6.1 as notified with the following amendments: Policy - Sustainable and efficient use of land 2A.3.6.1 To encourage developments that are comprehensively designed, and which provide a range of housing types and options that meet changing housing needs. Developments that are comprehensively designed where spaces can be shared will be preferred.		That the point of submission is rejected The requested amendments change the intent of the Policy.
79.204	Oppose in part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.7.1	The development of housing in itself would not cause reverse sensitivity effects. The policy is not clear as to what reverse sensitivity effects are required to be addressed. The MDRS setbacks and District Plan noise provisions are sufficient to address effects on adjoining non-residential activities.	Delete the reference to address reverse sensitivity effects.	FS2 - oppose	That the point of submission is rejected The request to delete reference to reverse sensitivity in 2A.3.7.1 is not supported as this is considered a relevant resource management consideration that is also referenced in the RPS.
79.205	Oppose in part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	All	The development of housing in itself would not cause reverse sensitivity effects. Policy 2A.3.7.1 is not clear as to what reverse sensitivity effects are required to be addressed. The MDRS setbacks and District Plan noise provisions are sufficient to address effects on adjoining non-residential activities.	Delete any references to reverse sensitivity in the residential zones, consistent with the overall submission.	FS2 - oppose	That the point of submission is rejected The request to delete reference to reverse sensitivity is not supported as this is considered a relevant resource management consideration that is also referenced in the RPS.
79.206	Support in part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.8.1	The use of the term 'avoid' is contrary to the directive under Environmental Defence Society Inc v New Zealand King Salmon Company Ltd (2014) NZSC 38 ('King Salmon') concerning the term 'avoid'. As the policy uses 'avoid' there cannot be any exceptions which is tantamount to a prohibited activity. The policy is unclear as to what would be appropriate mitigation.	Include policy 2A.3.8.1 as notified with the following amendments: Policy - Maintain residential function 2A.3.8.1 To maintain ensure the Medium Density Residential Zone is provides for residential activities by ensuring that: (a) No Industrial activities and commercial activities are avoided located within the Medium Density Residential Zone except as provided for in a structure plan or policy overlay; (b)		That the point of submission is rejected The use of 'maintain' in this policy is acceptable. The change from the word 'avoid' to 'no' achieves the same outcome, so is not supported.
79.207	Oppose in part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.8.3	The policy conflicts with Policy 6(b) of the NPS-UD that acknowledges the amenity values of existing neighbourhoods will change as a result of intensification. References to the anticipated character and form of	Include the policies as notified with the following amendments to be consistent with the Kāinga submissions on other 'resource management issues': 2A.3.8.3 Buildings and activities associated with non-residential activities should be of a scale and design that: (a) Maintains residential character Are consistent with the planned urban built form character and amenity of the		That the point of submission is rejected The use of 'maintain' in this policy is acceptable.

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
				development in the zone should use terminology consistent with the NPS-UD and MDRS.	<u>zone</u> , including the scale and design of buildings and their location on the site; and (b)...		
79.208	Support in part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Objectives and Policies	2A.3.8.6	Generally supports the policy, but does not consider it appropriate that visitor accommodation be required to 'enhance' town character.	Include policy 2A.3.8.6 as notified with the following amendments: Policy-Visitor accommodation in limited circumstances 2A.3.8.6 Visitor accommodation may be appropriate where a development is comprehensively designed and the scale and design of the development <u>does not detract from residential activities within the medium density residential zone; enhances town character</u> ; and where site specific issues such as on-site servicing and transport related effects are addressed.		That the point of submission is rejected Visitor accommodation in the MDRZ is a Discretionary Activity or permitted if home based. As a Discretionary Activity it is considered suitable to require enhancement of town character rather than detracting from residential activities.
32.2	Support	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Qualifying Matters	All	The qualifying matters and the modifications to the MDRS should be retained as they are necessary in order to achieve the purpose and principles of the Act, to give effect to Te Ture Whaimana and to recognise and provide for the matters of national importance in s.6 of the Act.	Retain the qualifying matters included in PC26.	FS1 - support	Support noted
32.3	Amend	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Qualifying Matters	All	Given the recent amendment of the Act, the complexity of the amendments, and limited timeframe available to Council to prepare PC26, it may be necessary to make further amendments to the provisions to ensure that modifications are sufficient to recognise and protect the relevant qualifying matter and are workable in the context of the district plan.	Such further amendments to PC26 that are necessary to accurately and effectively accommodate qualifying matters.		Support noted A number of amendments to the heritage/character cluster provisions in section 2A MDRZ are recommended that fall under the request of this submission point.
38.3	Support	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Qualifying Matters	1.3.2.2	Supports the reference to Qualifying Matters as it assists in plan interpretation and gives effect to the RMA.	Retain the text in Policy 1.3.2.2 that refers to 'qualifying matters'.		Support noted
38.7	Support	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Qualifying Matters	2A.1.4	Supports the reference in 2A.1.4 to Qualifying Matters.	Retain 2A.1 Introduction.		Support noted
38.9	Support	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Qualifying Matters	2A.1.9	Supports there being explicit guidance in this section about the circumstances in which qualifying matters have been applied.	Retain 2A.1.9.		Support noted
41.1	Support	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Qualifying Matters	1.3.2.2	Proposed amendment to 1.3.2.2 (b) contains direct reference to qualifying matters. The introduction of qualifying matters will enable the plan to provide for the RMA matters of national importance found in section 6(e) and 6(f).	Retain 1.3.2.2.		Support noted

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
41.21	Support	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Qualifying Matters	Appendix 3 Assessments of New Qualifying Matters	Supports the retention of the new qualifying matters and the related controls for Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa Waikato, Open Space and Expanded Character Area Clusters. HNZPT suggests that it would be appropriate for the Council to follow up this work with a Plan Change to ensure the permanent protection of these important items into the future.	That the New Qualifying Matters in Appendix 3 are retained.		Support noted
45.1	Support in Part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Qualifying Matters	All	Unregulated development will ruin town character, put unnecessary strain on infrastructure, community facilities, roading and traffic effects. I am concerned with the effect on amenity values and need to protect amenity for residents. I support the use of qualifying matters to assess appropriate development.	Use as many qualifying matter overlays as you can to dampen the implementation of wide scale unregulated change and ensure higher density developments are appropriate for our town and environment.		Support noted
47.3	Support	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Qualifying Matters	2A.1.9	Supports the adoption of Te Ture Whaimana as a qualifying matter to modify the Medium Density Residential Standards to manage the effects of development on infrastructure capacity, in particular, the water supply and transport networks. Fire and Emergency also support the use of qualifying matters to control subdivision and development to manage significant risks from natural hazards.	Retain 2A.1.9 as notified.		Support noted
50.2	Oppose	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Qualifying Matters	Section 2A	The medium density residential standards have been modified to accommodate qualifying matters. The provision does not comply with the qualifying matters set out in section 771 of the RMA Amendment, and in particular those relation to Infrastructure and Stormwater constraints.	Oppose the way PC26 is worded.		No specific request made The qualifying matters have been assessed against the relevant sections of the Act in the section 32 report including giving effect to Te Ture Whaimana.
50.4	Oppose	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Qualifying Matters	Map 57	Map 57 Provides for the qualifying matters in Te Awamutu/Kihikihiki area. Matters include 'Stormwater constraint' and 'Infrastructure constraint'. These are not Qualifying Matters in section 771 of the RMA Amendment and so this designation should not be applied to the Zone.	Oppose Map 57 Qualifying Matters in the Te Awamutu / Kihikihiki area.		That the point of submission is rejected The qualifying matters have been assessed against the relevant sections of the Act in the section 32 report including giving effect to Te Ture Whaimana.
56.1	Support in Part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Qualifying Matters	Planning map 56	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 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.	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).	FS8 - oppose	Support noted That the point of submission is rejected It is not considered that the matters listed under s771(j) and s77L to be a qualifying matter have been met for the Hautapu Dairy Factory.
56.2	Support in Part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Qualifying Matters - Nationally Significant Inf	Planning map 56	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 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.	Add a new qualifying matter that applies to all land within the 55 dBA Ldn noise contour surrounding the Hautapu Dairy Manufacturing site and the land within 100m of the rural farmland that is utilised by Hautapu Dairy Factory for spray irrigation purposes.		That the point of submission is rejected It is not considered that the matters listed under s771(j) and s77L to be a qualifying matter have been met for the Hautapu Dairy Factory.
56.3	Support in Part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Qualifying Matters	Planning map 57	Amendments are required to add an additional qualifying matter for the land surrounding the Te Awamutu Dairy Factory site and the land surrounding the facilities associated with the Te Awamutu Dairy factory, accessed from 487 Factory Road, TA, to enable potential reverse sensitivity effects to be assessed and mitigated. The existing provisions	Retain Planning Map 57 as notified with amendments sought in the submission. Specifically, retain the qualifying matters (river/gully proximity, stormwater constraint and infrastructure constraint) that apply to the TA Dairy Factory.		Support noted

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
				relating to acoustic treatment for noise sensitive activities do not afford the existing Dairy Factory site adequate protection with respect to intensification.			
56.4	Support in Part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Qualifying Matters - Nationally Significant Inf	Planning map 57	Amendments are required to add an additional qualifying matter for the land surrounding the Te Awamutu Dairy Factory site and the land surrounding the facilities associated with the Te Awamutu Dairy factory, accessed from 487 Factory Road, TA, to enable potential reverse sensitivity effects to be assessed and mitigated. The existing provisions relating to acoustic treatment for noise sensitive activities do not afford the existing Dairy Factory site adequate protection with respect to intensification.	Add a new qualifying matter that applies to all of the land within the 55 dBA Ldn noise contour surrounding the TA Dairy Factory; and the land surrounding the storage and distribution facilities associated with the TA Dairy Factory.		That the point of submission is rejected It is not considered that the matters listed under s771(j) and s77L to be a qualifying matter have been met for the Te Awamutu Dairy Factory.
56.5	Support	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Qualifying Matters	Planning maps 4, 22, 23, 8, 37 and 38.	Supports the proposal to retain the existing planning maps that identify the existing dairy manufacturing sites at Te Awamutu and Hautapu, and the corresponding dairy manufacturing noise contour boundaries, with the changes showing the updates introduced by PC26.	Retain the following notations on the Planning Maps as notified: - The identification of the Hautapu Dairy Factory and associated noise contour boundaries on the Planning Maps for Policy Areas 4, 22 and 23; and - The identification of the TA Dairy Factory and associated noise contour boundaries on the Planning Maps for Policy Areas 8, 37 and 38.		Support noted
56.6	Support in Part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Qualifying Matters - Nationally Significant Inf	All	Supports the proposal to identify and apply the qualifying matters for river/gully proximity, stormwater constraint and infrastructure constraint on land that is located in close proximity to/surrounding the Te Awamutu Dairy Factory and Hautapu Dairy Factory. However, amendments are required to add an additional qualifying matter relating to land surrounding the Te Awamutu and Hautapu Dairy Factory sites, (including the land surrounding the storage and distribution facilities associated with the Te Awamutu Dairy Factory, accessed from 487 Factory Road, Te Awamutu; and the land surrounding the rural farmland in Hautapu that is utilised for spray irrigation activities associated with wastewater from Hautapu Dairy Factory) to enable potential reverse sensitivity effects to be assessed and mitigated.	Amend all sections to include an additional qualifying matter relating to the land surrounding the Te Awamutu and Hautapu Dairy Factory sites (including the land surrounding the storage and distribution facilities associated with the Te Awamutu Dairy Factory, accessed from 487 Factory Road, Te Awamutu; and the land surrounding the rural farmland in Hautapu that is utilised for spray irrigation activities associated with wastewater from the Hautapu Dairy Factory), to enable a more limited level of residential activity to occur (two dwellings per site rather than three), and to enable potential reverse sensitivity effects to be assessed and mitigated.		That the point of submission is rejected It is not considered that the matters listed under s771(j) and s77L to be a qualifying matter have been met for the Hautapu and Te Awamutu Dairy Factory's.
56.11	Support in part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Qualifying Matters	2A.1.9	Supports the introduction to the Medium Residential Zone in Section 2A.1. However, additional wording is required to protect Fonterra's existing dairy manufacturing and spray irrigation sites from potential reverse sensitivity effects.	Amend Proposed Section 2A to include provisions relating to consideration of reverse sensitivity effects associated with residential development occurring in the vicinity of Fonterra's Dairy Manufacturing sites at Te Awamutu and Hautapu. Amend the Introduction in Section 2A.1 of the Proposed Medium Density Residential Zone to include the following sentence (added at the end of the Introduction, as para 2A.1.9): <u>Development within the zone should not create land use conflicts and/or reverse sensitivity effects, particularly in relation to the existing Dairy Manufacturing Sites at Hautapu and Te Awamutu.</u>		That the point of submission is rejected It is not considered that the matters listed under s771(j) and s77L to be a qualifying matter have been met for the Hautapu and Te Awamutu Dairy Factory's.
56.12	Support in part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Qualifying Matters	Various	The objectives, policies and rules for the Medium Density Residential Zone should include consideration of reverse sensitivity effects associated with Fonterra's existing dairy manufacturing activities within Waipā District.	Amendments are required to the objectives, policies, and rules for the Medium Density Residential Zone to include consideration of the reverse sensitivity effects associated with existing dairy manufacturing sites at Hautapu and Te Awamutu.		That the point of submission is rejected This request is specifically addressed by Policy 2A.3.4.10. Reverse sensitivity is also addressed (not specific to the dairy factories) throughout the ODP and PC26.

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
56.13	Support in Part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Qualifying Matters	2A.2.7, 2A.2.20	Supports the inclusion of Resource Management Issues 2A.2.7 and 2A.2.20 in Section 2A Medium Density Residential. It is important the new Residential provisions in Proposed Section 2A recognise and provide for existing lawfully established industrial activities such as the Te Awamutu Dairy Factory.	Retain Resource Management Issues 2A.2.7 and 2A.2.19 as notified.		Support noted
56.14	Support	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Qualifying Matters	2A.3.1	Supports the addition of new Objective 2A.3.1. Residential development must not impede upon Fonterra's ability to operate on their existing sites within the Waipā District.	Retain Objective 2A.3.1 as notified.		Support noted
56.15	Support	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Qualifying Matters	2A.3.4.10	Supports the addition of New Policy 2A.3.4.10. Residential development around the Te Awamutu Dairy Factory site must address reverse sensitivity effects and provide appropriate acoustic treatments.	Retain Policy 2A.3.4.10 as notified.		Support noted
56.16	Support	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Qualifying Matters	2A.3.7.1	Supports the reference to reverse sensitivity effects in Policy 2A.3.7.1.	Retain 2A.3.7.2(h) as notified.		Support noted
56.17	Support in Part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Qualifying Matters	2A.4.1.3(b)-(c)	A corresponding provision is required to the assessment criteria in Rule 21.1.2A.5(u). This will provide for the recognition of reverse sensitivity effects as a matter of discretion.	Include reverse sensitivity as a matter of discretion in Rule 2A.4.1.3: (b)... Activities that fail to comply with this rule will require a resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity with discretion being restricted over: ... - Alignment with any relevant Urban Design Guidelines adopted by Council; and - Reverse sensitivity. (c)... Activities that fail to comply with this rule will require a resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity with discretion being restricted over: ... - Alignment with any relevant Urban Design Guidelines adopted by Council; and - Reverse sensitivity.	That the point of submission is rejected This request relates to reverse sensitivity generally and has implications beyond the dairy factories.	
56.18	Support in Part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Qualifying Matters	2A.4.1.1	To be able to effectively consider the reverse sensitivity effects, a similar approach should be taken to the Infrastructure Constraint Qualifying Matter. That is, a new activity status needs to be provided that restricts the number of dwellings to two per site within the Reverse Sensitivity Qualifying Matter Overlay.	Add a new activity status in Rule 2A.4.1.1: (cA) Up to three dwellings per site outside of the Reverse Sensitivity Qualifying Matter Overlay. (cB) Up to two dwellings per site within the Reverse Sensitivity Qualifying Matter Overlay.		That the point of submission is rejected It is not considered that the matters listed under s771(j) and s77L to be a qualifying matter have been met for the Hautapu and Te Awamutu Dairy Factory's.
56.19	Support in Part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Qualifying Matters	Rule 2A.4.1.3	It is appropriate to restrict the level of additional residential enablement in close proximity to Fonterra's key activities in the district.	Add new restricted discretionary activities and matters of discretion to Rule 2A.4.1.3: (cA) <u>Four of more dwellings per site outside the Reverse Sensitivity Qualifying Matter Overlay.</u> <u>Activities that fail to comply with this rule will require a resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity with discretion being restricted over:</u> - Building location, bulk and design; and - Development density; and - Landscaping; and - Location of parking areas and vehicle manoeuvring; and - Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design; and - Traffic generation and connectivity; and - Privacy within and between adjoining sites; and	That the point of submission is rejected It is not considered that the matters listed under s771(j) and s77L to be a qualifying matter have been met for the Hautapu and Te Awamutu Dairy Factory's.	

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
					<p>- Noise; and</p> <p>- <u>The outcomes of an infrastructure capacity assessment; and</u></p> <p>- <u>Stormwater disposal; and</u></p> <p>- <u>Alignment with any relevant Urban Design Guidelines adopted by Council; and</u></p> <p>- <u>Reverse sensitivity.</u></p> <p><u>(cB) Three or more dwellings per site within the Reverse Sensitivity Qualifying Matter Overlay.</u></p> <p><u>Activities that fail to comply with this rule will require a resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity with discretion being restricted over:</u></p> <p>- <u>Building location, bulk and design; and</u></p> <p>- <u>Development density; and</u></p> <p>- <u>Landscaping; and</u></p> <p>- <u>Location of parking areas and vehicle manoeuvring;</u></p> <p><u>and</u></p> <p>- <u>Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design; and</u></p> <p>- <u>Traffic generation and connectivity; and</u></p> <p>- <u>Privacy within and between adjoining sites; and</u></p> <p>- <u>Noise; and</u></p> <p>- <u>The outcomes of an infrastructure capacity assessment; and</u></p> <p>- <u>Stormwater disposal; and</u></p> <p>- <u>Alignment with any relevant Urban Design Guidelines adopted by Council; and</u></p> <p>- <u>Reverse sensitivity.</u></p>		
56.20	Support	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Qualifying Matters	2A.4.2.4 to 2A.4.2.6	Supports the reference to reverse sensitivity effects as one of the limits of discretion for activities that do not comply with the setbacks rules (Rules 2A.4.2.4 to 2A.4.2.6) and require resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity.	Retain the reference to reverse sensitivity effects as a limit of discretion for Rules 2A.4.2.4 to 2A.4.2.6 (Setbacks) as notified.		Support noted
56.21	Support	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Qualifying Matters	2A.4.2.12 to 2A.4.2.20	Supports the reference to reverse sensitivity effects as one of the limits of discretion for activities that do not comply with the outlook space rules (Rules 2A.4.2.12 to 2A.4.2.20) and require resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity.	Retain the reference to reverse sensitivity effects as a limit of discretion for Rules 2A.4.2.12 to 2A.4.2.20 (Outlook) as notified.		Support noted
56.22	Support in Part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Qualifying Matters	2A.4.2.42	Fonterra supports addition of new Rule 2A.4.2.42. The requirement for noise sensitive activities located within the noise contour of the Te Awamutu Dairy Factory to be designed to comply with the applicable noise standards is supported. The discretionary activity status for activities that do not comply is supported provided the owner and operator of the Te Awamutu Dairy Factory is considered an affected person in accordance with s.95E of the Act. However, amendments are required to Rule 2A.4.2.42 so that the requirement to provide noise insulation for noise sensitive activities is applicable to both the Te Awamutu and Hautapu sites. Any noise sensitive activity occurring within the noise contour boundary of the Te Awamutu or Hautapu Dairy Factory sites should comply with the same noise insulation provisions.	<p>Supports Rule 2A.4.2.42 with amendments as follows:</p> <p>Where a noise sensitive activity is proposed within the 55 dBA Ldn noise contour of the Te Awamutu Dairy Manufacturing Site or the Hautapu Dairy Manufacturing Site as shown on the Planning Maps it shall be designed to achieve 35dB LAeq inside habitable rooms of new dwellings or new habitable rooms to existing dwellings whether attached or detached. Activities that fail to comply with Rules 2A.4.2.40 to 2A.4.2.42 will require a resource consent for a discretionary activity;</p> <p>and</p> <p>Retain the Discretionary Activity Status for activities that do not comply with Rule 2A.4.2.42;</p> <p>and</p> <p>Require the Te Awamutu Dairy Factory and Hautapu Dairy Factory to be a potentially affected party for any such application.</p>		<p>That the point of submission is rejected</p> <p>This request is outside the scope of PC26. Hautapu has different provisions due to the different surrounding uses.</p>

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
56.23	Support in Part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Qualifying Matters	Rule 21.1.2 A.5	Fonterra supports the Assessment Criteria in Rule 21.1.2A.5. However, amendments are required to include an additional standard relating to reverse sensitivity effects as reverse sensitivity effects are not adequately provided for within the assessment criteria. A new standard is proposed to ensure reverse sensitivity is afforded appropriate weighting and consideration in the assessment under Rule 21.1.2A.5.	Amend Rule 21.1.2A.5 as follows: Add the following additional (new) standard: (u) The extent of adverse effects including reverse sensitivity effects on adjacent commercial, industrial or rural zones, and lawfully established industrial activities including the Hautapu and Te Awamutu Dairy Factory Sites.		That the point of submission is rejected It is not considered that the matters listed under s77I(j) and s77L to be a qualifying matter have been met for the Hautapu and Te Awamutu Dairy Factory's.
56.24	Support in part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Qualifying Matters	21.1.2 A.5A	To be able to effectively consider the reverse sensitivity effects for the Hautapu and Te Awamutu Dairy Factories, a similar approach should be taken to the Infrastructure Constraint Qualifying Matter in Rule 21.1.2A.5. That is, a new set of assessment criteria needs to be provided for the situation where there are more than two dwellings per site within the Reverse Sensitivity Qualifying Matter Overlay. This must include the addition (u).	Add new Rule 21.1.2A.5A: <u>More than two dwellings per site within the Reverse Sensitivity Qualifying Matter Overlay or more than three dwellings per site outside the Reverse Sensitivity Qualifying Matter Overlay.</u> (a) <u>Whether the site is located within or outside of the Reverse Sensitivity Qualifying Matter Overlay.</u> (b) <u>Amenity values, including design features that promote privacy and neighbourhood coherence –such as yards, height, fencing and screening, separation and orientation of dwellings to obstruct sight lines between living areas.</u> (c) <u>The extent to which adequate vehicle parking and the provision of safe vehicle entrances for both pedestrians and vehicles, car parking and manoeuvring and vehicle access to rubbish and recycling compounds, and access for emergency vehicles has been provided.</u> (d) <u>The extent of adverse effects on the surrounding road network, including on the function of intersections.</u> (e) <u>The adequacy of the servicing proposed for the development.</u> (f) <u>The adequacy of the site to accommodate the proposed density of development. In particular for compact housing developments involving seven or more dwellings, whether it is located in the areas where this type of development is encouraged under Compact Housing Policy.</u> (g) <u>The provision of lighting for amenity and crime prevention, without being a nuisance to residents.</u> (h) <u>The provision of connections to public walkways/cycleways and the road network.</u> (i) <u>Open space character including on-site landscaping, retention of mature trees, provision of shared driveways.</u> (j) <u>Outdoor living spaces for independent living units that are private and have good access to sunlight in midwinter.</u> (k) <u>The location of outdoor storage areas and rubbish and recycling compounds so that the appearance from the street is not adversely affected and on-site amenity, such as the provision of outdoor living spaces is not compromised.</u>		That the point of submission is rejected It is not considered that the matters listed under s77I(j) and s77L to be a qualifying matter have been met for the Hautapu and Te Awamutu Dairy Factory's. (refer to s42a discussion s9.17.68 to s9.17.75; pgs 103 to 105)

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
					<p><u>(l) The design of the road boundary setback:</u> <u>(i) Street definition -the extent to which units as opposed to garages orient and face the street creating a strong interface between the public and private domains. Designs need to avoid street frontages that are dominated by garages and outdoor storage areas; and</u> <u>(ii) Landscaping -the type and nature of the landscaping both within the road boundary setback and throughout the development so that it contributes both to the neighbourhood and to on-site amenity; and</u> <u>(iii) Access way design -the width and proportion of the frontage as well as the landscaping and the materials to be used.</u></p> <p><u>(m) Building design including:</u> <u>(i) The extent to which solar potential and good solar aspect is optimized within the development; and</u> <u>(ii) Colours; and</u> <u>(iii) The materials to be used and how they are to be repeated within the development; and</u> <u>(iv) Detail of roof pitches; and</u> <u>(v) Details of doorways and the provision of shelter for visitors; and</u> <u>(vi) Windows, revetment, balconies and recesses; and</u> <u>(vii) Garaging to create visual continuity and cohesion and reflect a residential character.</u></p> <p><u>(n) Designs shall avoid monolithic walls in favour of designs that incorporate smaller scale building elements to promote feelings of interest and diversity.</u></p> <p><u>(o) Visually permeable fences and glazing of façades that provide for surveillance from the dwelling to the street and other public places such as walkways and reserves.</u></p> <p><u>(p) Integration with neighbouring residential development through consistency of façade treatment, including building proportions, detailing, materials and landscape treatment.</u></p> <p><u>(q) The extent to which compact housing development involving seven or more dwellings within the C1 and C2 / C3 structure plan areas:</u> <u>(i) Includes 'universal access' design principles within design, maximising accessibility for all users.</u> <u>(ii) Provides an internal movement network layout that is legible and enables good connectivity.</u> <u>(iii) Maximises safety for pedestrians, by:</u></p> <p><u>(r) Providing dedicated pedestrian access to dwellings and areas of communal open space, demarcated through materials, colours and/or texture.</u></p> <p><u>(s) Minimises the need for vehicular backing manoeuvres where site size and layout allows, by providing safe turning areas.</u></p> <p><u>(t) Facilitates an internal movement network that provides for dedicated vehicle access to each dwelling, such as may include:</u></p>		

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
					<p>(i) Using rear lanes where vehicle access off a public street is difficult or compromises pedestrian and visual amenity.</p> <p>(ii) Providing shared vehicular access layout for larger developments.</p> <p>(iii) Uses surface treatments to clearly demarcate vehicular entrances.</p> <p>(iv) Takes into account safety and accessibility if visitor car parking is provided within the development.</p> <p>(v) Provides clearly visible main pedestrian entries from the street or lane to each dwelling at ground floor level.</p> <p>(vi) Maximises the visual relationship between dwellings and adjacent streets, lanes and public open spaces, through provision of windows and balconies at upper levels.</p> <p>(vii) Minimises the number of dwellings with internal and outdoor living areas oriented to the south. (viii) Dwellings are designed to provide private outdoor areas adjacent to living areas.</p> <p>(ix) Orientates windows to maximise daylight and outlook, without compromising dwelling privacy or the privacy of neighbouring dwellings.</p> <p>(x) Provides adequate storage space for each residential unit, including for larger items such as bicycles and outdoor equipment. (xi) For apartment style developments, provides communal open spaces with edges that are activated or overlooked by adjacent streets, lanes or dwellings.</p> <p>(xii) Integrates proposed communal open spaces with the development's wider pedestrian network.</p> <p>(xiii) Compatibility of the proposed development with the existing and likely future surrounding environment including the residential density (minimum and maximum) of the development.</p> <p>(u) The extent of adverse effects including reverse sensitivity effects on adjacent commercial, industrial or rural zones, and lawfully established industrial activities including the Hautapu and Te Awamutu Dairy Factory Sites.</p>		
56.25	Support in Part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Qualifying Matters	21.1.2 A.6	Supports the Assessment Criteria in Rule 21.1.2A.6 for building height. However, amendments are required to include an additional standard relating to reverse sensitivity effects on adjacent commercial, industrial and rural zones. A new standard is proposed to ensure reverse sensitivity is afforded appropriate weighting and consideration in the assessment of building height under Rule 21.1.2A.6.	Amend Rule 21.1.2A.6 as follows: Add the following additional (new) standard: (f) Minimising overlooking adjacent industrial activities including Te Awamutu Dairy Factory to reduce reverse sensitivity effects.		That the point of submission is rejected The link between increased height and reserve sensitivity impacts is not justified. <i>(refer to s42a discussion s9.17.68 to s9.17.75; pgs 103 to 105)</i>
56.26	Support in Part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Qualifying Matters	21.1.2 A.8	Supports the Assessment Criteria in Rule 21.1.2A.8 for setbacks. However, amendments are required to the Assessment Criteria to also require setbacks to consider the potential for reverse sensitivity effects. A larger setback is likely to be more appropriate for residential development occurring in close proximity to the Te Awamutu or Hautapu Dairy Factory sites.	Amend Rule 21.1.2A.8 to include the following additional assessment criteria (k): (k) The extent to which the development will have <u>reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established industrial activities including dairy manufacturing sites.</u>		That the point of submission is rejected The request is already addressed under 21.1.2A.8(h) Whether the proposed activity will have reverse sensitivity effects on adjacent activities or zones <i>(refer to s42a discussion s9.17.68 to s9.17.75; pgs 103 to 105)</i>
56.27	Support	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Qualifying Matters	21.1.2 A.24	Supports the assessment criteria proposed for Noise insulation: noise sensitive activities in Rule 21.1.2A.24.	Retain Rule 21.1.2A.24(a) as notified.		Support noted

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
56.28	Support in Part, Oppose in part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Qualifying Matters	21.1.1 5.6	Supports the assessment criteria proposed for subdivision in the Medium Density Residential Zone; and in particular, Assessment Criteria (e).	Retain Rule 21.1.15.6 as notified; and add the following additional (new) standard: <u>(w) The extent to which the proposed subdivision and/or development creates land use conflicts and/or reverse sensitivity effects.</u>		That the point of submission is accepted in part The following amendment is recommended: <u>21.1.15.6 (e) The extent to which the proposal has taken sufficient account of proximity to the dairy manufacturing sites and reverse sensitivity effects.</u> (refer to s42a discussion s9.17.68 to s9.17.75; pgs 103 to 105)
56.29	Support	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Qualifying Matters	15.4.1.1(e)	Supports the inclusion of reverse sensitivity effects and proximity to dairy manufacturing sites as Matters of Discretion for restricted discretionary activities in the Activity Status Table for Rule 15.4.1.1(e).	Retain the references to 'the potential for reverse sensitivity effects' and 'proximity to the dairy manufacturing sites' as matters of discretion for Restricted Discretionary Subdivision (Activity Table 15.4.1.1(e)) as notified.		Support noted
63.2	Support	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Qualifying Matters	Various	The infrastructure constraint and stormwater constraint overlays are generally supported. Given the extent of the overlays it will be important there is a clear programme in parallel to PC26 which sets out when Council expects to uplift parts of the overlay due to infrastructure upgrades, so that these overlays are actively managed to ensure they don't end up providing too much of a constraint to development.	The infrastructure constraint and stormwater constraint overlays are generally supported. Given the extent of the overlays it will be important there is a clear programme in parallel to PC26 which sets out when Council expects to uplift parts of the overlay due to infrastructure upgrades, so that these overlays are actively managed to ensure they don't end up providing too much of a constraint to development.		No specific relief sought Councils modelling identifies pipes where capacity is low and where there is flood hazard present. Council has an ongoing pipe upgrade programme, and the modelling is likely to be upgraded periodically
68.2	Oppose	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Qualifying Matters	Planning Maps	The proposed qualifying matter overlays and rezoning of the entire C5 growth cell to the Medium Density Residential Zone are not supported. The private plan change will be seeking a more bespoke approach to rezoning, with provision for a range of densities (lower density (General Residential Zone), medium density, higher density (either a new Residential Intensification Zone or Compact Housing Overlay), and neighbourhood centre scale commercial activity (Commercial Zone).	The proposed qualifying matter overlays and rezoning of the entire C5 growth cell to the Medium Density Residential Zone are not supported.		That the point of submission is rejected C5 is deferred and not a live residential zone so it is agreed should not be part of the MDRZ.
68.9		Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Qualifying Matters	Various	It is anticipated that technical solutions will be available to ensure the development of growth cells does not unduly compromise the carrying capacity of existing public infrastructure or necessitate public funding to facilitate upgrades to reticulated services.	The necessity for the stormwater and infrastructure qualifying matter overlays in C5 growth cell is uncertain. As the technical assessments are finalised and the private plan change is advanced it is anticipated that the need for these qualifying matters will be closely investigated.		No specific relief sought C5 has been mapped in the Infrastructure Constraint Overlay in error. This error has been corrected, reducing the extent of the Infrastructure Constrain Overlay.
70.5	Oppose	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Qualifying Matters	All	The submitter questions the justification for the geographical extent to which the qualifying matters have been applied to land zoned MRZ and seeks that the extent of the qualifying matters be reviewed and refined.	Seeks that the extent of the qualifying matter overlays be reviewed and refined.		No specific relief sought The justification for and extent of the qualifying matters has been reviewed by the technical experts and is addressed in the s42a report.
70.40	Support in Part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Qualifying Matters	2A.1	Overall, supports the introductory statements for the Medium Density Residential Zone. However, it considers that some of the statements are inconsistent with the direction provided in the Enabling Housing Act and NPSUD as they do not align with the enabling intent of these documents.	Retain 2A.1 subject to the relief sought by the submitter in other points of submission.		Addressed in following submission point.
70.41	Oppose in Part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Qualifying Matters	-	Considers that some of the statements signal development density that does not align with the MDRS under the Enabling Housing Act.	Amend Section 2A.1.1 as follows: 2A.1.1 The Medium Density Residential Zone of the District is where most people in Waipā live. It is principally located in Waipā's Urban Areas comprising the two main towns of Cambridge and Te Awamutu, together with Kihikihi as a functional part of the Te Awamutu Urban Area. The density of this zone is expected to be a minimum of twenty five to thirty of this zone is expected to be a minimum of twenty five to thirty five dwellings per hectare (not once public spaces and infrastructure have been provided for).		That the point of submission is rejected The density mentioned links in with the work relevant Waikato Councils have undertaken in the Future Proof study, which has taken into account the NPS-UD.

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
70.43	Support	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Qualifying Matters	2A1.5	Supports section 2A.1.5 as it reflects the requirements of the NPSUD. The submitter particularly supports the recognition for the District's main townships to grow as well-functioning urban environments that enable a variety of homes to meet the needs of different households.	Retain Section 2A.1.5 as notified.		Support noted
70.45	Oppose in Part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Qualifying Matters	2A.1.9	Opposes 2A.1.9(a) as this does not appropriately recognise the role of development/financial contributions or developer-led works in the provision of necessary infrastructure to support development. The submitter considers there to be inadequate justification under s32 of the Act for infrastructure capacity to be a qualifying matter to the extent identified. Further, the submitter opposes 2A.1.9(i) as it considers there to be inadequate justification under s32 of the Act for these matters (protected trees, character clusters and structure plans) to be qualifying matters.	Review extent of and justification for qualifying matters in 2A.1.9(a) and (i) and amend provisions/maps to reflect narrower scope of qualifying matters.		No specific relief sought The justification for and extent of the qualifying matters has been reviewed by the technical experts and is addressed in the s42a report.
70.46	Oppose in Part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Qualifying Matters	2A.1.10 - 2A.1.15	Considers the proposed three-waters related qualifying matter does not appropriately recognise the role of development/ financial contributions or developer-led works in the provision of necessary infrastructure to support development. The submitter considers there to be inadequate justification under s32 of the Act for infrastructure capacity to be a qualifying matter to the extent identified. The submitter considers that the current infrastructure constraints have been unreasonably leveraged to qualify the MDRS and, as a result, PC26 does not appropriately give effect to the Enabling Housing Act.	Review extent of and justification for three-waters related qualifying matters and amend provisions/maps to reflect narrower scope of qualifying matters.		No specific relief sought The justification for and extent of the qualifying matters has been reviewed by the technical experts and is addressed in the s42a report. The overlay applies to the majority of areas because of the nature of water networks where upstream (water supply) or downstream (wastewater) capacity is relevant to the wider network. Issues in the network can limit development across the wider network.
70.123	Oppose	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Qualifying Matters	Planning Maps 56 & 57	The submitter questions the justification for the geographical extent to which qualifying matters have been applied to land zoned Medium Density Residential. For example, the Infrastructure Constraint Qualifying Matter appears to capture the entirety of the Medium Density Residential Zone and there does not appear to be adequate justification for this in terms of the requirements under s32 of the Act	Amend Planning Maps 56 & 57 to rationalise the extent to which the Qualifying Matters apply.		No specific relief sought The justification for and extent of the qualifying matters has been reviewed by the technical experts and is addressed in the s42a report. The overlay applies to the majority of areas because of the nature of water networks where upstream (water supply) or downstream (wastewater) capacity is relevant to the wider network. Issues in the network can limit development across the wider network.
72.4	Oppose	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Qualifying Matters	All	It is necessary for the Plan Change to give effect to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 and Resource Management (Enabling Housing and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 to provide for more intensive development and to recognise that the built form of urban areas will change to provide greater housing choice and supply.	Seeks that unnecessary qualifying matter overlays are removed from the planning maps.		That the point of submission is rejected The justification for and extent of the qualifying matters has been reviewed by the technical experts and is addressed in the s42a report. <i>RMA Amendment Act provides for qualifying matters.</i>
72.17	Support in Part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Qualifying Matters	2A.1.13 - 15	Seeks to expand the resource management issue relating to the increasing and changing housing demand. This is the focus of the Amendment Act and should be better reflected in these provisions. The functional and operational needs of retirement village housing will be crucial to ensure that the elderly population have suitable housing that meet their needs.	Amend 2A.1.13 as shown below (or words to similar effect): •2A.1.13 There is a requirement to meet a wide range of housing needs including for families, single or two person households; and options for extended families. •2A.2.14 In order to meet the needs of an ageing population there is a need to provide a range of housing options and types with an appropriate range of facilities. •2A.2.15 <u>It should be recognised that the character and amenity of existing areas will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.</u> •2A.2.[16] <u>The functional and operational needs of different housing solutions must be recognised and provided for.</u> •2A.2.[17] There is a need to enable more intensive development on larger sites to provide for the efficient use of those sites where they can mitigate adverse effects on adjoining sites.		That the point of submission is accepted in part Following amendment supported •2A.2.15 <u>It should be recognised that the character and amenity of existing areas will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.</u> Unclear how discussing the functional and operational needs of housing solutions adds to the introduction on changing housing demands (other than relating to wording used by the submitter relating to retirement facilities). The request to allow more intensive development on larger sites is not supported in the objectives and policies or elsewhere in the ODP or PC26.

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
					•2A.2.[158] In the future there may be increased demand for marae and papakāinga developments within Medium Density Residential Zones.		
72.33	Oppose	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Qualifying Matters	Map 56	The site at 41 Bryce Street in Cambridge is an existing retirement village development. It is unclear why the stormwater and infrastructure constraint qualifying matters have been applied to this site when it is an existing retirement village with adequate infrastructure. This approach is not consistent with policy 2A.3.2.2.4 which seeks to enable the modification of the MDRS only to the extent necessary to accommodate a qualifying matter applying to that site.	Apply the Medium Density Residential zoning and remove the Stormwater and Infrastructure qualifying matter constraints from 41 Bryce Street, Cambridge.		That the point of submission is rejected The overlay applies to the majority of areas because of the nature of water networks where upstream (water supply) or downstream (wastewater) capacity is relevant to the wider network. Issues in the network can limit development across the wider network. Modelling for pipe capacity (10 year ARI + CC) and flood hazard (100 year ARI + CC) are the basis of the qualifying matters rather than the current zoning or land use.
73.5	Oppose	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Qualifying Matters	All	The submitter questions the justification for the geographical extent to which the qualifying matters have been applied to land zoned MRZ and seeks that the extent of the qualifying matters be reviewed and refined.	Seeks that the extent of the qualifying matter overlays be reviewed and refined.		No specific relief sought The justification for and extent of the qualifying matters has been reviewed by the technical experts and is addressed in the s42a report.
73.40	Support in Part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Qualifying Matters	2A.1	Overall, supports the introductory statements for the Medium Density Residential Zone. However, it considers that some of the statements are inconsistent with the direction provided in the Enabling Housing Act and NPSUD as they do not align with the enabling intent of these documents.	Retain 2A.1 subject to the relief sought by the submitter in other points of submission.		Addressed in following submission point
73.41	Oppose in Part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Qualifying Matters	-	Considers that some of the statements signal development density that does not align with the MDRS under the Enabling Housing Act.	Amend Section 2A.1.1 as follows: 2A.1.1 The Medium Density Residential Zone of the District is where most people in Waipā live. It is principally located in Waipā's Urban Areas comprising the two main towns of Cambridge and Te Awamutu, together with Kihikihi as a functional part of the Te Awamutu Urban Area. The density of this zone is expected to be a minimum of twenty five to thirty of this zone is expected to be a minimum of twenty five to thirty five dwellings per hectare (not once public spaces and infrastructure have been provided for).		That the point of submission is rejected The density mentioned links in with the work relevant Waikato Councils have undertaken in the Future Proof study, which has taken into account the NPS-UD.
73.43	Support	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Qualifying Matters	2A1.5	Supports section 2A.1.5 as it reflects the requirements of the NPSUD. The submitter particularly supports the recognition for the District's main townships to grow as well-functioning urban environments that enable a variety of homes to meet the needs of different households.	Retain Section 2A1.5 as notified.		Support noted
73.44	Oppose	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Qualifying Matters	2A.1.8	Opposes the reference to "design outcomes" and need for development within areas subject to structure plans to be undertaken in general accordance with the requirements of structure plans. The submitter considers these outcomes/ requirements are inconsistent with the intent of the Enabling Housing Act and NPSUD as they inappropriately and unnecessarily restrict development	Delete Section 2A.1.8 or any other relief that addresses the submitter's concerns.		That the point of submission is rejected It is considered that structure planning remains a valid approach for carrying out Council's functions under sections 30 and 31 of the RMA.

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
73.45	Oppose in Part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Qualifying Matters	2A.1.9	Opposes 2A.1.9(a) as this does not appropriately recognise the role of development/financial contributions or developer-led works in the provision of necessary infrastructure to support development. The submitter considers there to be inadequate justification under s32 of the Act for infrastructure capacity to be a qualifying matter to the extent identified. Further, the submitter opposes 2A.1.9(i) as it considers there to be inadequate justification under s32 of the Act for these matters (protected trees, character clusters and structure plans) to be qualifying matters.	Review extent of and justification for qualifying matters in 2A.1.9(a) and (i) and amend provisions/maps to reflect narrower scope of qualifying matters.		No specific relief sought The justification for and extent of the qualifying matters has been reviewed by the technical experts and is addressed in the s42a report.
73.46	Oppose in Part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Qualifying Matters	2A.1.10 - 2A.1.15	Considers the proposed three-waters related qualifying matter does not appropriately recognise the role of development/ financial contributions or developer-led works in the provision of necessary infrastructure to support development. The submitter considers there to be inadequate justification under s32 of the Act for infrastructure capacity to be a qualifying matter to the extent identified. The submitter considers that the current infrastructure constraints have been unreasonably leveraged to qualify the MDRS and, as a result, PC26 does not appropriately give effect to the Enabling Housing Act.	Review extent of and justification for three-waters related qualifying matters and amend provisions/maps to reflect narrower scope of qualifying matters		No specific relief sought The justification for and extent of the qualifying matters has been reviewed by the technical experts and is addressed in the s42a report.
73.123	Oppose	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Qualifying Matters	Planning Maps 56 & 57	The submitter questions the justification for the geographical extent to which qualifying matters have been applied to land zoned Medium Density Residential. For example, the Infrastructure Constraint Qualifying Matter appears to capture the entirety of the Medium Density Residential Zone and there does not appear to be adequate justification for this in terms of the requirements under s32 of the Act	Amend Planning Maps 56 & 57 to rationalise the extent to which the Qualifying Matters apply.		No specific relief sought The justification for and extent of the qualifying matters has been reviewed by the technical experts and is addressed in the s42a report. The overlay applies to the majority of areas because of the nature of water networks where upstream (water supply) or downstream (wastewater) capacity is relevant to the wider network. Issues in the network can limit development across the wider network.
77.1	Support	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Qualifying Matters	Section 2A; Planning Maps	The section at 80 Whitmore Street Kihikihi is large and has sufficient land area to be part of intensive residential development. The land is at the top of a rise and is not affected by flooding, there is a sufficient volume to remove sewage. This would be similar with the present approved developments occurring around this property.	Remove constraints proposed by Waipā Council re Stormwater & Infrastructure for 80 Whitmore St Kihikihi & allow for more intensive residential development into the Waipā District Plan as outlined in overarching Govt directive.		No specific relief sought The justification for and extent of the qualifying matters has been reviewed by the technical experts and is addressed in the s42a report. Further modelling has been undertaken which confirmed the acceptable number of dwellings per lot. Anything more than that would require further assessment or would not be permitted. Modelling for pipe capacity (10 year ARI + CC) and flood hazard (100 year ARI + CC) are the basis of the qualifying matters rather than the current zoning or land use.
79.110	Oppose in part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Qualifying Matters	2A.1.9 Introduction	Opposes reference to special character, character clusters and character streets, state highways, as well as broad reference to adverse effects on the Waikato and Waipā rivers in relation to infrastructure. This is consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission and in particular (but not limited to) the proposed provisions concerning infrastructure overlays, character streets and clusters.	Amend Qualifying Matters-Introduction 2A.1.9 as follows: Qualifying Matters - Introduction 2A.1.9 The Medium Density Residential Standards have been modified to accommodate qualifying matters in the Waipa District in the following circumstances: (a) Where there are existing constraints on infrastructure capacity meaning that increased density of development could lead to <u>unacceptable</u> adverse effects on the Waikato and Waipa Rivers and their catchment which is in conflict with the Vision, Objectives and Strategies of Te Ture Whaimana; (b)...		That the point of submission is rejected The justification for and extent of the qualifying matters has been reviewed by the technical experts and is addressed in the s42a report.

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
					(c) Where cultural, or historic or special character related values are present and could be lost through uncontrolled development; ... (h) Where sites are located proximate to nationally significant infrastructure, such as the National Grid transmission lines, state highways and the North Island Main Truck railway line; and (i) Where there are specific matters which make higher density inappropriate such as protected trees, character clusters and specific requirements applying within Structure Plans.		
79.244	Oppose in part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Qualifying Matters	Planning maps; various	The implications of the 'stormwater infrastructure' and 'river / gully proximity' qualifying matter overlays have not been sufficiently assessed or justified in accordance with ss77J and 77L of the Housing Supply Act.	Accept the changes sought in Appendix 5 to the submission (Appendix 5 to the submission seeks deletion of the Qualifying Matter-River/Gully Proximity, Qualifying Matter-Stormwater Constraint and Qualifying Matter-Infrastructure Constraint overlays "in its entirety")		That the point of submission is rejected River/gully proximity overlay extent appropriate to protect values associated with these open spaces.
79.245	Oppose in part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Qualifying Matters	Planning maps; various	Consistent with the overall submission, Kāinga Ora opposes and seeks deletion of the 'stormwater infrastructure' and 'river / gully proximity' qualifying matter overlays.	Seeks removal of the overlays sought from the planning maps.		That the point of submission is rejected River/gully proximity overlay extent appropriate to protect values associated with these open spaces. Modelling for pipe capacity (10 year ARI + CC) and flood hazard (100 year ARI + CC) are the basis of the qualifying matters rather than the current zoning or land use.
47.4	Support in Part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Resource Management Issues	2A.2.4	Considers that the functional effects on the amenity of the Medium Density Residential Zone should be expanded to include neighbourhoods that are accessible and provide for the health, safety and wellbeing of residents. This is consistent with proposed objective 2A.3.1.	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>	FS8 - oppose	That the point of submission is rejected Requested addition is too vague and does not add to the proposed residential amenity issue.
56.8	Support	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Resource Management Issues	2A.2.7, 2A.2.19, 2.2.7, 2.2.20	Supports the amendments proposed to Resource Management Issues 2.2.7 and 2.2.20 (deleting reference to the Te Awamutu Dairy Factory in Issue 2.2.7 and deleting 2.2.20 in its entirety) provided that identical resource management issues are included in Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone.	Amend Resource Management Issues 2.2.7 and 2.2.20 in Section 2 Residential Zone as notified; and Retain new Resource Management Issues 2A.2.7 and 2A.2.19 in Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone as notified.		Support noted
70.49	Oppose	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Resource Management Issues	2A.2.2 - 2A.2.10	Considers that the description of the residential amenity issues conflicts with the intent of the NPSUD and MDRS and does not recognise that residential amenity and character of the residential zone needs to change over time to provide for the diverse and changing needs of the community and this change is not necessarily adverse.	Delete sections 2A2.2 – 2A2.10 or amend the description of the issue to reflect the intent of the NPSUD and MDRS.		That the point of submission is rejected Changes have been made to PC26 to recognise that residential amenity is not static.
70.50	Oppose	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Resource Management Issues	2A.2.12	Opposes the description of on-site amenity values as it does not recognise that retirement villages provide on-site amenity through a range of communal areas or that retirement village operators are best placed to understand the amenity needs of their residents.	Delete Section 2A.2.12.		That the point of submission is rejected This issue relates to all development in the MDRZ not just retirement villages and is appropriate to consider in the context of on-site amenity and the positioning of buildings.
73.49	Oppose	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Resource Management Issues	2A.2.2 - 2A.2.10	Considers that the description of the residential amenity issues conflicts with the intent of the NPSUD and MDRS and does not recognise that residential amenity and character of the residential zone needs to change over time to provide for the diverse and changing needs of the community and this change is not necessarily adverse.	Delete sections 2A2.2 – 2A2.10 or amend the description of the issue to reflect the intent of the NPSUD and MDRS.		That the point of submission is rejected Changes have been made to PC26 to recognise that residential amenity is not static.

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
73.50	Oppose	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Resource Management Issues	2A.2.1 2	Opposes the description of on-site amenity values as it does not recognise that retirement villages provide on-site amenity through a range of communal areas or that retirement village operators are best placed to understand the amenity needs of their residents.	Delete Section 2A.2.12		That the point of submission is rejected This issue relates to all development in the MDRZ not just retirement villages and is appropriate to consider in the context of on-site amenity and the positioning of buildings.
79.132	Oppose	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Resource Management Issues	2A.2.2	Opposes the assumption that new developments and subdivisions result in poor amenity outcomes by virtue of the act they are new. The issue statement should be amended to relate to the methods employed to address the stated issues, and ensure it does not conflict with MDRZ and reflect that the NPS-UD and MDRS anticipates effects of development as a result of change in density and urban form and enabled.	Amend 2A.2.2 Residential Amenity as follows: 2A.2.2 The density, design and layout of new developments and subdivision <u>need to be managed to ensure they do not</u> can result in poor amenity outcomes for that development and neighbouring properties.		That the point of submission is rejected The use of the word 'can' does not assume that new developments 'do' result in poor amenity outcomes.
73.134	Oppose	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Resource Management Issues	2A.2.3	Opposes reference to character clusters in 2A.2.3.	Delete 2A.2.3 as notified.		That the point of submission is rejected The justification for and extent of the qualifying matter has been reviewed by technical experts and changes are recommended to the extent of the character clusters, however they are recommended to be retained.
79.135	Oppose	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Resource Management Issues	2A.2.4	Opposes the assumption that new developments and subdivisions result in poor amenity outcomes by virtue of the act they are new. The issue statement should be amended to relate to the methods employed to address the stated issues, and ensure it does not conflict with MDRZ and reflect that the NPS-UD and MDRS anticipates effects of development as a result of change in density and urban form and enabled.	Amend 2A.2.4 as follows: Developments and subdivisions <u>need to manage potential</u> can have adverse visual and functional effects on the amenity of the Medium Density Residential Zone. <u>The amenity values of to ensure the Medium Density Residential Zone includes provides:</u> (a) A low <u>An ambient noise environment consistent with the planned medium density urban built form outcomes of the zone;</u> and (b) Neighbourhoods that are well maintained, safe, and are free from non-residential activities developments and associated signs that can result in adverse visual and nuisance effects; (c) Vibrant and active communities that have a mix of demographics and housing types.		That the point of submission is rejected The use of the word 'can' does not assume that new developments 'do' result in poor amenity outcomes. Other proposed amendments do not add to the description of the amenity values of the MDRZ.
79.138	Support in part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Resource Management Issues	2A.2.5	Generally supports 2A.2.5 to the extent that it is consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission.	Include 2A.2.5 as notified, to the extent it is consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission and relief sought.		Support noted
79.139	Oppose	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Resource Management Issues	2A.2.6	Relocated buildings can locate within urban environments where they meet the development and performance standards. They do not have any inherent qualities that make them unsuitable for urban environments. The Building Act manages relocated buildings.	Delete 2A.2.5 and associated provisions relating to relocated buildings in their entirety.		That the point of submission is rejected The ODP includes controls on relocated buildings which have been carried through to the MDRZ.
79.141	Oppose	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Resource Management Issues	2A.2.8	Noise levels within the MDRZ would comply with noise standards anticipated within any residential activity. This issue is already stated under 2A.2.4. Privacy effects are a separate 'amenity' issue and can be adequately managed through design as per 2A.2.2	Delete 2A.2.8 as the issues are already identified in other provisions.		That the point of submission is rejected The issue outlined in 2A.2.8 is much more specific than that mentioned in 2A.2.4.
79.145	Support in part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Resource Management Issues	2A.2.1 1	While Kāinga Ora supports the issue, it reads as a statement rather than a resource management 'issue' to be addressed.	Amend 2A.2.11 Neighbourhood Safety as follows: Inappropriate building design, fence design, and site layout <u>has the potential to reduce opportunities</u> affects the opportunity for passive surveillance from dwellings to roads and other public places and as a consequence adversely affect community safety.		That the point of submission is accepted in part Following amendment recommended: 2A.2.11 Inappropriate building design, fence design, and site layout <u>can</u> affects the opportunity for passive surveillance from dwellings to roads and other public places and as a consequence adversely affect community safety.

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
79.146	Support in part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Resource Management Issues	2A.2.12	While Kāinga Ora supports the issue, it relates to 'on-site' amenity values but also talks of neighbouring properties 'off-site'. This is not consistent.	Amend 2A.2.12 On-site amenity values as follows: 2A.2.12 Buildings that are poorly positioned on a site can affect the level of sunlight and daylight that people receive and the amount of on-site space that is available for outdoor living. Poorly positioned buildings can also result in adverse effects on neighbouring properties.		That the point of submission is accepted
79.147	Support in part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Resource Management Issues	2A.2.13 - 2A.2.15	Supports the acknowledgement of the need for changing housing options to meet changing demands.	Supports the acknowledgement in 2A.1.13-2A.1.15 of the need for changing housing options to meet changing demands.		Support noted
79.152	Support in part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Resource Management Issues	2A.2.16 - 2A.2.19	Supports the provisions 2A.2.16-2A.2.19 and the need to ensure that non-residential activities within residential zones are appropriate and do not conflict with the amenity values to be expected in such zones.	Supports the provisions 2A.2.16-2A.2.19.		Support noted
79.153	Support in part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Resource Management Issues	2A.2.16	Supports the provisions 2A.2.16-2A.2.19 and the need to ensure that non-residential activities within residential zones are appropriate and do not conflict with the amenity values to be expected in such zones.	Amend 2A.2.16 as follows: The intensity of non-residential activities can cause adverse effects and has the potential to detract from anticipated levels of residential amenity.		That the point of submission is rejected 'Can' and 'has the potential' have the same meaning.
79.154	Support in part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Resource Management Issues	2A.2.18	Supports the provisions 2A.2.16-2A.2.19 and the need to ensure that non-residential activities within residential zones are appropriate and do not conflict with the amenity values to be expected in such zones.	Amend 2A.2.18 as follows: The design and layout of non-residential buildings is often inconsistent with the <u>planned</u> amenity and <u>urban built form character</u> of the Medium Density Residential Zone, and can result in adverse effects beyond that anticipated in the zone.		That the point of submission is rejected Character is considered a relevant term used throughout the ODP and PC26.
70.86	Oppose in Part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Rules	2A.4	Opposes the direction for development within a structure plan area to be "in general accordance" with an approved structure plan. The submitter considers this requirement unnecessarily and inappropriately limits development in those areas subject to structure plans, and it fails to recognise that urban environments change over time and the functional and operational requirements of particular development types. This requirement is therefore inconsistent with the intent of the Enabling Housing Act and NPSUD.	Delete the following text in 2A.4 Rules (and any consequential amendments): "Development within a structure plan area identified on Planning Maps is required to be in general accordance with an approved structure plan."		That the point of submission is rejected It is considered that structure planning remains a valid approach for carrying out Council's functions under sections 30 and 31 of the RMA.
73.86	Oppose in Part	Section 2A Medium Density Residential Zone - Rules	2A.4	Opposes the direction for development within a structure plan area to be "in general accordance" with an approved structure plan. The submitter considers this requirement unnecessarily and inappropriately limits development in those areas subject to structure plans, and it fails to recognise that urban environments change over time and the functional and operational requirements of particular development types. This requirement is therefore inconsistent with the intent of the Enabling Housing Act and NPSUD.	Delete the following text from 2A.4 Rules (and any consequential amendments): "Development within a structure plan area identified on Planning Maps is required to be in general accordance with an approved structure plan."		That the point of submission is rejected It is considered that structure planning remains a valid approach for carrying out Council's functions under sections 30 and 31 of the RMA.

2.5 Chapter 15 (see s42a report - Topic 2.5 pgs 43 to 45)

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Sub	Response
13.5	Support in Part	Section 15 - Infrastructure, Hazards, Development & Subdivision	15.4.1.1(e) & (l)	For controlled activities (in relation to subsidisation in MDRZ), the plan must specify matters over which control is reserved. Such matters must be clearly identified so that relevant effects on the environment can be identified. The matters specified are not clear.	Redraft the matters of control in 15.4.1.1(e) and (l) in relation to subdivision for clarity.		No specific request These provisions are considered clear.
13.6	Support in Part	Section 15 - Infrastructure, Hazards, Development & Subdivision	15.4.1A	Inclusion of the phrase "or the need to obtain written approval from affected parties" is misleading. There is no need (as in legal requirement) to obtain written approval from affected parties.	Delete in 15.4.1A "or the need to obtain written approval from affected parties".		That the point of submission is rejected This provision describes the process of notification when written approval is provided and is correct.
47.17	Support	Section 15 - Infrastructure, Hazards, Development & Subdivision	15.4.1	Given that Section 21 –Assessment Criteria and Information Requirements sets out the full suite of matters of control / discretion, Fire and Emergency support the cross referencing of Section 21 in Activity Status Table 15.4.1, as relevant	Retain 15.4.1 as notified.		Support noted
47.25	Support	Section 15 - Infrastructure, Hazards, Development & Subdivision	15.4.1	Generally supports the inclusion of matters of control and matters of discretion in Activity Status Table 15.4.1 that requires consideration of the suitability of access and servicing of the proposed sites and that the risk of natural hazards on the site and whether this can be avoided or mitigated in the Medium Density Residential Zone	Retain 15.4.1 as notified.		Support noted
47.26	Support	Section 15 - Infrastructure, Hazards, Development & Subdivision	15.4.2.1A	Supports Rule 15.4.2.1A insofar that it requires a subdivision application to be accompanied by a land use application that is to be determined concurrently with the subdivision application. This will be important for Council to understand the impact of the proposed development at the time of subdivision so that the consequent adverse impacts on infrastructure such as the water supply and transport network can be considered prior to the granting of any subdivision resource consent. This will also ensure that an infrastructure capacity assessment is undertaken as per new section 2A requirements.	Retain 15.4.2.1A as notified.		Support noted W&WW – the density limits proposed by WDC are intended to limit development to maintain demand within the limits of current planned strategic infrastructure and without the need for additional. Development applications exceeding the permitted levels will be subject to assessment.
47.27	Oppose	Section 15 - Infrastructure, Hazards, Development & Subdivision	15.4.2.3	Rule 15.4.2.3 is opposed as it does not prescribe the minimum vehicle crossing requirements that would ensure well-functioning and resilient communities. Fire and Emergency requires all sites to provide a minimum vehicle crossing width of no less than 3.5m and a height clearance of 4m at site entrances. Should an application not comply with the minimum requirements, resource consent will be required as a restricted discretionary activity and will provide Council the ability to assess a development in accordance with the existing matters of discretion.	Amend Rule 15.4.2.3: Vehicle Crossing minimum: <u>3.5m</u>	FS5 – oppose FS6 – oppose FS8 – oppose	That the point of submission is rejected These provisions only relate to vehicle crossing widths, access widths increase in size depending on the number of lots served. It is unlikely a small vehicle crossing will be sought for a large access width, hence why a range is provided. It is not considered the introduction of the MDRZ necessitate the revision of this standard.
47.28	Support in Part	Section 15 - Infrastructure, Hazards, Development & Subdivision	15.4.2.18	Supports the application of Rule 15.4.2.18 to the new MDRZ. This is important in ensuring that new developments are connected to Council infrastructure services to ensure there is a water supply available for firefighting purposes.	Support the application of Rule 15.4.2.18 to the MDRZ.		Support noted W&WW – the density limits proposed by WDC are intended to limit development to maintain demand within the limits of current planned strategic infrastructure and without the need for additional. Development applications exceeding the permitted levels will be subject to assessment.
47.29	Support in Part	Section 15 - Infrastructure, Hazards, Development & Subdivision	15.4.2.18	Seeks a minor amendment to the advice note in 15.4.2.18 to include reference to 'development' of which this rule applies. This is important in scenarios where subdivision is not sought.	Amend 15.4.2.18 advice note: 2. If infrastructure capacity is unable to be confirmed the subdivision or development will either be declined or a financial contribution will be required to address the effects on infrastructure capacity.		That the point of submission is accepted Amend 15.4.2.18 to give effect to submission point 47.29.
47.30	Support	Section 15 - Infrastructure, Hazards, Development & Subdivision	15.4.2.19	Strongly supports the requirement for an infrastructure capacity assessment to be required where it is proposed to establish more than two dwellings on a site located within a qualifying matter overlay or overlays to ensure that there is sufficient capacity in the infrastructure network to deal with	Fire and Emergency strongly support the requirement for an infrastructure capacity assessment to be required where it is proposed to establish more than two dwellings on a site located within a qualifying matter overlay or overlays to ensure that there is sufficient capacity in the infrastructure		Support noted

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Sub	Response
				the additional demand being placed on the existing network from developments.	network to deal with the additional demand being placed on the existing network from developments.		
53.17	Not stated	Section 15 - Infrastructure, Hazards, Development & Subdivision	Various	How are the rules around vehicle access widths going to be addressed? Many Rear sites in Waipā will not comply with the minimum width standards when subdivided. Eg: When more than 3 Lots are being created and the access is 4m or less how will development be addressed.	Clarification around how reduced access widths for rear sites will be assessed.		No specific relief sought Applications not able to meet vehicle crossing standards will be assessed in a resource consent application.
56.30	Support	Section 15 - Infrastructure, Hazards, Development & Subdivision	Rule 15.4.1.1(o)	Supports the inclusion of reverse sensitivity effects as a Matter for a non-complying subdivision in the Activity Status Table for Rule 15.4.1.1.(o).	Retain the reference to reverse sensitivity effects as a matter of assessment for Non-Complying Subdivision (Activity Table 15.4.1.1(o)) as notified.		Support noted
65.13	Amend	Section 15 - Infrastructure, Hazards, Development & Subdivision	15.4.1.1 (o)	Infill subdivision should not be limited to three to six lots, CKL have previously been granted consent to undertake infill development comprising one additional infill lot and up to nine infill lots. Other proposals we have sought pre-application advice on have given the nod to fourteen infill lots without land use consent for 400m2, therefore this shouldn't be restricted by number or by concurrent land use consent. If a proposed dwelling does not meet the rules of the ODP this will be picked up at building consent stage and a land use consent would then be sought at this stage. There is no reason to have this limitation on number of lots being created and this also should apply to the Medium Density Residential Zone.	Amend rule as follows: Rule 15.4.1.1 (o) Subdivision to create three to six or more lots for infill housing between 350m2 to 500m2 in conjunction with a land use consent for the development Residential Zone - RD Medium Density Residential Zone for four or more lots - NA RD.	FS8 - support	That the point of submission is rejected PC26 does not amend the subdivision standards except to meet the specific requirements of the MDRS. It is not considered the introduction of the MDRZ necessitate the revision of this standard.
65.14	Amend	Section 15 - Infrastructure, Hazards, Development & Subdivision	15.4.2.1A, 15.4.2.1 (b)	On many occasions, consents have been granted with a smaller lot size of 500m2, especially around one additional lot in the residential zone. This minimum lot size should be reduced to reflect what is occurring throughout the district. Again, assessment at the building consent stage would pick up that a suitable dwelling is being constructed on the site.	Amend Rule as follows: Performance standard 15.4.1 (b) Residential Zone - Minimum Net Lot Area - 5350m2 Average Net Lot Area - > 6500m2 for 3 or more lots		That the point of submission is rejected PC26 does not amend the subdivision standards except to meet the specific requirements of the MDRS It is not considered the introduction of the MDRZ necessitate the revision of this standard.
65.15	Amend	Section 15 - Infrastructure, Hazards, Development & Subdivision	15.4.2.3	Often with infill development, the lot frontage of 20m cannot be achieved and there are many examples of previous subdivision where lot frontage reduces down to the existing dwelling on the site of the physical existing lot frontage is 20m and once you take of a crossing for a rear lot this reduces to 16m, therefore this is a consistent non-compliance with resource consent applications and should be amended to reflect what is being approved. With smaller sized lots it also means a 13m or 16m diameter circle would not be achievable, need to consider smaller lots in new subdivisions for duplexes or units. Assessment at the building consent stage will ensure that an appropriately sized dwelling is established on the site otherwise a land use consent would need to be sought.	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 210m, lot shape factor 13m diameter circle, Vehicle crossing - 3m -5.5m - Medium density residential front lots on entrance corridors - Lot frontage 215m, lot shape factor 106m diameter circle, vehicle crossing - 3m-5.5m Residential except front lots on entrance corridors; - Lot frontage 210m, lot shape factor 13m diameter circle, vehicle crossing - 3m-5.5m Residential front lots on entrance corridors - Lot frontage 215m, lot shape factor 106m diameter circle, vehicle crossing - 3m -5.5m	FS8 - oppose	That the point of submission is rejected PC26 does not amend the subdivision standards except to meet the specific requirements of the MDRS It is not considered the introduction of the MDRZ necessitate the revision of this standard.
65.16	Amend	Section 15 - Infrastructure, Hazards, Development & Subdivision	Rule 15.4.2.40	This rule doesn't make sense as it doesn't link back to the rule it refers to, need to add the link.	Amend rule as follows 15.4.2.40 As a result of the use of the rules 15.4.2.35- 15.4.2.39, Council shall....		That the point of submission is accepted in part Amend 15.4.2.40 As a result of the use of these rules
76.11	Support	Section 15 - Infrastructure, Hazards, Development & Subdivision	15.4.1.1(l)	Supports Rule 15.4.1.1(l) for subdivision around either existing (implemented or approved) dwellings or proposed dwellings where the subdivision is accompanied by a land use application that will be determined concurrently as a Controlled Activity.	Supports Rule 15.4.1.1(l).		Support noted.

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Sub	Response
76.12	Amend	Section 15 - Infrastructure, Hazards, Development & Subdivision	15.4.2.1 - Net lot area	Supports the minimum 500sqm net lot area in the Medium Density Residential Zone in Rule 15.4.2.1 Net Lot Area, however, seeks clarification and/or amendment to remove the average 600sqm for 3 or more lots and 1000sqm maximum net lot areas, where the intention behind vacant Lot subdivision in the MDRZ is to further develop into up to two dwellings (depending on Infrastructure Constraint Qualifying Matter Overlay).	Supports the minimum 500sqm net lot area in the Medium Density Residential Zone in Rule 15.4.2.1 Net Lot Area, however, seeks clarification and/or amendment to remove the average 600sqm for 3 or more lots and 1000sqm maximum net lot areas, where the intention behind vacant Lot subdivision in the MDRZ is to further develop into up to two dwellings (depending on Infrastructure Constraint Qualifying Matter Overlay).	FS7 - support	No specific relief sought PC26 does not amend the subdivision standards except to meet the specific requirements of the MDRS It is not considered the introduction of the MDRZ necessitate the revision of this standard.
76.13	Amend	Section 15 - Infrastructure, Hazards, Development & Subdivision	15.4.2.1 - Net lot area	Residential Zone (sewered): seeks to reduce the minimum 400sqm-500sqm net lot area to 300sqm-400sqm within standard residential zones and to remove average and maximum net lot area requirements to efficiently utilise the land as well as following other District Plans such as Hamilton and Auckland.	Residential Zone (sewered): seeks to reduce the minimum 400sqm-500sqm net lot area to 300sqm-400sqm within standard residential zones and to remove average and maximum net lot area requirements to efficiently utilise the land as well as following other District Plans such as Hamilton and Auckland.		That the point of submission is rejected This provisions only applies to the Residential Zone and is not the focus of PC26.
76.14	Support	Section 15 - Infrastructure, Hazards, Development & Subdivision	15.4.2.1A	Supports Rule 15.4.2.1A - Medium Density Residential Zone subdivision around existing or proposed dwellings.	Supports Rule 15.4.2.1A - Medium Density Residential Zone subdivision around existing or proposed dwellings.		Support noted.
76.15	Support	Section 15 - Infrastructure, Hazards, Development & Subdivision	15.4.2.3	Supports Rule 15.4.2.3 - Lot frontage, lot shape factor and vehicle crossings.	Supports Rule 15.4.2.3 - Lot frontage, lot shape factor and vehicle crossings.		Support noted.
76.16	Support	Section 15 - Infrastructure, Hazards, Development & Subdivision	15.4.2.5	Supports Rule 15.4.2.5 - Lot Design.	Supports Rule 15.4.2.5 - Lot Design.		Support noted.
76.17	Amend	Section 15 - Infrastructure, Hazards, Development & Subdivision	15.4.2.19	Seeks clarification and/or amendment in Rule 15.4.2.19 - Additional infrastructure servicing for the Residential, Commercial and Industrial Zones within the urban limits to reference suitably qualified and experienced person as a (generally a professional land surveyor or engineer) to ensure that a Infrastructure Capacity Assessment is prepared by the correct profession.	Seeks clarification and/or amendment in Rule 15.4.2.19 - Additional infrastructure servicing for the Residential, Commercial and Industrial Zones within the urban limits to reference suitably qualified and experienced person as a (generally a professional land surveyor or engineer) to ensure that a Infrastructure Capacity Assessment is prepared by the correct profession.		That the point of submission is accepted The following definition is recommended: A Suitably Qualified and Experienced Person to prepare an Infrastructure Capacity Assessment means a Chartered Engineer (or equivalent) experienced in the planning and design of three waters networks who is competent to carry out the assessment of development impacts on three waters networks. It should be noted that Council may require the use a nominated Consultant to carry out hydraulic modelling on behalf of Council for the purpose of a capacity assessment, but developers may wish to engage their own Engineer to assess on their own behalf.
79.8	Amend	Section 15 - Infrastructure, Hazards, Development & Subdivision	Section 15	Amendments are sought to ensure that the subdivision provisions provide for controlled activity subdivision in residential zones, as-required under Clause 3A of the Housing Supply Act. A range of amendments are also sought for consistency with the overall Kāinga Ora submission, and to ensure that vacant lot subdivision requirements better-align with the higher-density development that is proposed to be enabled under PC26.	Amendments are sought to ensure that the subdivision provisions provide for controlled activity subdivision in residential zones, as-required under Clause 3A of the Housing Supply Act.		No specific relief sought Provided for under rule 15.4.1.1(l).
79.265	Support	Section 15 - Infrastructure, Hazards, Development & Subdivision	15.3.4.1	Supports shape factor requirements only applying to vacant lots	Include the amendment to Policy 15.3.4.1 as notified.		Support noted
79.268	Support in Part	Section 15 - Infrastructure, Hazards, Development & Subdivision	15.4.1.1(e)	No reasons stated.	Delete all references to reverse sensitivity effects as a matter of discretion.	FS2 - oppose	That the point of submission is rejected The request to delete reference to reverse sensitivity is not supported as this is considered a relevant resource management consideration that is also referenced in the RPS.

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Sub	Response
79.270	Support in Part	Section 15 - Infrastructure, Hazards, Development & Subdivision	15.4.1.1(e)	No reasons stated.	Delete reference to the urban design guidelines which is in keeping with the submission to delete all character clusters and character precinct areas and their provisions. This includes the character urban design guidelines within the District Plan.		That the point of submission is rejected Character clusters have been reviewed and amendments are proposed. Urban design guidelines are considered a valid tool in the district plan and are not the focus of PC26 changes.
79.271	Support in Part	Section 15 - Infrastructure, Hazards, Development & Subdivision	15.4.1.1(e)	Amendments are sought to ensure that the subdivision provisions provide for controlled activity subdivision in residential zones, as required under Clause 3A of the Housing Supply Act.	Amend 15.4.1.1 (e) as shown: Subdivision that meets all the performance rules in Part A OR; Part A and Part C for 7 or more lots. Restricted discretionary Controlled activity – Medium Density Residential zone <u>and High Density Residential Zone.</u> Matters over which Council reserves its control in relation to subdivision in the Medium Density Residential Zone <u>and High Density Residential Zone</u> are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The subdivision contains an existing dwelling, or land use consent has been applied or approved for a dwelling on the proposed site; • No vacant sites are proposed to be created; • The extent to which the proposal will result in new or increased infringements to the applicable Medium Density Residential Zone <u>or High Density Residential Zone</u> rules and performance standards; §Suitability of access and servicing of the proposed sites; • The risk of natural hazards on the site and whether this can be avoided or mitigated. Matters of discretion for Assessment of restricted discretionary activities will be restricted to the following matters: (For Houchens Road Large Lot Residential Structure Plan Area refer to the matters in (o p) below instead): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure servicing; and • Site suitability including the risk of natural hazards on the site and whether this can be avoided or mitigated; and • Access and manoeuvring; and • The potential for reverse sensitivity effects; and • Proximity to the dairy manufacturing sites; and • Low impact design; and • Archaeology; and • Connectivity; and • Integration with the productive use of the land; and • Effects on the National Grid electricity transmission network within the Rural Zone, Residential Zone, Large Lot Residential Zone and Reserves Zone. In the Character Cluster Areas and Character Precinct Areas, the extent to which the Design Guidelines (Appendix DG1 – DG6) have been applied. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In areas subject to an approved structure plan or development plan, development in general accordance with that structure plan or development plan. • For Comprehensive Residential Subdivision within the C1 and C2/C3 Structure Plan areas, assessment of the overall concept plan for staged subdivision layout, including distribution of residential densities. Alignment with any relevant Urban Design Guidelines approved by Council. These matters will be considered in accordance with the assessment criteria in Section 21.	FS2 - oppose	That the point of submission is rejected High Density Zone not supported. The request to delete reference to reverse sensitivity is not supported as this is considered a relevant resource management consideration that is also referenced in the RPS. Subdivision does not have to be a controlled activity when vacant lots are proposed in the MDRS. Controlled subdivision in the MDRZ is addressed in 15.4.1.1(l)
79.274	Oppose in Part	Section 15 - Infrastructure, Hazards, Development & Subdivision	15.4.2.1	Opposes the net lot area standards and proposed amendments therein that apply as it does not enable a permitted level of development anticipated within the MDRZ. Kāinga Ora consider that a shape factor of 8m x 15m would be more appropriate on the basis that it does not apply to concurrent land use and subdivision applications as	Remove the net lot area rules as amended. Delete (a) from table 15.4.2.1.		No specific relief sought PC26 does not amend the subdivision standards except to meet the specific requirements of the MDRS

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Sub	Response
				prescribed in Clause 8 of Schedule 3A of the Housing Supply Act			It is not considered the introduction of the MDRZ necessitate the revision of this standard.
79.275	Oppose in Part	Section 15 - Infrastructure, Hazards, Development & Subdivision	15.4.2.1	Opposes the net lot area standards and proposed amendments therein that apply as it does not enable a permitted level of development anticipated within the MDRZ. Kāinga Ora consider that a shape factor of 8m x 15m would be more appropriate on the basis that it does not apply to concurrent land use and subdivision applications as prescribed in Clause 8 of Schedule 3A of the Housing Supply Act.	Support proposed changes to 15.4.2.1 other than 15.4.2.1(a).		Support noted
79.276	Oppose in Part	Section 15 - Infrastructure, Hazards, Development & Subdivision	15.4.2.1	Oppose the net lot area standards and proposed amendments therein that apply as it does not enable a permitted level of development anticipated within the MDRZ. Kāinga Ora consider that a shape factor of 8m x 15m would be more appropriate on the basis that it does not apply to concurrent land use and subdivision applications as prescribed in Clause 8 of Schedule 3A of the Housing Supply Act.	Shape factor standard covered under Rule 15.4.2.3.		That the point of submission is rejected PC26 does not amend the subdivision standards except to meet the specific requirements of the MDRS It is not considered the introduction of the MDRZ necessitate the revision of this standard.
79.279	Support in Part	Section 15 - Infrastructure, Hazards, Development & Subdivision	15.4.2.3	Supports the use of lot shape factors to ensure that new lots are of a shape and size that can accommodate a permitted level of development within the MDRZ, to the extent they are consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission, and on the basis that they do not apply to concurrent land use and subdivision applications as prescribed in Clause 8 of Schedule 3A of the Housing Supply Act. However, Kāinga Ora consider that a shape factor of 8m by 15m is more appropriate for the zone. Kāinga Ora considers that a minimum lot frontage requirement is unnecessary given the shape factor sought above. In addition, the MDRS provides for smaller typologies with smaller frontages and the NPS-UD removes the requirement for carparking, which also removes the requirement to include additional frontage for vehicle access. Amendments sought and to ensure that vacant lot subdivision requirements better-align with the higher-density development that is proposed to be enabled under PC26.	Amend 15.4.2.3 Rules-Lot frontage, lot shape and vehicle crossings to the extent the amendments are consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission and on the basis that they do not apply to concurrent land use and subdivision applications as prescribed in Clause 8 of Schedule 3A of the Housing Supply Act, as follows: 15.4.2.3 Except as provided for in Rule 15.4.2.1A, all All <u>vacant</u> lots shall comply with the following: Zone – Medium Density Residential except front lots on entrance corridors Lot frontage (excluding rear lots) 20m Lot shape factor 13m diameter circle 8m x15m Vehicle Crossing minimum to maximum – 3m to 5.5m		That the point of submission is rejected PC26 does not amend the subdivision standards except to meet the specific requirements of the MDRS It is not considered the introduction of the MDRZ necessitate the revision of this standard.
79.280	Support in Part	Section 15 - Infrastructure, Hazards, Development & Subdivision	15.4.2.3	Supports the use of lot shape factors to ensure that new lots are of a shape and size that can accommodate a permitted level of development within the MDRZ, to the extent they are consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission, and on the basis that they do not apply to concurrent land use and subdivision applications as prescribed in Clause 8 of Schedule 3A of the Housing Supply Act. However, Kāinga Ora consider that a shape factor of 8m by 15m is more appropriate for the zone. Kāinga Ora considers that a minimum lot frontage requirement is unnecessary given the shape factor sought above. In addition, the MDRS provides for smaller typologies with smaller frontages and the NPS-UD removes the requirement for carparking, which also removes the requirement to include additional frontage for vehicle access. Amendments sought and to ensure that vacant lot subdivision requirements better-align with the higher-density development that is proposed to be enabled under PC26.	Delete that part of Rule 15.4.2.3 Rules-Lot frontage, lot shape and vehicle crossings relating to 'Medium Density Residential, front lots on entrance corridors' to the extent the amendments are consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission and on the basis that they do not apply to concurrent land use and subdivision applications as prescribed in Clause 8 of Schedule 3A of the Housing Supply Act, as follows: Zone – Medium Density Residential, front lots on entrance corridors Lot frontage (excluding rear lots) 25m Lot shape factor 16m diameter circle Vehicle Crossing minimum to maximum 3m to 5.5m		That the point of submission is rejected PC26 does not amend the subdivision standards except to meet the specific requirements of the MDRS It is not considered the introduction of the MDRZ necessitate the revision of this standard.
79.281	Support in Part	Section 15 - Infrastructure, Hazards, Development & Subdivision	15.4.2.3	Support the use of lot shape factors to ensure that new lots are of a shape and size that can accommodate a permitted level of development within the MDRZ, to the extent they are consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission, and on the basis that they do not apply to concurrent land use and subdivision applications as prescribed in Clause 8 of Schedule 3A of the Housing Supply Act. However, Kāinga Ora consider that a shape factor of 8m by 15m is more appropriate for the zone. Kāinga Ora considers that a minimum lot frontage requirement is unnecessary given the shape factor sought above. In addition, the MDRS provides for smaller typologies with smaller frontages and the NPS-UD	Amend 15.4.2.3 Rules-Lot frontage, lot shape and vehicle crossings to the extent the amendments are consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission and on the basis that they do not apply to concurrent land use and subdivision applications as prescribed in Clause 8 of Schedule 3A of the Housing Supply Act, as follows: 15.4.2.3 Except as provided for in Rule 15.4.2.1A, all All <u>vacant</u> lots shall comply with the following: Zone – Medium Density Residential except front lots on entrance corridors Lot frontage (excluding rear lots) 20m		That the point of submission is rejected PC26 does not amend the subdivision standards except to meet the specific requirements of the MDRS It is not considered the introduction of the MDRZ necessitate the revision of this standard.

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Sub	Response
				removes the requirement for carparking, which also removes the requirement to include additional frontage for vehicle access. Amendments sought and to ensure that vacant lot subdivision requirements better-align with the higher-density development that is proposed to be enabled under PC26.	Lot shape factor - 43m diameter circle 8m x 15m Vehicle Crossing minimum to maximum – 3m to 5.5m		
79.282	Support in Part	Section 15 - Infrastructure, Hazards, Development & Subdivision	15.4.2.3	Support the use of lot shape factors to ensure that new lots are of a shape and size that can accommodate a permitted level of development within the MDRZ, to the extent they are consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission, and on the basis that they do not apply to concurrent land use and subdivision applications as prescribed in Clause 8 of Schedule 3A of the Housing Supply Act. However, Kāinga Ora consider that a shape factor of 8m by 15m is more appropriate for the zone. Kāinga Ora considers that a minimum lot frontage requirement is unnecessary given the shape factor sought above. In addition, the MDRS provides for smaller typologies with smaller frontages and the NPS-UD removes the requirement for carparking, which also removes the requirement to include additional frontage for vehicle access. Amendments sought and to ensure that vacant lot subdivision requirements better-align with the higher-density development that is proposed to be enabled under PC26.	Delete that part of Rule 15.4.2.3 Rules-Lot frontage, lot shape and vehicle crossings relating to 'Residential front lots on entrance corridors to the extent the amendments are consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission and on the basis that they do not apply to concurrent land use and subdivision applications as prescribed in Clause 8 of Schedule 3A of the Housing Supply Act, as follows: Zone – Residential front lots on entrance corridors Lot frontage (excluding rear lots) – 25 m Lot shape factor – 16m diameter circle Vehicle Crossing minimum to maximum - 3m to 5.5m.		That the point of submission is rejected PC26 does not amend the subdivision standards except to meet the specific requirements of the MDRS It is not considered the introduction of the MDRZ necessitate the revision of this standard.
79.285	Support	Section 15 - Infrastructure, Hazards, Development & Subdivision	15.4.2.5 and 15.4.2.6	Supports shape factor requirements only applying to vacant lots.	Include amendment to Rules-Lot Design 15.4.2.5 and 15.4.2.6 as notified.		Support noted.
79.286	Support	Section 15 - Infrastructure, Hazards, Development & Subdivision	15.4.2.18	Supports amendments to Rule 15.4.2.18 and associated rule, to the extent consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission.	Supports amendments to Rule 15.4.2.18 and associated rule, to the extent consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission.		Support noted.
79.288	Support in Part	Section 15 - Infrastructure, Hazards, Development & Subdivision	15.4.2.18	Supports the amendment and associated rule. Kāinga Ora however considered that alternative means may be considered where appropriate. Such as the use of stormwater detention/retention, reuse of grey water. Amendments sought to include reference to the new proposed HDRZ.	Alternative means may be considered where appropriate, such as the use of stormwater detention/retention, reuse of grey water in Rule 15.4.2.18.		No specific relief sought We would expect that this would be an outcome of the infrastructure assessment. This will be addressed via advice notes.
79.289	Support in part	Section 15 - Infrastructure, Hazards, Development & Subdivision	15.4.2.19	Seeks amendments to the infrastructure capacity assessment requirement, to reflect submissions on the MDRZ and proposed new HDRZ, as well as the permitted levels of residential development within those zones.	Amend Rule 15.4.2.19 as shown for consistency with the overall Kāinga Ora submission: An infrastructure capacity assessment by a suitably qualified and experienced person will be required where it is proposed to establish more than two <u>the permitted number of dwellings</u> on a site located within a qualifying matter overlay or overlays to ensure that there is sufficient capacity in the infrastructure network to deal with the additional demand being placed on the existing network from developments.		That the point of submission is rejected The overlays are not recommended to be deleted.

3 Qualifying Matters (see s42a report Topic 3)

3.1 Nationally Significant Infrastructure (see s42a report National Grid (pgs 48 to 51) State Highways (pgs 51 to 54) and Rail Corridor (pgs 54 to 55))

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submission	Response
38.1	Support	Nationally Significant Infrastructure – Qualifying Matter	All	Largely supports the proposed IPI, and in particular supports the identification of the National Grid within the IPI as a qualifying matter and inclusion of the ODP National Grid Corridor provisions within the IPI and ISPP process.	Supports identification of the National Grid as a qualifying matter.		Support noted
38.4	Support	Nationally Significant Infrastructure – Qualifying Matter	2.1.5	Supports the retention of the introductory paragraph outlining that there are National Grid transmissions lines which traverse those areas which remain in the Residential Zone. Transpower is neutral on the minor amendments proposed.	Retain 2.1.5.		Support noted
38.5	Amend	Nationally Significant Infrastructure – Qualifying Matter	2.3.7.5	Queries the necessity of this change and considers that it is unclear how the change arises as a consequence of implementing the Act. In the event the wording is changed, Transpower considers it is appropriate to amend the policy to better align with the NPSET (particularly Policies 2 & 5), by removing the phrase “to the extent practicable”; and using the word “compromise” rather than “exclude”, as this is consistent with the wording used in the NPSET(Policy 10).	Retain Policy 2.3.7.5 without amendment, or amend as follows: 2.3.7.5 To not compromise exclude foreclose operation or maintenance options or, to the extent practicable , the carrying out of routine and planned upgrade works.	FS8 - support	That the point of submission is accepted Policies – Management of activities within National Grid Corridors 2.3.7.5 To not compromise exclude foreclose operation or maintenance options or, to the extent practicable , the carrying out of routine and planned upgrade works.
38.8	Support	Nationally Significant Infrastructure – Qualifying Matter	2A.1.6	Supports reference to the relevance of section 15, being the section where the National Grid Corridor as a qualifying matter is applied to subdivision.	Retain reference in 2A.1.4 Introduction to Section 15		Support noted
38.10	Amend	Nationally Significant Infrastructure – Qualifying Matter	2A.1.24 - 2A.1.29	Supports the introduction section being explicit about the National Grid being a qualifying matter. This ensures that the relationship between the MDRS and limitations on development within the National Grid Yard are clear.	Retain 2A.1.24 - 2A.1.29.		Support noted
38.11	Amend	Nationally Significant Infrastructure – Qualifying Matter	2A.1.25	Minor amendments are sought to provide greater clarity and to better align with the NPSET. This includes being clear that the NPSET directs management of both the effects of the National Grid, as well as effects of activities on the National Grid, including reverse sensitivity effects.	Amend 2A.1.25 as follows: <u>Specific to electricity transmission,</u> t The relevant national policy statement is the National Policy Statement for Electricity Transmission 2008. It sets out the objective and policies to enable <u>which direct</u> the management of the effects of <u>and on</u> the electricity transmission network under the Resource Management Act 1991.		Amendment supported 2A.1.25 <u>Specific to electricity transmission,</u> t The relevant national policy statement is the National Policy Statement for Electricity Transmission 2008. It sets out the objective and policies to enable <u>which direct</u> the management of the effects of <u>and on</u> the electricity transmission network under the Resource Management Act 1991.
38.12	Amend	Nationally Significant Infrastructure – Qualifying Matter	2A.1.27	Minor amendments are sought to provide greater clarity and to better align with the NPSET. This includes being clear that the NPSET directs management of both the effects of the National Grid, as well as effects of activities on the National Grid.	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 ...	FS8 - support	Amendment supported 2A.1.27 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 ...
38.20	Amend	Nationally Significant Infrastructure – Qualifying Matter	2A.3.9	Supports the objective being carried over to the Medium Density Residential Zone. However, the objective should also refer to upgrading, for consistency with the NPSET Policy 2, and to align with the wording used in Policy 2.3.7.3.	Amend Objective 2A.3.9 as follows: To recognise and provide for the ongoing operation, maintenance, <u>upgrade</u> and development of the National Grid electricity transmission network.		Amendment supported 2A.3.9 To recognise and provide for the ongoing operation, maintenance, <u>upgrade</u> , and development of the National Grid electricity transmission network.
38.21	Support	Nationally Significant Infrastructure – Qualifying Matter	2A.3.9.1	Supports the policy being carried over to the Medium Density Residential Zone.	Retain Policy 2A.3.9.1.		Support noted

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submission	Response
38.22	Support	Nationally Significant Infrastructure – Qualifying Matter	2A.3.9.2	Supports the policy being carried over to the Medium Density Residential Zone.	Retain Policy 2A.3.9.2.		Support noted
38.23	Support	Nationally Significant Infrastructure – Qualifying Matter	2A.3.9.3	Supports the policy being carried over to the Medium Density Residential Zone.	Retain Policy 2A.3.9.3.		Support noted
38.24	Support	Nationally Significant Infrastructure – Qualifying Matter	2A.3.9.4	Supports the policy being carried over to the Medium Density Residential Zone.	Retain Policy 2A.3.9.4.		Support noted
38.25	Amend	Nationally Significant Infrastructure – Qualifying Matter	2A.3.9.5	Supports the policy being carried over to the Medium Density Residential Zone, but considers the policy should be amended to better align with the NPSET (particularly Policies 2 & 5), by removing the phrase “to the extent practicable”. Transpower considers that the word “compromise” would be more appropriate than “exclude”, as this is consistent with the wording used in the NPSET (Policy 10).	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.	FS8 - support	Amendment supported 2A.3.9.5 To not exclude <u>compromise</u> operation or maintenance options or, to the extent practicable , the carrying out of routine and planned upgrade works.
38.32	Amend	Nationally Significant Infrastructure – Qualifying Matter	15.3.15.5	Queries how the change arises as a consequence of the Amendment Act. It is appropriate to amend the policy to better align with the NPSET (particularly policies 2 & 5).	Retain policy 15.3.15.5 without amendment, or amend as follows: To not compromise-exclude foreclose operation or maintenance options or, to the extent practicable , the carrying out of routine and planned upgrade works.		Amendment supported 15.3.15.5 To not exclude foreclose <u>compromise</u> operation or maintenance options or, to the extent practicable , the carrying out of routine and planned upgrade works.
38.33	Amend	Nationally Significant Infrastructure – Qualifying Matter	15.4.1.1(e)	Supports the requirement for subdivision in the MDRZ to meet the performance rules in Part A. It is necessary to amend the matter of discretion to refer to the MDRZ; without this reference, the National Grid will not have effectively been applied as a qualifying matter.	Amend Rule 15.4.1.1(e) matters of discretion as follows: Effects on the National Grid electricity transmission network within the Rural Zone, Residential Zone, <u>Medium Density Residential Zone</u> , Large Lot Residential Zone and Reserves Zone.		Amendment supported 15.4.1.1(e) matters of discretion Effects on the National Grid electricity transmission network within the Rural Zone, Residential Zone, <u>Medium Density Residential Zone</u> , Large Lot Residential Zone and Reserves Zone.
38.34	Amend	Nationally Significant Infrastructure – Qualifying Matter	15.4.1.1(e)	If the activity status of subdivision within the MRZ under clause (e) is amended to a controlled activity, then Transpower seeks that the rules are amended so that this excludes any subdivision within the National Grid Corridor to ensure that the qualifying matter is appropriately applied.	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”.	FS8 - oppose	That the point of submission is rejected No change to the activity status of 15.4.1.1(e) recommended as this is provided for in 15.4.1.1(l).
38.35	Amend	Nationally Significant Infrastructure – Qualifying Matter	15.4.1.1(l)	Does not support the controlled activity status proposed for this type of subdivision, without any consideration of the National Grid. As a minimum, Transpower consider that there is a need for the rule to be subject to compliance with Rule 15.4.2.29. Transpower’s preference is that subdivision within the defined National Grid Corridor is explicitly listed as a restricted discretionary activity, with matters of discretion allowing for consideration of “Effects on the National Grid electricity transmission network ...”	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.”	FS8 - oppose	That the point of submission is rejected The National Grid can form a QM but cannot in itself restrict SD in the MDRZ that meets the requirements set out in the Amendment Act.
38.36	Support	Nationally Significant Infrastructure –	4.3.4	Although not forming part of the IPI, Transpower supports reference to the national grid as a qualifying matter within the Section 32.	Retain the National Grid as a qualifying matter.		Support noted

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submission	Response
		Qualifying Matter					
38.37	Support	Nationally Significant Infrastructure – Qualifying Matter	2.4.2.37	Notes that the application of Rule 2.4.2.37 as a qualifying matter will also limit density of development within the National Grid Yard, as well as building height. As Rule 2.4.2.37, 2A.4.1.5 and 2A.4.2.48 do not permit residential buildings and structures, they are a noncomplying activity.	Supports the s.32 assessment of Rule 2.4.2.37 and notes the application of the rule as a qualifying matter will also limit density of development within the National Grid Yard.		Support noted
38.38	Support	Nationally Significant Infrastructure – Qualifying Matter	2.4.2.38	Although not forming part of the IPI, Transpower generally supports the assessment, noting that buildings and structures for residential activities are a non-complying activity under Rule 2.4.2.37, 2A4.1.5 and 2A.4.2.48.	Supports the s.32 assessment of Rule 2.4.2.38.		Support noted
38.39	Support in Part	Nationally Significant Infrastructure – Qualifying Matter	15.4.1.1(e)	Notes that the assessment criteria do not refer to the Medium Density Residential Zone. In order for the National Grid Corridor to be applied as a qualifying matter, it is necessary to apply this matter of discretion within the new zone.	Amend Rule 15.4.1.1(e) as set out in Submission 38.32.		Amendment supported Refer to sub. Points 38.32 and 38.33.
38.40	Support	Nationally Significant Infrastructure – Qualifying Matter	21.1.15.37	Although not forming part of the IPI, Transpower generally supports the assessment. However, as noted above, for these to be applied as a qualifying matter as intended, the rules need to be amended to refer to these matters applying within the Medium Density Residential Zone.	Supports the s.32 assessment of Rule 21.1.15.37.		Support noted
38.41	Support	Nationally Significant Infrastructure – Qualifying Matter	All	There is no ambiguity as to whether the National Grid Corridors are a qualifying matter. The National Grid corridors area a qualifying matter as they are a matter required to give effect to the NPSET and are a matter required for the purpose of ensuring the safe or efficient operation of a nationally significant infrastructure.	It is not an efficient use of resources for the National Grid Corridor provisions to be relitigated as part of the Council's incorporation of the Medium Density Residential Standards.		Support noted
53.13	Oppose	Nationally Significant Infrastructure – Qualifying Matter	Various	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.	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.	FS3 – oppose FS8 - support	That the point of submission is rejected Rail corridor accepted as NSI and therefore meets the criteria to be a QM.
54.1	Support	Nationally Significant Infrastructure – Qualifying Matter	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.	FS8 - oppose	Support noted
54.2	Support	Nationally Significant Infrastructure – Qualifying Matter	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.	FS8 - oppose	Support noted
54.3	Support in Part	Nationally Significant Infrastructure – Qualifying Matter	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.	Include a new policy in the Residential Zone in 2.3.2: <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>	FS8 - oppose	That the point of submission is rejected A similar policy already exists in the Residential Zone addressing the management of activities within identified setbacks and corridors (2.3.7.1)

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submission	Response
54.4	Support in Part	Nationally Significant Infrastructure – Qualifying Matter	2A.3.4	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.	Include a new policy in the Medium Density Residential Zone in 2A.3.4: <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>	FS8 - oppose	That the point of submission is rejected A similar policy already exists in the Medium Residential Zone addressing the management of activities within identified setbacks and corridors (2A.3.9.1)
54.5	Support	Nationally Significant Infrastructure – Qualifying Matter	2A.3.4.9	Supports recognition of potential reverse sensitivity effects when noise sensitive activities locate close to existing activities such as railway lines.	Retain 2A.3.4.9 as notified.	FS8 - oppose	Support noted
54.6	Support in Part	Nationally Significant Infrastructure – Qualifying Matter	2.4.2	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.	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>	FS8 - oppose	That the point of submission is rejected KiwiRail are invited to provide a s77J assessment to support accommodating the setback within the qualifying matter.
54.7	Support in Part	Nationally Significant Infrastructure – Qualifying Matter	2.4.2	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.	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>	FS8 - oppose	That the point of submission is rejected KiwiRail are invited to provide a s77J assessment to support accommodating the setback within the qualifying matter.
54.8	Amend	Nationally Significant Infrastructure – Qualifying Matter	2A.4.1.4(a)(vii)	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.	<u>Supports discretionary activity status for non-compliance with 2A.4.1.4(vii). Amend 2A.4.1.4(a)(vii) to include reference to the vibration standard proposed as follows:</u> <u>2A.4.2.X Indoor railway vibration</u> <u>1. Any new buildings or alterations to existing buildings containing a noise sensitive activity, within 60 metres of the boundary of any railway network, must be protected from vibration arising from the nearby rail corridor.</u> <u>2. Compliance with standard 1 above shall be achieved by a report submitted to the council demonstrating compliance with the following matters:</u> <u>(a) the new building or alteration or an existing building is designed, constructed and maintained to achieve rail vibration levels not exceeding 0.3 mm/s vw.95 or</u> <u>(b) the new building or alteration to an existing building is a single-storey framed residential building with:</u> <u>i. a constant level floor slab on a full-surface vibration isolation bearing with natural frequency not exceeding 10 Hz, installed in accordance with the supplier's instructions and recommendations; and</u> <u>ii. vibration isolation separating the sides of the floor slab from the ground; and</u> <u>iii. no rigid connections between the building and the ground.</u>	FS8 - oppose	That the point of submission is rejected KiwiRail are invited to provide a s77J assessment to support accommodating the setback within the qualifying matter.
54.9	Support in Part	Nationally Significant Infrastructure – Qualifying Matter	2A.4.2.6	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.	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>	FS8 - oppose	That the point of submission is rejected KiwiRail are invited to provide a s77J assessment to support accommodating the setback within the qualifying matter.
54.10	Amend	Nationally Significant Infrastructure – Qualifying Matter	2A.4.2.6	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.	Amend 2A.4.2.6 matters for discretion by as follows: 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: ... - 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 ...	FS8 - oppose	That the point of submission is rejected KiwiRail are invited to provide a s77J assessment to support accommodating the setback within the qualifying matter.
54.11	Amend	Nationally Significant	2.4.2.29	Seeks amendment to Rule 2.4.2.29 to ensure that the noise controls apply to 100m from the	Amend Rule 2.4.2.29 as follows:	FS8 - oppose	That the point of submission is rejected

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submission	Response
		Infrastructure – Qualifying Matter		rail corridor and to include associated ventilation standards.	Where a <u>new or altered</u> noise sensitive activity or is proposed to be located within 40 <u>100m</u> of a railway track <u>corridor</u> , the building shall be insulated so that: (1) it achieves the following noise levels: (a) Inside bedrooms 35dBA LAeq (1hr) (b) Inside other habitable rooms 40dBA LAeq (1hr) (2) <u>Is at least 50 meters from any railway network, and is designed so that a noise barrier completely blocks line-of-sight from all parts of doors and windows, to all points 3.8 meters above railway tracks.</u> (3) <u>The levels in the above table must be met based on an assumed level of 70 dB LAeq(1h) at a distance of 12m from the track and reduce at a rate of 3 dB per doubling of distance of up to 40m and 6 dB per doubling of distance beyond 40m.</u> (4) <u>Where windows are required to be closed to achieve the sound levels in the table above the room or space shall be designed, constructed and maintained to:</u> - a. <u>Provide mechanical ventilation that satisfies clause G4 of the New Zealand Building Code and is adjustable by the occupant to control the ventilation rate in increments up to a high air flow setting that provides at least 6 air changes per hour; and</u> - b. <u>Provide relief for equivalent volumes of spill air; and</u> - c. <u>Provide cooling and heating that is controllable by the occupant and that can maintain the inside temperature of the room or space between 180C and 250C. Ensure that where a ventilation or cooling system is used that it does not generate more than 35dBLAeq when measured 1m away from any grille or diffuser).</u>		KiwiRail are invited to provide a s77J assessment to support accommodating the setback within the qualifying matter.
54.12	Amend	Nationally Significant Infrastructure – Qualifying Matter	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.	Amend Rule 2A.4.2.40 as follows: Where a <u>new or altered</u> noise sensitive activity or is proposed to be located within 40 <u>100m</u> of a railway track <u>corridor</u> , the building shall be insulated so that: (1) it achieves the following noise levels: (a) Inside bedrooms 35dBA LAeq (1hr) (b) Inside other habitable rooms 40dBA LAeq (1hr) (2) <u>Is at least 50 meters from any railway network, and is designed so that a noise barrier completely blocks line-of-sight from all parts of doors and windows, to all points 3.8 meters above railway tracks.</u> (3) <u>The levels in the above table must be met based on an assumed level of 70 dB LAeq(1h) at a distance of 12m from the track and reduce at a rate of 3 dB per doubling of distance of up to 40m and 6 dB per doubling of distance beyond 40m.</u> (4) <u>Where windows are required to be closed to achieve the sound levels in the table above the room or space shall be designed, constructed and maintained to:</u> - a. <u>Provide mechanical ventilation that satisfies clause G4 of the New Zealand Building Code and is adjustable by the occupant to control the ventilation rate in increments up to a high air flow setting that provides at least 6 air changes per hour; and</u> - b. <u>Provide relief for equivalent volumes of spill air; and</u> - c. <u>Provide cooling and heating that is controllable by the occupant and that can maintain the inside temperature of the room or space between 180C and 250C. Ensure that where a ventilation or cooling system is used that it does not generate more than 35dBLAeq when measured 1m away from any grille or diffuser).</u>	FS8 - oppose	That the point of submission is rejected KiwiRail are invited to provide a s77J assessment to support accommodating the setback within the qualifying matter.
54.13	Amend	Nationally Significant Infrastructure – Qualifying Matter	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	Amend 2.4.2 Performance Standards by including a new rule for indoor railway vibration 1. <u>Any new buildings or alterations to existing buildings containing a noise sensitive activity, within 60 metres of the boundary of any railway network, must be protected from vibration arising from the nearby rail corridor.</u>	FS8 - oppose	That the point of submission is rejected KiwiRail are invited to provide a s77J assessment to support accommodating the setback within the qualifying matter.

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submission	Response
				proposed permitted activity rule be assessed as a discretionary activity.	<p><u>2. Compliance with standard 1 above shall be achieved by a report submitted to the council demonstrating compliance with the following matters:</u></p> <p><u>(a) the new building or alteration or an existing building is designed, constructed and maintained to achieve rail vibration levels not exceeding 0.3 mm/s vw.95 or</u></p> <p><u>(b) the new building or alteration to an existing building is a single-storey framed residential building with:</u></p> <p><u>i.a constant level floor slab on a full-surface vibration isolation bearing with natural frequency not exceeding 10 Hz, installed in accordance with the supplier's instructions and recommendations;</u> and</p> <p><u>ii.vibration isolation separating the sides of the floor slab from the ground;</u> and</p> <p><u>iii.no rigid connections between the building and the ground.</u></p>		
54.14	Amend	Nationally Significant Infrastructure – Qualifying Matter	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.	<p>Amend 2A.4.2 Performance Standards by including a new rule for Indoor railway vibration:</p> <p><u>1. Any new buildings or alterations to existing buildings containing a noise sensitive activity, within 60 metres of the boundary of any railway network, must be protected from vibration arising from the nearby rail corridor.</u></p> <p><u>2. Compliance with standard 1 above shall be achieved by a report submitted to the council demonstrating compliance with the following matters:</u></p> <p><u>(a) the new building or alteration or an existing building is designed, constructed and maintained to achieve rail vibration levels not exceeding 0.3 mm/s vw.95 or</u></p> <p><u>(b) the new building or alteration to an existing building is a single-storey framed residential building with:</u></p> <p><u>i.a constant level floor slab on a full-surface vibration isolation bearing with natural frequency not exceeding 10 Hz, installed in accordance with the supplier's instructions and recommendations;</u> and</p> <p><u>ii.vibration isolation separating the sides of the floor slab from the ground;</u> and</p> <p><u>iii.no rigid connections between the building and the ground.</u></p>	FS8 - oppose	<p>That the point of submission is rejected</p> <p>KiwiRail are invited to provide a s77J assessment to support accommodating the setback within the qualifying matter.</p>
54.15	Support	Nationally Significant Infrastructure – Qualifying Matter	21.1.2A.8(b) and (h)	KiwiRail supports (h) which refers to the extent of reverse sensitivity effects. KiwiRail seeks that (b) also be amended to refer to rail.	<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 network.</u></p>	FS8 - oppose	<p>That the point of submission is rejected</p> <p>KiwiRail are invited to provide a s77J assessment to support accommodating the setback within the qualifying matter.</p>
63.4	Support in Part	Nationally Significant Infrastructure – Qualifying Matter	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 further justification is required in relation to this.	Provide further justification regarding how the 7.5m setback will ensure the safe or efficient operation of nationally significant infrastructure.	FS8 – oppose	<p>Amendment supported</p> <p>Council has considered the purpose of this additional setback and have made it more targeted in relation to noise sensitive development such as dwellings and sleepouts only.</p> <p>Recommend change as follows: Along boundaries adjoining a State Highway, a setback of 7.5 metres is required <u>for dwellings or sleep outs.</u></p>
63.5	Support in Part	Nationally Significant Infrastructure – Qualifying Matter	Various	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	Provide further justification for the state highway being identified as a qualifying matter.	FS8 - oppose	<p>No specific relief sought.</p> <p>Due to state highways been defined as regionally significant in statutory documents it is considered acceptable to class them as qualifying matters.</p>

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submission	Response
				to relation to the state highway network being a qualifying matter.			
79.129	Support in part	Nationally Significant Infrastructure – Qualifying Matter	2A.1.24	Opposes reference to the state highway roading network and the North Island Main Trunk railway and consider that the noise and vibration provisions will appropriately mitigate any potential effects on future development sites within proximity to these.	Amend 2A.1.24 as follows: Provisions in the Waipā Operative District Plan related to building in relation to the National Grid transmission network the state highway roading network and the North Island Main Trunk railway are is a qualifying matters by virtue of section 77(l)(b) of the Act being a matter required to give effect to a National Policy Statement and section 77(l)(e) being a matter required for the purpose of ensuring the safe or efficient operation of nationally significant infrastructure.	FS3 - oppose	That the point of submission is accepted in part It is agreed the Rail Corridor should not be classed as a qualifying matter. State Highways are assessed as qualifying matters in terms of the tests of the RMA.
79.130	Support in part	Nationally Significant Infrastructure – Qualifying Matter	2A.1.24-2A.1.29	Supports the remainder of the provisions in 2A.1.24-2A.1.29 (except for those relating to the state highway roading network and the North Island Main Trunk railway), to the extent they are consistent with overall Kāinga Ora submission.	Include the Qualifying Matters - Nationally Significant Infrastructure provisions 2A.1.24-2A.1.29 as amended, to the extent they are consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission.		That the point of submission is accepted in part It is agreed the Rail Corridor should not be classed as a qualifying matter. State Highways are assessed as qualifying matters in terms of the tests of the RMA.
79.140	Oppose	Nationally Significant Infrastructure – Qualifying Matter	2A.2.7	The provision does not align with the NPS-UD, wherein high-density development is encouraged around rapid transport routes. Kāinga Ora is opposed to provisions concerning reverse sensitivity, whether for infrastructure or otherwise. Effects should be managed 'at source' as far as practicable.	Delete 2A.2.7 as notified.	FS2 – oppose FS3 – oppose FS4 - oppose	That the point of submission is rejected The request to delete reference to reverse sensitivity in 2A.2.7 is not supported as this is considered a relevant resource management consideration that is also referenced in the RPS.

3.2 Te Ture Whaimana/Infrastructure Overlay (see s42a report pgs 66 to 72)

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submission	Response
17.2	Oppose	Infrastructure	All	Cambridge, Te Awamutu, and Kihikihi are small picturesque towns that shouldn't be changed to city complexes, and the traffic and people increase will make them overloaded. Privacy will be compromised, and local parks and trees will be destroyed.	Areas for intensification should have parks built for public use.		Support submission point Council has ongoing plans for protection and provision of reserves and parks in Cambridge and Te Awamutu,
18.3	Oppose	Infrastructure	All	Cambridge, Te Awamutu, and Kihikihi are small picturesque towns that shouldn't be changed to city complexes, and the traffic and people increase will make them overloaded. Privacy will be compromised, and local parks and trees will be destroyed.	There should be reserves/parks with trees added for public use.		Support submission point Council has ongoing plans for protection and provision of reserves and parks in Cambridge and Te Awamutu,
19.2	Support in Part	Infrastructure	All	Intensification of new sub-divisions requires more core service infrastructure - fresh potable water, wastewater and stormwater. A new wastewater plant should be built in Hautapu; and stormwater could be stored in underground tanks under green spaces like playgrounds with over flow heading to natural courses. For freshwater, all new builds should have, and existing builds should be allowed to have, watertanks for rain water for watering the garden, laundry and the W/C.	Intensification of new subdivisions calls on more core service infrastructure: water, wastewater and stormwater.		No specific relief sought WDC will recommend through an advice note that network capacity renewals/upgrades as well as on site measures are required. On site measures can include rain tanks (above or below ground), use of porous materials, living roofs inert roof materials etc. Intensification that requires a resource consent is assessed against the existing CSDC, the RITS and NZBC E1 RITS (and other applying documentation).
30.27	Support	Infrastructure	Various	Supports the continued inclusion of CPTED principles. These principles, when implemented provide actual and perceived safety outcomes, and therefore encourage walking and cycling.	Retain reference to CPTED principles in various provisions.		Support noted
30.28	Support	Infrastructure	15.4.2.19	Supports the requirement for an infrastructure capacity assessment for more than 2 dwellings on a site. This provides the option to enable development to meet the MDRS.	Retain the requirement for an infrastructure capacity assessment for more than 2 dwellings on a site.		Support noted

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submission	Response
30.29	Support in Part	Infrastructure	2.2.1 and 2A.2.1	"Impervious surfaces" is used which does not match the rest of the plan which uses "impermeable surfaces". We consider terminology should be consistent.	Amend issue statement to use "impermeable" instead of "impervious".		Amendment supported
30.33	Amend	Infrastructure	All	The Waikato stormwater management guideline 2020 could be referenced in the advice note to Rule 2A.4.2.54(f) or elsewhere in the plan (e.g. Rule 15.4.2.25).	Reference the Waikato stormwater management guideline 2020 in the advice note to rule 2A.4.2.54(f) and/or other relevant sections of the plan - e.g., Rule 15.4.2.25.		That the point of submission is accepted in part The RITS and the Waikato stormwater management guideline 2020 should be referenced in the advice notes for all rules in relation to Stormwater management for design purposes. Rule 2A.4.2.54(f) is recommended to be deleted as it was retained in error (relates to Compact Housing). Therefore, only amend 15.4.2.25 to add the following advice note: <u>4. The Waikato Stormwater Management Guideline 2020 are applicable.</u>
46.1	Oppose	Infrastructure	All	With respect to Lot 6 DPS 64524 (16 Fairburn Place, Cambridge, 3432), the Urban Flood Hazard Maps does not indicate reasonably the 1% AEP Modelled Flooding Extent: Climate Change RCP6.0.	Adjust the 1% AEP Modelled Flooding Extent: Climate Change mapping by removing all the portion of said mapping within Lot 6 DPS 64524 that lies adjacent to Lot 1 DP 553498 (see map attached to the submission).		To be responded to.
58.3	Oppose	Infrastructure	All	Cambridge is known as the Town of Trees and this character must be retained.	Plan more trees and allow more green spaces for increased population.		Support submission point Council has ongoing plans for protection and provision of reserves and parks in Cambridge and Te Awamutu,
63.15	Support in Part	Infrastructure	Objective 16.3.1	Supports Objective, 16.3.1 however we seek to include accessibility within the existing objective. This amendment will incorporate the element of well-functioning urban environment in accordance with NPS-UD Objective 1.	Amend Objective 16.3.1 as follows: 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.	FS8 - support	That the point of submission is accepted
63.16	Support in Part	Infrastructure	Policy 16.3.1.1	Seeks that policy 16.3.1.1 be amended to include accessibility. This will provide for a well-functioning urban environment in accordance with NPS-UD Objective 1.	Amend 16.3.1.1 as follows: Development, subdivision and transport infrastructure shall be designed and located to: ... (d) Contribute to: (i) Integrated transport and land use planning and a safe road system approach; and (ii) Reducing deaths and serious injuries on roads; and (iii) An effective and efficient road network; and (iv) Efficient movement of freight; <u>and</u> (v) <u>Providing good accessibility for people.</u>		Amendment supported
63.17	Support in Part	Infrastructure	Rule 16.4.2.22- Provision of an integrated transport assessment	Any integrated transport assessment (ITA) should demonstrate how it will achieve government and regional transport goals of Vehicle Kilometres Travelled (VKT) reductions. This provision does not currently require an assessment on VKT reduction. As such, Waka Kotahi considers that the assessment criteria be amended to ensure that any subdivision, use and development achieves Objective 8 of the NPS-UD and the NZ Emissions Reduction Plan target 1.	Amend 16.4.2.22 as follows: Assessment will be restricted to the following matters: ... - Provision for multi-modal transport options <u>and identification of initiatives for reducing Vehicle Kilometres Travelled</u> (Broad ITA only); and	FS5 – oppose FS6 – oppose FS8 - oppose	That the point of submission is rejected This has implications beyond just PC26. PC26 proposes no changes to Section 16 – Transportation at a rule and assessment criteria level. While I agree that such a method would align well with national guidance, recommend that this matter is considered and progressed separately by the Council.

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submission	Response
37.2	Support in part	Infrastructure Constraints - Qualifying Matter	All	Supports the application by the Council of the infrastructure constraint overlay and the stormwater constraint overlay as qualifying matters.	That the Council can implement the infrastructure constraint overlay and the stormwater constraint overlay as qualifying matters to protect the Waikato River and cultural/heritage sites.		Support noted Agree, WDC will seek opportunities to provide for water treatment as part of as part of stormwater network renewal/upgrade to provide for PC26. This aligns with Vision, Objectives and Strategies of Te Ture Whaimana and the new Waipa CSDC.
53.1	Support in Part	Infrastructure Constraints - Qualifying Matter	Infrastructure Constraints - Qualifying Matter	As Waipā is a Tier one authority, intensification should be enabled over much of the existing residential areas unless a qualifying matter applies. It is disappointing to see that the infrastructure and stormwater qualifying matter overlays have been placed over the entire residential areas.	A preference would be for the overall infrastructure capacity to be modelled and for this spare capacity to be able to be utilised while the upgrades are occurring in the areas which require it (no limit on the number of lots or dwellings per underlying title developed).		That the point of submission is rejected Planning for development anywhere in the town(s) has significant uncertainties about where capacity is required. The effect of this is that larger infrastructure typically needs to be planned for, but it may not be used. Removal of the overlay in lieu of modelling would result in uncertainty and a 'first in first served' development environment with limited controls on early development. Further modelling is to be undertaken which will confirm the acceptable number of dwellings per lot. Waipa have undertaken modelling of the overall infrastructure capacity and the 100 year flooding that addresses both the existing development scenario and Climate Change RCP 6. The spare capacity is estimated as part of this modelling. The infrastructure assessments that are undertaken on other assets will be above to comment on the capacity of the stormwater.
53.5	Oppose	Infrastructure Constraints - Qualifying Matter	2A.4.1.3(c)	While we acknowledge that certain areas within Waipā have constraints on reticulated infrastructure, it is noted that three or more dwellings within the Infrastructure Constraint Qualifying Matter Overlay is a Restricted Discretionary with the matters of discretion not being confined to the qualifying matter that relates to Infrastructure Constraints. The only matters of discretion that have any relevance to infrastructure is the outcomes of an infrastructure capacity assessment & stormwater disposal. In our opinion, any effects on infrastructure capacity from an increase in dwelling density would be sufficiently captured by the results of the infrastructure capacity assessment.	Amend the matters of Discretion for the Infrastructure Constraint Qualifying matter to only refer to the outcomes of an infrastructure capacity assessment; and Stormwater disposal. Suggested Rule amendment: 2A.4.1.3(c) Three or more dwellings per site within the Infrastructure Constraint Qualifying Matter Overlay. Activities that fail to comply with this rule will require a resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity with discretion being restricted over: •Building location, bulk and design; and •Development density; and •Landscaping; and •Location of parking areas and vehicle manoeuvring; and •Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design; and •Traffic generation and connectivity; and •Privacy within and between adjoining sites; and •Noise; and •The outcomes of an infrastructure capacity assessment; and •Stormwater disposal; and •Alignment with any relevant Urban Design Guidelines adopted by Council		That the point of submission is accepted Agreed that three dwellings within the Inf. Constraint Overlay should only have matters of discretion limited to the Inf. Constraint Overlay.

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submission	Response
65.30	Amend	Infrastructure Constraints - Qualifying Matter	Maps 56 and 57	Based on a review of the specialist reports supporting the plan change, it is not clear whether water leak improvement has been applied to the water model per the water Management Plan forecasts of 2019. It is considered that this would provide increased capacity for further development. Based on a review of the specialist reports supporting this plan change, it is unclear if consideration has been given to the use of private wastewater pump stations. These could detain wastewater to pre development and pump at off peak times into the wastewater network. Further, for the wastewater network, it is unclear if inflow and infiltration reduction measures have been applied to maximise capacity in the network.	Amend maps to provide a more accurate representation of infrastructure constraint qualifying matter.		That the point of submission is rejected Reductions in water losses and inflow and infiltration is not currently included in the models. The implementation of water loss reduction and I&I mitigation in networks in the long term can be difficult - the level of reduction ultimately achievable is often uncertain and does not result in capacity that can be reliably used in planning. Preference is to monitor benefits of such initiatives over time and allow discretionary higher-density development only where additional capacity has been realised and subject to assessments.
72.32	Oppose	Infrastructure Constraints - Qualifying Matter	Map 56	Insufficient justification has been provided to include the majority of the urban areas in Waipā within an Infrastructure Constraint qualifying matter area.	Remove the Infrastructure constraint qualifying matter from the Plan.		That the point of submission is rejected Removal of the overlay in lieu of modelling would result in uncertainty and a 'first in first served' development environment with limited controls on early development. Further modelling is to be undertaken which will confirm the acceptable number of dwellings per lot. The overlay applies to the majority of areas because of the nature of water networks where upstream (water supply) or downstream (wastewater) capacity is relevant to the wider network. Issues in the network can limit development across the wider network. The infrastructure considered to be a valid qualifying matter to apply to the MDRS to give effect to Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato—the Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River (s771(c)).
79.17	Oppose	Infrastructure Constraints - Qualifying Matter	Various	The spatial application of the Infrastructure Constraints overlay is extensive. As a result, the reduction in enabled density of up to two dwellings per site for land located within the overlay reduces the permitted density of development that the MDRS enables and requires. The implications of this have not been sufficiently assessed or justified in accordance with ss77J and 77L of the Housing Supply Act. The information on the infrastructure constraints may be appropriate as a non-statutory layer within Council's GIS. The submitter seeks to understand whether there is a net difference in effect between two or three dwellings per site on water supply and wastewater capacity - further work and analysis is warranted.	Delete the Infrastructure Constraint Overlay and associated provisions in their entirety.		That the point of submission is rejected Removal of the overlay in lieu of modelling would result in uncertainty and a 'first in first served' development environment with limited controls on early development. Further modelling is to be undertaken which will confirm the acceptable number of dwellings per lot. The overlay applies to the majority of areas because of the nature of water networks where upstream (water supply) or downstream (wastewater) capacity is relevant to the wider network. Issues in the network can limit development across the wider network. The infrastructure considered to be a valid qualifying matter to apply to the MDRS to give effect to Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato—the Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River (s771(c)).
79.33	Oppose	Infrastructure Constraints - Qualifying Matter	Oppose	The spatial application of the infrastructure constraints overlay is extensive and reduces the permitted density of development. Infrastructure effects mitigation is proposed by way of financial and development contributions. The implications of the infrastructure constraints overlay have not been sufficiently assessed or justified in accordance with ss77J and 77L of the Housing Supply Act. Further work and analysis is warranted to understand whether there is a net-difference in effect between two or three dwellings per site on water supply and wastewater capacity, taking into consideration the relativities of housing demand and enabled capacity in the district.	Delete the Infrastructure Constraint Overlay and associated provisions in their entirety.		That the point of submission is rejected Removal of the overlay in lieu of modelling would result in uncertainty and a 'first in first served' development environment with limited controls on early development. Further modelling is to be undertaken which will confirm the acceptable number of dwellings per lot. The overlay applies to the majority of areas because of the nature of water networks where upstream (water supply) or downstream (wastewater) capacity is relevant to the wider network. Issues in the network can limit development across the wider network. The infrastructure considered to be a valid qualifying matter to apply to the MDRS to give effect to Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato—the Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River (s771(c)).

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submission	Response
79.34	Oppose	Infrastructure Constraints - Qualifying Matter	Section 2A	The spatial application of the infrastructure constraints overlay is extensive and reduces the permitted density of development. Infrastructure effects mitigation is proposed by way of financial and development contributions. The implications of the infrastructure constraints overlay have not been sufficiently assessed or justified in accordance with ss77J and 77L of the Housing Supply Act. Kāinga Ora therefore seeks that up to three dwellings per site is a permitted activity in the MDRZ, and that four or more dwellings per site be included as a restricted discretionary activity. Further work and analysis is warranted to understand whether there is a net-difference in effect between two or three dwellings per site on water supply and wastewater capacity, taking into consideration the relativities of housing demand and enabled capacity in the district.	Amend Chapter 2A to allow for up to three dwellings per site as a permitted activity in the MDRZ, and that four or more dwellings per site be included as a restricted discretionary activity inclusive of (but not limited to) matters of discretion and assessment criteria requiring infrastructure capacity assessment at the point of connection.		That the point of submission is rejected Further modelling has confirm edthe acceptable number of dwellings per lot. Removal of the overlay would result in uncertainty and a 'first in first served' development environment with limited controls on early development. The infrastructure considered to be a valid qualifying matter to apply to the MDRS to give effect to Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato—the Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River (s77I(c)).
79.35	Oppose	Infrastructure Constraints - Qualifying Matter	Volume 3: Planning Maps - Infrastructure Constraints Overlay	The implications of the infrastructure constraints overlay have not been sufficiently assessed or justified in accordance with ss77J and 77L of the Housing Supply Act. The information on the infrastructure constraints may be appropriate as a non-statutory layer within Council's GIS, to assist in the infrastructure assessments for four or more dwellings as a restricted discretionary activity.	Appendix 5 identifies the Infrastructure Constraint Overlay that Kāinga Ora opposes and seeks deletion (refer to Appendix 5 to the submission).		That the point of submission is rejected Removal of the overlay in lieu of modelling would result in uncertainty and a 'first in first served' development environment with limited controls on early development. Further modelling is to be undertaken which will confirm the acceptable number of dwellings per lot. The overlay applies to the majority of areas because of the nature of water networks where upstream (water supply) or downstream (wastewater) capacity is relevant to the wider network. Issues in the network can limit development across the wider network The infrastructure considered to be a valid qualifying matter to apply to the MDRS to give effect to Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato—the Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River (s77I(c)).
79.112	Support in part	Infrastructure Constraints - Qualifying Matter	2A.1 Introduction	The submitter does not support use of the infrastructure overlays to constrain the permitted level of development or coverage otherwise required under the MDRS. The qualifying matter description in 2A.1.12 should be deleted so as to not conflict with the overall Kāinga Ora submission that up to three dwellings per site should be enabled in the MDRZ without overlay restrictions applying.	Delete 2A.1.12 and renumber as consequentially required.		That the point of submission is rejected Removal of the overlay would result in uncertainty and a 'first in first served' development environment with limited controls on early development. Further modelling is to be undertaken which will confirm the acceptable number of dwellings per lot. The overlay applies to the majority of areas because of the nature of water networks where upstream (water supply) or downstream (wastewater) capacity is relevant to the wider network. Issues in the network can limit development across the wider network The infrastructure considered to be a valid qualifying matter to apply to the MDRS to give effect to Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato—the Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River (s77I(c)).
79.209	Oppose in part	Infrastructure Constraints - Qualifying Matter	2A.4.1.1	The implications of the 'infrastructure constraint' qualifying matter overlay have not been sufficiently assessed or justified in accordance with s.s77J and 77L of the Housing Supply Act as to the effect this will have on development capacity and enabling up to three dwellings per site in accordance with that Act.	Amend 2A.4.1(b) to enable up to three dwellings per site as follows: 2A.4.1.1 Permitted activities... ... (b) Up to three dwellings per site outside of the Infrastructure Constraint Qualifying Matter Overlay.		That the point of submission is rejected Removal of the overlay would result in uncertainty and a 'first in first served' development environment with limited controls on early development. Further modelling is to be undertaken which will confirm the acceptable number of dwellings per lot. The overlay applies to the majority of areas because of the nature of water networks where upstream (water supply) or downstream (wastewater) capacity is relevant to the wider network. Issues in the network can limit development across the wider network
79.210	Oppose in part	Infrastructure Constraints - Qualifying Matter	2A.4.1.1	The implications of the 'infrastructure constraint' qualifying matter overlay have not been sufficiently assessed or justified in accordance with s.s77J and 77L of the Housing Supply Act as to the effect this will have on development capacity and enabling up to three dwellings per site in accordance with that Act.	Delete all references to infrastructure overlays and 2A.4.1(c) as follows: A.4.1.1 Permitted activities... ...		That the point of submission is rejected Removal of the overlay would result in uncertainty and a 'first in first served' development environment with limited controls on early development.

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submission	Response
					(c) Up to two dwellings per site within the Infrastructure Constraint Qualifying Matter Overlay.		<p>Further modelling is to be undertaken which will confirm the acceptable number of dwellings per lot.</p> <p>The overlay applies to the majority of areas because of the nature of water networks where upstream (water supply) or downstream (wastewater) capacity is relevant to the wider network. Issues in the network can limit development across the wider network</p> <p>The infrastructure considered to be a valid qualifying matter to apply to the MDRS to give effect to Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato—the Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River (s771(c)).</p>
79.211	Oppose in part	Infrastructure Constraints - Qualifying Matter	All	The implications of the 'infrastructure constraint' qualifying matter overlay have not been sufficiently assessed or justified in accordance with s.s77J and 77L of the Housing Supply Act as to the effect this will have on development capacity and enabling up to three dwellings per site in accordance with that Act.	Seeks the 'infrastructure constraint' qualifying matter overlay and associated provisions are deleted in their entirety.		<p>That the point of submission is rejected</p> <p>Removal of the overlay would result in uncertainty and a 'first in first served' development environment with limited controls on early development.</p> <p>Further modelling is to be undertaken which will confirm the acceptable number of dwellings per lot.</p> <p>The overlay applies to the majority of areas because of the nature of water networks where upstream (water supply) or downstream (wastewater) capacity is relevant to the wider network. Issues in the network can limit development across the wider network</p> <p>The infrastructure considered to be a valid qualifying matter to apply to the MDRS to give effect to Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato—the Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River (s771(c)).</p>
79.212	Oppose in part	Infrastructure Constraints - Qualifying Matter	All	The implications of the 'infrastructure constraint' qualifying matter overlay have not been sufficiently assessed or justified in accordance with s.s77J and 77L of the Housing Supply Act as to the effect this will have on development capacity and enabling up to three dwellings per site in accordance with that Act.	Seeks that four or more dwellings per site be included as a restricted discretionary activity inclusive of (but not limited to) matters of discretion and assessment criteria requiring infrastructure capacity assessment at the point of connection.		<p>That the point of submission is rejected</p> <p>Four or more dwellings within the Infrastructure Constraint is beyond the permitted MDRS density and is suitable to be classed as a RD activity. The matters for discretion do not need to be limited to Infrastructure Capacity alone for this density infringement.</p> <p>Further modelling will confirm whether 2 dwellings or more is acceptable in inf constraint overlay</p> <p>Removal of the overlay would result in uncertainty and a 'first in first served' development environment with limited controls on early development.</p> <p>Further modelling is to be undertaken which will confirm the acceptable number of dwellings per lot.</p> <p>The overlay applies to the majority of areas because of the nature of water networks where upstream (water supply) or downstream (wastewater) capacity is relevant to the wider network. Issues in the network can limit development across the wider network</p>
79.213	Oppose in part	Infrastructure Constraints - Qualifying Matter	All	The implications of the 'infrastructure constraint' qualifying matter overlay have not been sufficiently assessed or justified in accordance with s.s77J and 77L of the Housing Supply Act as to the effect this will have on development capacity and enabling up to three dwellings per site in accordance with that Act.	Accept the changes sought in Appendix 5 to the submission (Appendix 5 to the submission seeks deletion of the Qualifying Matter-River/Gully Proximity, Qualifying Matter-Stormwater Constraint and Qualifying Matter-Infrastructure Constraint overlays "in its entirety")		<p>That the point of submission is rejected</p> <p>Removal of the overlay would result in uncertainty and a 'first in first served' development environment with limited controls on early development.</p> <p>Further modelling is to be undertaken which will confirm the acceptable number of dwellings per lot.</p> <p>The overlay applies to the majority of areas because of the nature of water networks where upstream (water supply) or downstream (wastewater) capacity is relevant to the wider network. Issues in the network can limit development across the wider network</p> <p>The infrastructure considered to be a valid qualifying matter to apply to the MDRS to give effect to Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato—the Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River (s771(c)).</p>

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submission	Response
							We believe that the qualifying matter is needed to align with Vision, Objectives and Strategies of Te Ture Whaimana.
79.214	Oppose in part	Infrastructure Constraints - Qualifying Matter	All	The implications of the 'infrastructure constraint' qualifying matter overlay have not been sufficiently assessed or justified in accordance with s.77J and 77L of the Housing Supply Act as to the effect this will have on development capacity and enabling up to three dwellings per site in accordance with that Act.	The information on the infrastructure constraints may be appropriate as a non-statutory layer within Council's GIS, to assist in infrastructure assessments for four or more dwellings as a restricted discretionary activity.		That the point of submission is rejected Removal of the overlay would result in uncertainty and a 'first in first served' development environment with limited controls on early development. Further modelling is to be undertaken which will confirm the acceptable number of dwellings per lot. The overlay applies to the majority of areas because of the nature of water networks where upstream (water supply) or downstream (wastewater) capacity is relevant to the wider network. Issues in the network can limit development across the wider network The infrastructure considered to be a valid qualifying matter to apply to the MDRS to give effect to Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato—the Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River (s77I(c)).
79.215	Oppose in part	Infrastructure Constraints - Qualifying Matter	All	Seeks to understand whether there is a net-difference in effect between two or three dwellings per site on water supply and wastewater capacity, taking into consideration the relativities of housing demand and enabled capacity in the district. Further work and analysis is warranted.	Seeks to understand whether there is a net-difference in effect between two or three dwellings per site on water supply and wastewater capacity, taking into consideration the relativities of housing demand and enabled capacity in the district. Further work and analysis is warranted.		No specific relief sought Further modelling is to be undertaken which will confirm the acceptable number of dwellings per lot. Additional dwellings may be approved in some cases subject to a three waters assessment. However, the proposed rule rated to 2 dwellings per lot is recommended to be retained to preserve opportunity for anyone to develop up to this density without limitations imposed by other development occurring first.
79.220	Oppose in part	Infrastructure Constraints - Qualifying Matter	2A.4.1.3	Consistent with the submission on 2A.4.1(b) and (c), Kāinga Ora opposes the application of the Infrastructure qualifying matter overlay.	Amend 2A.4.1.3(b) to remove reference to the Infrastructure Constraint Qualifying Matter Overlay.		That the point of submission is rejected Removal of the overlay would result in uncertainty and a 'first in first served' development environment with limited controls on early development. Further modelling has confirmed the acceptable number of dwellings per lot. The overlay applies to the majority of areas because of the nature of water networks where upstream (water supply) or downstream (wastewater) capacity is relevant to the wider network. Issues in the network can limit development across the wider network The infrastructure considered to be a valid qualifying matter to apply to the MDRS to give effect to Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato—the Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River (s77I(c)).
79.222	Oppose in part	Infrastructure Constraints - Qualifying Matter	2A.4.1.3	Generally supports the referencing of the established assessment criteria under the operative provisions. However, in light of the NPS-UD and acknowledgement that existing environments will change in response to the planned urban built form character and amenity, the existing matters of discretion need to be reframed to account for this. The matters for discretion and associated assessment criteria can be rationalised to ensure effective and efficient plan-administration. An additional matter for discretion in relation to three waters for four or more dwellings per site seeks to ensure the appropriate assessment is undertaken, given Kāinga Ora's submission points seeking deletion of the infrastructure constraints overlay.	Seeks four or more dwellings per site be included as a restricted discretionary activity inclusive (but not limited to) matters of discretion and assessment criteria requiring infrastructure capacity assessment at the point of connection.		That the point of submission is rejected Further modelling has confirmed the acceptable number of dwellings per lot. Additional dwellings may be approved in some cases subject to a three waters assessment. However, the proposed rule rated to 2 dwellings per lot is recommended to be retained to preserve opportunity for anyone to develop up to this density without limitations imposed by other development occurring first.
79.226	Oppose in part	Infrastructure Constraints - Qualifying Matter	2A.4.1.3	Consequential changes to other listed activities and associated matters of discretion may be required should the relief sought to the infrastructure constraint overlay be granted.	Consequential changes to other listed activities and associated matters of discretion may be required should the relief sought to the infrastructure constraint overlay be granted.		That the point of submission is rejected Relief regarding the infrastructure overlay is not supported for this reason.

Commented [HC1]: Please make sure WDC – Tony Coutts is happy with this logic, in lieu of modelling

Commented [HC2]: Please make sure WDC – Tony Coutts is happy with this logic, in lieu of modelling

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submission	Response
							<p>Removal of the overlay in lieu of modelling would result in uncertainty and a 'first in first served' development environment with limited controls on early development.</p> <p>The proposed rule rated to 2 dwellings per lot is recommended to be retained to preserve opportunity for anyone to develop up to this density without limitations imposed by other development occurring first.</p> <p>Further modelling is to be undertaken which will confirm the acceptable number of dwellings per lot.</p> <p>The infrastructure considered to be a valid qualifying matter to apply to the MDRS to give effect to Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato—the Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River (s771(c)).</p>
30.1	Support	Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato	Various	WRC supports the increased recognition of Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato and generally supports the approach to applying Te Ture Whaimana as a qualifying matter.	Retain provisions requiring development to give effect to Te Ture Whaimana.		Support noted
49.1	Support	Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato	All	Housing intensification has the potential to adversely affect the Waikato River and therefore fails to give effect to Te Ture Whaimana. Waikato-Tainui agree that the application of the Te Ture Whaimana qualifying matter must be related to impacts on the health and wellbeing of the Waikato River and that the matter required to give effect to Te Ture Whaimana relates to the balance in the relationship between enabled residential densities, and the provision of public infrastructure necessary to address adverse effects arising from development taking up those densities.	Waikato-Tainui are satisfied that the provisions that have been developed and included will give effect to or achieve the objectives of Te Ture Whaimana, with further amendments noted in the submission.		Support noted
49.2	Amend	Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato	All	Waikato-Tainui are concerned about the adverse effects as a result of intensive developments in the areas not subject to an infrastructure constraint overlay and consider appropriate provision has not been included to provide for this.	Waikato-Tainui are concerned about the adverse effects as a result of intensive developments in the areas not subject to an infrastructure constraint overlay and consider appropriate provision has not been included to provide for this.		<p>No specific relief sought</p> <p>The infrastructure constraint has been applied throughout to the relevant residential areas.</p> <p>The infrastructure overlay considers areas where the pipes are below capacity or there are areas that contribute to increased flood hazard.</p>
49.3	Amend	Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato	Policy 1.3.1.1	To accurately reflect Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato.	Amend Policy 1.3.1.1 as follows: "1.3.1.1 To achieve the directions and outcome Objectives and Strategies of Te Ture Whaimana..." And any consequential amendments or alternative relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.		That the point of submission is accepted
49.4	Amend	Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato	2.3 Objectives and Policies	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.	Amend Section 2.3 as follows: Add a new Objective and subsequent policies to Section 2.3 as follows: Objective X Ensure that development within the Residential Zones give effect to the Vision and Strategy Policy X Developments and activities are designed and operated to protect and restore the Waikato River by: (i). Requiring new subdivision and development to incorporate water-	FS5 – oppose FS6 – oppose FS8 – support in part	<p>That the point of submission is rejected</p> <p>The sentiment of these changes is supported however the focus of PC26 is on inserting the MDRS into the plan. These changes relate to the operative Residential Zone, which is not the focus of PC26.</p>

Commented [HC3]: Please make sure WDC – Tony Coutts is happy with this logic, in lieu of modelling

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submission	Response
					<p>sensitive techniques to reduce demand on water supplies, wastewater disposal and to manage stormwater.</p> <p>(ii). Limiting the area of impermeable surface to sustain groundwater recharge and stream flow and reduce the volume of contaminants discharged to surface water.</p> <p>(iii). Require Financial Contributions from developments to fund works to restore and protect the Waikato River.</p> <p>(iv). Preparing and implementing Integrated Catchment Management Plans</p> <p>(v). Managing activities to avoid river and stream bank erosion, river and stream bed scouring and deposition.</p> <p>Policy XX Avoid development where the direct or cumulative effects on the infrastructure network cannot be mitigated.</p> <p>And any consequential amendments or alternative relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.</p>		
49.8		Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato	2A.4.1	<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> <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. And any consequential amendments or alternative relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.</p>	FS8 - oppose	<p>Submission rejected</p> <p>Request acknowledged. This is not recommended to be inserted as an excerpt from a document is not considered appropriate as an Appendix to the Plan. Council will continue talks with Waikato-Tainui and consider alternate options for addressing better means to explain the consultation and engagement process. A document outside of the District Plan may be more appropriate.</p>
60.3	Support	Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato	Various	<p>Supports the proposed plan change, supported by the evidence-based conclusions from the New Zealand Infrastructure Commission report of March 2022 (attached to the submission). There is a lack of housing in New Zealand and this proposed plan change will help address housing supply issues. The current local planning rules are excessive and inadequate.</p>	<p>Support the qualifying matter overlay for Te Ture Whaimana and the protection of the Waikato River.</p>		<p>Support noted</p>
62.3	Support	Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato	Various	<p>Council's intensification rules of 2 buildings 3 stories high due to the "infrastructure constraint qualifying matter overlay" will protect the Waikato River and I support this.</p>	<p>Support the qualifying matter overlay for Te Ture Whaimana and the protection of the Waikato River.</p>		<p>Support noted</p>

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submission	Response
63.6	Support in Part	Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato	Infrastructure constraint and stormwater constraint overlays	Given the extent of the introduced infrastructure constraint and stormwater constraint overlays, it is recommended that a programme (including process/timeline) is established in parallel to PC26, which sets out when the Council expects to uplift parts of the overlay due to infrastructure upgrades.	Given the extent of the introduced infrastructure constraint and stormwater constraint overlays, it is recommended that a programme (including process/timeline) is established in parallel to PC26, which sets out when the Council expects to uplift parts of the overlay due to infrastructure upgrades.		That the point of submission is rejected Council has a programme of stormwater upgrades identified as part of the LTP and the new CSDC. The modelling will periodically be updated and this will inform any infrastructure assessments.
70.48	Support in Part	Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato	2A.2.1	The submitter does not oppose the statement that development within the medium density residential zone has the potential to adversely affect the health and well-being of the Waikato and Waipā Rivers. However, amendment is sought to ensure the issue is focused on activities that have potential effects.	Amend Issue 2A.2.1 as follows: Development within the Medium Density Residential Zone has the potential to adversely affect the health and well-being of the Waikato and Waipā Rivers. Careful consideration should be given to the following; (but not limited to) potential impacts of increased impervious surfaces, vegetation clearance, earthworks and residential intensification within river catchments.		That the point of submission is rejected Residential intensification is an activity that has potential effects.
73.48	Support in Part	Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato	2A.2.1	The submitter does not oppose the statement that development within the medium density residential zone has the potential to adversely affect the health and well-being of the Waikato and Waipā Rivers. However, amendment is sought to ensure the issue is focused on activities that have potential effects.	Amend Issue 2A.2.1 as follows: Development within the Medium Density Residential Zone has the potential to adversely affect the health and well-being of the Waikato and Waipā Rivers. Careful consideration should be given to the following; (but not limited to) potential impacts of increased impervious surfaces, vegetation clearance, earthworks and residential intensification within river catchments.		That the point of submission is rejected Residential intensification is an activity that has potential effects.
79.60	Support in part	Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato	Section 1 Strategic Policy Framework	Generally supports the principle of giving effect to Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato and the need to ensure that future development within the district ensures the restoration and protection of the Waikato and Waipā Rivers from the potential impact that intensification may have on their overall health and wellbeing.	Include the 'Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato - Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River' Introduction subsection of Section 1- Strategic Policy Framework as notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission.		Support noted
79.64	Support	Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato	Section 1 Strategic Policy Framework	Supports the reference to Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato.	Include the 'Implementation of Te Ture Whaimana' subsection of Section 1 - Strategic Policy Framework as notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission.		Support noted
79.65	Support	Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato	Objective 1.3.1	Supports as notified, giving effect to Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato and regional strategies.	Include Objective 1.3.1 in Section 1 - Strategic Policy Framework as notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission.		Support noted
79.66	Support	Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato	Policy 1.3.1.1	Supports as notified, giving effect to Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato and regional strategies.	Include Policy 1.3.1.1 in Section 1 - Strategic Policy Framework as notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission.		Support noted

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submission	Response
79.74	Support in part	Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato	1.4.4	Supports giving effect to Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato.	Include the provisions of 1.4.4 as notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission.		Support noted
79.75	Support in part	Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato	1.4.5	Supports giving effect to Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato.	Include the provisions of 1.4.5 as notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission.		Support noted
79.111	Support in part	Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato	2A.1 Introduction	Generally supports how PC26 gives effect to Te Ture Whaimana in the District Plan, which has used a combination of provisions to promote low impact design and encourage ecological preservation of the Waikato River.	Retain Qualifying Matters - Te Ture Whaimana and the National Policy Statement for Freshwater 2022, sections 2A.1.10, 2A.1.11, 2A.1.13, 2A.1.14, 2A.1.15 as notified.		Support noted
79.113	Support in part	Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato	2A.1 Introduction	Generally supports how PC26 gives effect to Te Ture Whaimana in the District Plan, which has used a combination of provisions to promote low impact design and encourage ecological preservation of the Waikato River.	Include 2A.1.16 and 2A.1.18 as notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission.		Support noted
79.131	Support in part	Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato	2A.2.1	Generally supports how PC26 gives effect to Te Ture Whaimana in the District Plan, which has used a combination of provisions to promote low impact design and encourage ecological preservation of the Waikato and Waipā Rivers.	Include 2A.2.1 as notified, to the extent it is consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission and relief sought.		Support noted
79.263	Support in Part	Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato	15.1.2 - 15.1.4	Generally supports the principle of giving effect to Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato ("Te Ture Whaimana") and therefore the proposed amendment.	Include 15.1.2, 15.1.3 and 15.1.4 as notified.		Support noted
79.264	Support in Part	Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato	15.2.22	Generally supports the principle of giving effect to Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato ("Te Ture Whaimana") and the need to ensure that future development within the district ensures the restoration and protection of the Waikato and Waipā Rivers from the potential impact that intensification may have on their overall health and wellbeing.	Include 15.2.22 as notified to the extent they are consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission.		Support noted
79.307	Support in part	Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato	21.1.1	Generally supports the principle of giving effect to Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato ("Te Ture Whaimana") and the need to ensure that future development within the district ensures the restoration and protection of the Waikato and Waipā Rivers from the potential impact that intensification may have on their overall health and wellbeing.	Include the provisions in 21.1.1 Assessment criteria for all Discretionary Activities as notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission.		No specific relief sought

3.3 Stormwater overlay/natural hazards (see s42a report pgs 61 to 63 and pgs 72 to 77)

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
53.12	Oppose	Natural Hazards - Qualifying Matter	Various	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.	Remove Natural Hazards from the list of qualifying matters.	FS8 - support	That the point of submission is rejected Natural hazards appropriate as a qualifying matter under s771(a) of the Amendment Act.
37.3	Support in part	Stormwater Constraints -	All	Supports the application by the Council of the infrastructure constraint overlay and the stormwater constraint overlay as qualifying matters.	That the Council can implement the stormwater constraint overlay as qualifying matters to protect the Waikato River and cultural/heritage sites.		Support noted

		Qualifying Matter					
53.3	Support in Part	Stormwater Constraints Qualifying Matter	2A.4.2.8	We agree that a qualifying matter relating to Te Ture Whaimana and the National Policy Statement for Freshwater should be imposed. However, the correct method for controlling stormwater runoff is through limiting Impermeable surfaces - a reduced permitted impermeable surface within this qualifying matter area is a more appropriate method of controlling & assessing stormwater runoff and any potential effects on the Waikato River. Assessment criteria should relate only to matters relating to impermeable area and mitigation of impermeable area.	Remove Rule 2A.4.2.8 or amend the rule to refer to Impermeable surfaces rather than site coverage. Suggested Rule amendment: 2A.4.2.8 On sites located within the Stormwater Qualifying Matter and the River / Gully Proximity Qualifying Matter Overlays, the maximum building coverage impermeable area must not exceed 50% 40% of the net site area. Activities that fail to comply with this Rule 2A.4.2.7 to 2A.4.2.8 will require a resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity with the discretion being restricted over: •Building location, bulk and design; and •On-site amenity; and •Outlook for adjoining neighbours; and •Effects on existing trees; and •Landscaping; and •The impact on rivers and waterbodies and whether any potential adverse effects from a development can be avoided or mitigated; and •The impact of the development on indigenous flora and fauna and the ability to avoid, remedy or mitigate any adverse effects on these; and •An assessment of stormwater disposal and whether this can be accommodated on-site. These matters will be considered in accordance with the assessment criteria in Section 21.		That the point of submission is accepted in part The River Gully Overlay and Stormwater Overlay building coverage rules and there relevant matters of discretion are recommended to be separated to avoid confusion. The building coverage provisions in section 21.1.2A.9 have been adjusted to also avoid confusion.
72.31	Oppose	Stormwater Constraints Qualifying Matter	All	Insufficient justification has been provided to include the majority of the urban areas in Waipā within a Stormwater Constraint qualifying matter area. Stormwater infrastructure and servicing should be a relevant consideration where appropriate but should not otherwise affect the ability to develop sites.	Remove the stormwater constraint qualifying matter from the Plan.		That the point of submission is rejected Stormwater – The stormwater constraint qualifying matter is informed by flood hazard modelling (100 year ARI + RCP 6 CC). The stormwater constraint is considered to be a valid qualifying matter to apply to the MDRS to give effect to Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato—the Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River (s77I(c)).
79.19	Oppose	Stormwater Constraints Qualifying Matter	Various	The implications of this overlay have not been sufficiently assessed or justified in accordance with ss77J and 77L of the Housing Supply Act and its purpose.	Opposes and seeks deletion of the Stormwater infrastructure qualifying matter overlays including the spatial application and associated provisions in PC26.	FS2 - oppose	That the point of submission is rejected The stormwater constraint is considered to be a valid qualifying matter to apply to the MDRS to give effect to Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato—the Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River (s77I(c)). Stormwater – we think this may be a planning response.
79.36	Oppose	Stormwater Constraints Qualifying Matter	Volume 3: Planning Maps - Stormwater Infrastructure Overlay; and various	The implications of the stormwater infrastructure qualifying matter have not been sufficiently assessed or justified in accordance with ss77J and 77L of the Housing Supply Act and its purpose. A 10% reduction in building coverage to 40% as-proposed under s2A.4.2.8 is not efficient or effective, where there are alternative methods and options that have not been explored to address the issues. Alternative methods would be more efficient and effective, balancing the need to ensure that new and redeveloped sites appropriately manage stormwater-related effects, while not incurring the costs of a resource consent process (where compliance can be achieved) for up to three dwellings per site.	Delete the 'stormwater infrastructure' qualifying matter overlays (including their spatial application and associated provisions).	FS2 - oppose	That the point of submission is rejected The stormwater constraint is considered to be a valid qualifying matter to apply to the MDRS to give effect to Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato—the Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River (s77I(c)). Stormwater – we think this may be a planning response.
79.37	Oppose	Stormwater Constraints Qualifying Matter	Volume 3: Planning Maps - Stormwater Infrastructure Overlay	The implications of the stormwater infrastructure qualifying matter have not been sufficiently assessed or justified in accordance with ss77J and 77L of the Housing Supply Act and its purpose. A 10% reduction in building coverage to 40% as-proposed under s2A.4.2.8 is not efficient or effective, where there are alternative methods and options that have not been explored to address the issues. Alternative methods would be more efficient and effective, balancing the need to ensure that new and redeveloped	Appendix 5 identifies the 'stormwater infrastructure' overlays that Kāinga Ora opposes and seeks deletion (refer Appendix 5 to the submission).		That the point of submission is rejected The stormwater constraint is considered to be a valid qualifying matter to apply to the MDRS to give effect to Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato—the Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River (s77I(c)). Stormwater – we think this may be a planning response.

				sites appropriately manage stormwater-related effects, while not incurring the costs of a resource consent process (where compliance can be achieved) for up to three dwellings per site.			
79.242	Oppose in part	Stormwater Constraints - Qualifying Matter	Planning maps; various	Consistent with the overall submission, Kāinga Ora opposes and seeks deletion of the 'stormwater infrastructure' qualifying matter overlay.	Delete the 'stormwater infrastructure' qualifying matter overlay, including the spatial application and associated provisions in their entirety.	FS2 - oppose	That the point of submission is accepted The stormwater constraint is considered to be a valid qualifying matter to apply to the MDRS to give effect to Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato—the Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River (s771(c)). Stormwater—we think this may be a planning response.

3.4 Historic heritage/character clusters (see 42a report pgs 58 to 60 and pgs 86 to 99)

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Sub	Response
17.3	Oppose	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	All	Cambridge, Te Awamutu, and Kihikihi are small, picturesque towns that shouldn't be changed to city complexes, and the traffic and people increase will make them overloaded. Privacy will be compromised, and local parks and trees will be destroyed.	Intensification should not be in areas of heritage buildings.		Submission noted Scheduled heritage places (individual properties) and character clusters (discrete property groupings) are included as qualifying matters, meaning that intensification is restricted and managed on these sites.
18.1	Oppose	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	All	Cambridge, Te Awamutu, and Kihikihi are small picturesque towns that shouldn't be changed to city complexes, and the traffic and people increase will make them overloaded. Privacy will be compromised, and local parks and trees will be destroyed.	Intensification should not be near or in areas where there are heritage buildings and close to high quality new subdivisions.		That the point of submission is rejected Scheduled heritage places (individual properties) and character clusters (discrete property groupings) are included as qualifying matters, meaning that intensification is restricted and managed on these sites. It is considered inappropriate to extend intensification limitations to areas "near" heritage buildings, as this would disproportionately constrain intensification opportunities in these locations, many of which are in areas of high amenity as they coincide with towns' central areas.
25.1	Amend	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	Planning Maps	Supports more intensive residential development in certain areas but does not support such development in historic areas.	710 Alexandra St, Te Awamutu should be added to the list of historic properties that are protected from intensification.		That the point of submission is rejected PC 26 does not propose to include 710 Alexandra Street in the ODP's list of heritage items (Appendix N1) but to identify it as a "character cluster." However, it is considered that the character cluster planning tool is not appropriate for individual properties unconnected from a contiguous streetscape "cluster," as discussed in this report. Recommendation: Delete 710 Alexandra St, Te Awamutu from the character cluster coverage. It may be appropriate to consider individual properties for scheduling as historic heritage items.
25.2	Amend	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	Various	I support more intensive residential development in certain areas but I do not support such development in historic areas.	Clear protections should be put in place to prevent loss of character areas and properties.		Submission noted Scheduled heritage places (individual properties) and character clusters (discrete property groupings) are included as qualifying matters, meaning that intensification is restricted and managed on these sites. It is considered that PC 26's approach appropriately gives effect to the RMA-EHS, and balances the needful requirements of MDRS with retention of historic places that give Waipā's towns their individual identity. Recommend that character cluster coverage should be modified to more accurately recognise areas of historic character as this submission alludes to.
32.9	Amend	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	2A.4.1.1	The activity status of new and additional dwellings within Character Cluster Policy Area Overlays identified in the Planning Maps needs to be clarified.	Amend rules 2A.4.1.1 and 2A.4.1.3 to clarify that a restricted discretionary activity consent will be required for new dwellings within a Character Cluster Policy Area Overlay.		That the point of submission is accepted in part Recommend clarification of the activity status table.
32.10	Amend	Historic Heritage and Character -	Appendix DG1	A description of the anticipated form of new development within the new Character Clusters needs to be included in Appendix DG1 as a guide to be used in the assessment required by criteria of Section 21 of the District Plan.	Amend Appendix DG1 Character Cluster Statements to include a description of the anticipated form of new development in the Te Awamutu: Alexandra Street Cluster and Te Awamutu: Bridgemen Road Cluster.		That the point of submission is accepted in part It is important that each character cluster has a historically and architecturally informative character statement to support its identification and ongoing management. However, in these particular cases, I recommend deletion of the

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Sub	Response
		Qualifying Matters					Te Awamutu: Alexandra Street Cluster and Te Awamutu: Bridgman Road Cluster. This is due to a "character cluster" being an inappropriate planning tool for individual properties unconnected from a contiguous streetscape "cluster," as is the case in for the individual properties identified on Alexandra Street and Bridgman Road (and elsewhere through Cambridge, Leamington, Te Awamutu and Kihikihi). Recommend amending character statements in ODP Appendix DG1 to provide fulsome descriptions to support future land use consent assessments.
32.11	Amend	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	2A.4.1.3(d) and 21.1.2A.4	Inclusion of the matters in Policy 2A.3.3.6 in the matters for discretion for development within Character Clusters and associated assessment criteria in Section 21, will assist in achieving the objective and policy for the Character Clusters.	Amend the matters for discretion and assessment criteria for development within the Character Cluster Policy Overlays to include matters addressed in Policy 2A.3.3.4.		That the point of submission is accepted in part Greater connectivity between policy and matters for discretion / assessment criteria will assist in achieving the purpose of the character cluster tool. It is considered that both need amendment to create this alignment. Recommendation: Amend 2A.3.3.4., 2A.4.1.3(d), 21.1.2.5 and 21.1.2A.4 to create consistency.
35.2	Oppose	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	All	Cambridge is known for its heritage buildings and unique character and these features need to be retained.	That council include a provision for the plan to include the option for a consultation with affected neighbours where the intention is to build next to, behind or in front of a heritage listed building.	FS5 – oppose FS6 - oppose	That the point of submission is accepted in part The ODP already contains triggers for notification as required by the RMA.
37.4	Support in part	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	All	Supports the Council including additional heritage/character areas - to protect the heritage of our towns. We would hate to see large scale demolition of older character homes in good condition, just because it's more profitable for intensification.	The Council protect and preserve cultural and heritage sites including heritage buildings and trees, which may be destroyed by housing intensification.		Submission noted This is actioned by the ODP and PC 26 historic heritage and character-related provisions.
41.2	Support in Part	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	21.1.2.5	Concerned that the residential policy and associated assessment criteria does not cover "removal," and the removal of a recognised character house from a character cluster has the potential to detract and cause adverse effects on the overall nature and integrity of the cluster. "Removal" should be included in this policy to enable it to be considered and assessed as part of a resource consent application.	That Rule 21.1.2.5 and associated assessment criteria, including proposed assessment criteria (b) are retained subject to the following amendment to 21.1.2.5: 21.1.2.5-Character Clusters-Construction of new buildings, relocated dwellings <u>and removal or demolition</u> of or alterations or additions to existing buildings." and Assessment criteria: "The extent to which the new building, alterations or additions to an existing building or demolition <u>or removal</u> of a building contributes or detracts from the character cluster statements in Appendix DG1.		Amendment supported It is noted that PC 26 Rule 21.1.2.5 does already contain the word "demolition" (but not "removal"). Recommendation: Amend Rule 21.1.2.5 and associated assessment criteria accordingly.
41.3	Support	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	21.1.2A.4	Supports the new rule. This policy covers the full range of matters that should be assessed as they have potential to adversely affect the cohesive nature of character clusters.	New activity 21.1.2A.4 is retained.		Support noted
41.4	Support	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	21.1.2A.4	Supports the proposed assessment criteria required to assess matters as part of the Medium Density Residential Zone. These assessment criteria appear to cover the full range of matters that should be assessed at the time of proposed works on a character cluster.	Assessment criteria 21.1.2A.4 (a) - (l) are retained		Support noted
41.5	Support in Part	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	21.1.2A.5	The Plan should specifically consider the impacts of the more intensive development on any adjacent sites that may contain the historic heritage, cultural, archaeological, or built, and character clusters.	That the assessment criteria are retained and amended with the addition of a new assessment criteria, as follows: <u>(u) The extent to which development is compatible and does not detract from the values of adjacent historic heritage or character cluster sites."</u>	FS5 – oppose FS6 - oppose	Amendment supported Recommendation: Amend Assessment Criteria 21.1.2A.5 accordingly.
41.6	Support in Part	Historic Heritage and Character -	All	The Plan should specifically consider the impacts of the more intensive development on any adjacent sites that may contain the historic heritage, cultural, archaeological, or built, and character clusters. This framework would also enable the	The Plan needs a framework to specifically consider the impacts of the more intensive development on any adjacent sites that may contain the historic heritage, cultural, archaeological, or built, and character clusters		That the point of submission is rejected Issues of cultural and archaeological heritage are outside the scope of this report. Such a framework would need to have associated rules etc. to make it

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Sub	Response
		Qualifying Matters		Plan to better provide for cultural and historic heritage landscape which is often spread across several sites.	and to enable mitigation as required in an integrated manner.		meaningful; in my view, this is beyond the scope of PC 26 but could be considered in future iterations of the district plan itself. With regard to historic heritage buildings (scheduled in ODP Appendix N1) and character clusters, PC 26's existing policy and associated rules (with recommended amendments) is considered an appropriate mechanism to manage the impacts of intensification while enabling development in (historic) inner-suburban areas.
41.9	Amend	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	21.1.2A.6	The Plan should specifically consider the impacts of the more intensive development on any adjacent sites that may contain the historic heritage cultural, archaeological, or built, and character clusters.	That the building height assessment criteria 21.1.2A.6 (c) and (d) are amended as follows: (c) Whether consistency has been achieved with respect of the appearance and design of the development with the character <u>and values</u> of the area, including existing buildings on site and adjoining sites. (d) the degree to which shading, loss of daylight, amenity values and privacy affect the adjoining properties, <u>including any historic heritage or parts of a character clusters on adjoining properties.</u>		Amendment supported Recommendation: Amend Assessment Criteria 21.1.2A.6 accordingly.
41.11	Support in Part	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	21.1.2A.7	The Plan needs a framework to acknowledge impacts of proposed development on adjacent sites and enable mitigation as required in an integrated approach.	That the height in relation to boundary assessment criteria (a) is amended as follows: " (a) the degree to which shading, loss of daylight, amenity values and privacy affect the adjoining properties, <u>including any historic heritage or character clusters on adjoining properties.</u> "		Amendment supported Recommendation: Amend Assessment Criteria 21.1.2A.7 accordingly.
41.13	Support in Part	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	21.2.2A.8	Supports the wide range of assessment criteria for sites where there are more than three dwellings within the Medium Density Residential Zone, particularly the assessment criteria related to setbacks that gives regard to the impacts of the proposed development on adjacent sites.	Include a new assessment criterion in 21.2.2A.8 as follows: (k) <u>The extent to which development is compatible and does not detract from the values of adjacent historic heritage or character clusters sites.</u>		Amendment supported Recommendation: Amend Assessment Criteria 21.1.2A.8 accordingly.
41.14	Support in Part	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	21.1.2A.9	Supports the wide range of assessment criteria for sites where there are more than three dwellings within the Medium Density Residential Zone, particularly the building coverage assessment criteria that gives regard to the impacts of the proposed development on adjacent sites.	That the assessment criteria 21.1.2A.9 are retained, and assessment criteria (e) is amended as follows: (e) The extent to which increased site coverage would adversely affect adjoining properties, <u>including historic heritage and character cluster sites</u> , in terms of dominance of building, loss of privacy, access to sunlight and daylight		Amendment supported Recommendation: Amend Assessment Criteria 21.1.2A.9 accordingly.
41.15	Support in Part	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	21.1.2A.9	Supports the wide range of assessment criteria for sites where there are more than three dwellings within the Medium Density Residential Zone, particularly the building coverage assessment criteria that gives regard to the impacts of the proposed development on adjacent sites.	That assessment criteria 21.1.2A.9 (e) is amended as follows: (e) The extent to which increased site coverage would adversely affect adjoining properties, <u>including historic heritage and character cluster sites</u> , in terms of dominance of building, loss of privacy, access to sunlight and daylight		Amendment supported
41.16	Support in Part	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	21.1.2A.28	Supports in part the assessment criteria.	That the assessment criteria 21.1.2A.28 are retained.		Support noted
41.17	Support in Part	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	21.1.2A.28	Considers the wording should be amended to better address the retention of historic heritage values rather than "heritage character" which does not encapsulate the correct matters. HNZPT is also concerned at the use of the word "enhance" as this has no meaning in the context of historic heritage and should be deleted.	That assessment criteria 21.1.2A.28(a) is amended as follows: (a) The extent to which the historic heritage character values <u>is</u> <u>are</u> maintained and enhanced .		Amendment supported Recommendation: Amend Assessment Criteria 21.1.2A.28 accordingly.
41.19	Support in Part	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	21.1.15	The values of heritage items can be directly affected and detracted from, at the time of subdivision through the installation of additional buildings, driveways, parking, and landscaping and when revised access arrangements or similar changes are made. There should be a small amendment to ensure that the values of the listed heritage item are also considered at the time of subdivision allowing for an integrated consideration of the impacts.	That assessment criteria 21.1.15 (l) and (s) are retained, and (l) is amended as follows: (l) The extent to which the subdivision may affect the surroundings, <u>or values</u> of a listed heritage items.		Support noted. Amendment supported Recommendation: Amend Assessment Criteria 21.1.15 accordingly.

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Sub	Response
41.20	Support	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	Appendix 2 of Existing Qualifying Matters	Supports the retention of the existing qualifying matters and the related controls. This will assist to give effect to enable the Plan to provide for the RMA matters of national importance found at section 6(e) and 6(f).	That the Existing Qualifying Matters in Appendix 2 are retained.		Support noted
41.22	Amend	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	All	Suggests that it would be appropriate for the Council to follow up the specialist report that recognised a number of places that are suitable to be included on the Heritage Schedules of the District Plan with a Plan Change to ensure the permanent protection of these important items into the future	Council to follow up the specialist report that recognised a number of places that are suitable to be included on the Heritage Schedules of the District Plan with a Plan Change to ensure the permanent protection of these important items into the future		That the point of submission is rejected Scheduling place on the heritage register in the Plan is outside of the scope of PC26.
43.3	Support	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	All	RMA Section 77I introduces the ability to use qualifying matters to make the MDRS less enabling in order to manage effects on a range of matters with recognised features and attributes. The character, form and appearance of Cambridge's urban environment are integral parts of the town's strength.	Supports in principle the introduction of Character Clusters as a means of managing intensification within discrete parts of Cambridge.		Support noted
43.4	Support	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	Policies 2A.3.3.1(e) and 2A.3.3.4 and Rule 2A.1.9(i)	The character of Cambridge's urban environment is an integral part of the town's strength. If lost, this will have an adverse effect on market choice and future investment decisions. Objectives 1 and 4 of the NPS-UD, and one of the guiding principles of Future Proof (2.4), all make claims to ensure the character of urban environments remain diverse and retain their distinct identities.	Character Clusters be retained as a Qualifying Matter for Grey Street, Cambridge.		Support noted Agree, noting that fieldwork of this area indicate the extent of the Grey Street character cluster should extend from Clare Street (north) to Hamilton Road (south), forming a legible and contiguous block. This would enable the Grey Street character cluster to continue to contribute to Cambridge's distinct identity as sought by this submission. Recommendation: That the Grey Street character cluster be (a) retained and (b) amended to the extent shown in this report's proposed planning maps.
43.5	Oppose	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	Rule 2A.4.1.3(d)	While safeguarding the character clusters is necessary, it is considered that some of the provisions place an unreasonable regulatory burden on these properties. It is considered inappropriate and unnecessary for Rule 2A.4.1.3(d) to include alterations or additions to existing buildings within character cluster areas as a Restricted Discretionary activity. It is important that homes can be maintained and improved efficiently - they should also be readily able to adapt, so that they can continue to meet the needs of residents. It is more efficient for alterations and additions to existing buildings in character clusters to be permitted activities. The effects of alternations and additions can be effectively managed through the application of appropriate performance standards - these could control the scale, location and appearance of alterations and additions. The focus of the controls should be on maintaining the overall character of the area.	The activity status for alterations or additions to buildings within character clusters be amended to Permitted activity, subject to any necessary performance standards.		That the point of submission is rejected Alterations and additions may have significant adverse effects on the values of character clusters. It is considered important to retain the RD activity status for this activity.
51.2	Support	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	2A.1	The Submitters support the inclusion of heritage and character as qualifying matters and agrees with the rationale for the inclusion of these qualifying matters at 2A.1.19 - 2A.1.23 and the proposed statements of policy at 2A.3.3.1.	Submitter supports the inclusion of heritage and character as qualifying matters in Cambridge.		Support noted
51.3	Support	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	Map 58	Maintaining the special look and feel of these residential areas with houses with heritage-values, larger gardened sections, mature trees and an overall sense of space and beauty is good for the residents of Cambridge. The stretch of Thornton Road between Victoria/Albert St and Robinson St faces Lake Te Koo Utu reserve and as such is highly visible to large numbers of people using the reserve. The special character of the residential side of this area of Thornton Rd compliments the beauty of the reserve.	Submitter supports the inclusion of new Character Clusters in Cambridge as shown on New Map 58, and in particular we support the inclusion of a Character Cluster along Thornton Road/Princes St (between Victoria Street and Albert Street/Robinson Street).		That the point of submission is accepted in part The stretch of Thornton Road mentioned by this submitter is indeed in a highly prominent area of public recreation, and as such plays an important role in maintaining the legibility of Cambridge's history and early character. Fieldwork has confirmed the extent of this character cluster and the clusters identified on Princes and Bowen Streets, resulting in an amalgamated cluster (see proposed planning maps). This recommended change would enable this area to more robustly maintain the historic identity and legibility of Cambridge and is in a location to be easily experienced by residents and visitors, as raised by this submitter. The quantity and continuity of historically-derived character properties diminishes along Princes and Thornton Streets in the western

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Sub	Response
							portions, and as such it is not recommended that this cluster extends beyond Bowen Street. This balance of coverage also enables a significant area of potential intensification in this location of high amenity and proximity to the town centre. Recommendations: - Retain and amalgamate the Thornton Street, Princes Street and Bowen Street character clusters as shown in the proposed planning map. - Delete the small Princes Street and Bowen Street character clusters.
51.4	Amend	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	2A.4.1.1(b)	The submitters consider that three houses per section should not be permitted at all in Character Cluster areas in order to maintain the character of these areas. The requested amendment makes the treatment of the Character Cluster Qualifying Matter Overlay consistent with the treatment of the Infrastructure Constraint Qualifying Matter Overlay (i.e. that up to three dwellings can only be outside these areas).	Amend clause 2A.4.1.1(b) to add at the end of the first existing sentence the words "...and outside the Character Cluster Areas" to make it clear that the ability to build up to three dwellings per site as a permitted activity does not apply to Character Cluster areas.		Amendment supported Recommendation: Amend 2A.4.1.1(b) accordingly.
51.5	Amend	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	2A.4.1.3(b)	The submitters consider that three houses per section should not be permitted at all in Character Cluster areas in order to maintain the character of these areas. Therefore, we propose for clause 2A.4.1.3(b) to be amended to make it clear that the ability as a restricted discretionary activity to build up to three dwellings per site does not apply at all to Character Cluster areas. This makes the treatment of the Character Cluster Qualifying Matter Overlay consistent with the treatment of the Infrastructure Constraint Qualifying Matter Overlay (i.e. that up to three dwellings can only be outside these areas).	Amend clause 2A.4.1.3(b) to add at the end of the first existing sentence the words "... and outside the Character Cluster Areas".		That the point of submission is rejected All new construction in a character cluster is a RD activity under PC 26, with assessment criteria that take into account the character qualities of the area. This is considered sufficient to maintain and enhance the character qualities of character clusters, balanced with intensification requirements, as intended by PC 26.
51.6	Amend	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	Appendix DG1	Appendix DG1 as it appears in the proposed amended plan (section 2.6 page 128-129) only has amended character cluster statements for the existing clusters and does not have any character cluster statements for the new proposed clusters shown on New Maps 58 and 59. The criteria states: "The extent to which the [proposed work] contributes or detracts from the Character Cluster Statements in Appendix DG1." For this to be a meaningful and workable criteria, there needs to be a statement in DG1 for each of the new clusters in Maps 58 and 59. This appears to be an unintentional oversight.	Amend Appendix DG1 to include Character Clusters Statements for each of the new character cluster areas or streets identified on New Maps 58 and 59 including Princes Street, Thornton Road (between Victoria Street and Albert Street/Robinson Street), Hall Street, Bryce Street, Hamilton Road/Cambridge Road (between the town belt and Victoria Street), Burns Street and Moore Street in Cambridge; and College Street and Turere Lane in Te Awamutu. The content of the new Character Cluster Statements can be derived from the Character Area Review (appendix 4), which addresses the special character of each area.		Amendment supported The character statements are incomplete and insufficient for identifying clusters' values against which land use applications should be considered. Recommendation: Amend character statements in ODP Appendix DG1 to provide fulsome descriptions to support future land use consent assessments.
53.9	Support in Part	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	2A.4.2.6	Street character comes from the appearance of the streetscape - provision of mature street trees, wide berms and footpaths, rather than development within private property. As such, a 6m road boundary setback along an identified character street is excessive and does not create a sense of either historic & special character.	Remove the 6m road boundary setback requirement in Rule 2A.4.2.6 and reduce this to 4m. Suggested Rule amendment: 2A.4.2.6 The minimum building setback depth listed above is modified in the following locations: ... (b) On sites adjoining a road where the Character Street policy overlay area applies, a front yard setback of 6.4 meters is required.		That the point of submission is rejected A 6m setback is considered appropriate to maintain the particular character qualities of identified character streets (see body report). However, it is noted that the fieldwork undertaken as part of this report has resulted in a recommended reduction of character street coverage across Cambridge (reduced from 6 to 3), Leamington (reduced from 2 to zero) and Te Awamutu (reduced from 2 to 1).
53.10	Support in Part	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	Planning Maps	A number of identified character streets no longer contain 'character' within private property. This is demonstrated on streets like Bryce Street. While Bryce Street is identified as a 'character street', there is a large mix of housing densities, typologies and road boundary setbacks – the road berms within Bryce Street are not as wide as other identified character streets and street planting is dispersed along the street.	Remove Bryce Street from the List of identified character streets.		Amendment supported Bryce Street is not sufficiently historically and aesthetically distinctive to warrant its inclusion as a character street. Recommendation: Delete Bryce Street from the list of character streets in Cambridge, amend PC 26 planning maps accordingly.
53.11	Support in Part	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	Various	Sites with archaeological, cultural or historic notations already have existing protection via requiring a Resource Consent to undertaken development within the site, therefore an expansion of 'Character Clusters' to protect 'character' is unnecessary.	Sites with archaeological, cultural or historic notations already have existing protection via requiring a Resource Consent to undertaken development within the site, therefore an expansion of 'Character Clusters' to protect 'character' is unnecessary.		That the point of submission is rejected Character clusters are a distinct planning tool that maintains and enhances collective historically-derived character. Along with individually-scheduled historic heritage items, archaeology and cultural heritage, they provide an important mechanism for retaining the legibility and distinct identities of towns. It is considered that the fieldwork that has been undertaken as part of this report provides greater transparency and robustness to the location and extent of character clusters included in PC 26.

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Sub	Response
57.1	Support in Part	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	Planning map 59	The outcome of the new proposed Character Cluster/houses overlay is inequitable for the following reasons: (a) The property is not listed within an existing character overlay that I would have accepted 20 years ago when I purchased the property. (b) Time constraints have reduced the validity of the report. (c) Property rights will be lost (d) Private and commercial property development will be reduced. (e) The changes will subject certain properties to onerous planning standards.	682 Alexandra Street, Te Awamutu should be removed from the new proposed character cluster and that the recommendation of the report that it be considered for inclusion in the Heritage Schedule be rejected.		That the point of submission is accepted The character cluster planning tool is not appropriate for individual properties unconnected from a contiguous streetscape "cluster." Recommendation: Delete 682 Alexandra St, Te Awamutu from the character cluster coverage.
57.2	Support in Part	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	Planning Map 59; various	The process/review for deciding character clusters as qualifying matters is inadequate. Additional properties of equal or similar historical association or architectural merit to those recommended and included should be added. For instance, Appendix 4 states that a number of stand-alone and heritage cluster houses that are worthy of further investigation for inclusion on the heritage schedule may have been missed in this review owing to time constraints. The submitter has attached a document of photos of properties that should be included.	The new proposed character cluster/houses overlay and new planning map 59 'Character Clusters - Te Awamutu' is set aside or withdrawn and a more substantive analysis/review should be undertaken, for consultation with the full community and agreement before our property rights are removed via the reactive measure to the amended Act / new MDRS in the proposed qualifying matter.		That the point of submission is accepted in part Agree for the need for review, and this has been undertaken accordingly as presented in this report. In particular, historical research and systematic site survey fieldwork has been undertaken to ascertain the specific context and characteristics of character streets and character clusters. This has resulted in recommended amendments to their extent and boundaries, including in Te Awamutu, enabling the resultant areas to be adequately justified as qualifying matters under s771 of the RMA-EHS. Recommendation: Amend the character cluster coverage in Te Awamutu as shown in PC 26 maps to reflect changes recommended in this report.
57.3	Support in Part	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	Planning Map 59; various	Subdivision and development of the rear of 682 Alexandra Street would not be visible from the street and the Character Cluster policy to maintain and enhance the character of each character cluster and maintain streetscape would be satisfied.	Subject to submission points 57.1 and 57.2, and subject to 682 Alexandra Street being included within the implementation of a new Character overlay, Council acknowledge that the rear yard of the site is subdividable as of right, provide compensation, a new title free of development or financial contributions and provide confirmation that there is no limitation to carrying out the subdivision/development work at the rear at a future date under the new Medium Density Residential Standards that would apply to non-character sites >600m2, to waive the proposed new controls for the development of Character Properties and requirements for Resource Consent to develop the rear of the site.		That the point of submission is rejected Council cannot provide what the submitter has requested. This is beyond the scope of PC26. 682 Alexandra St, Te Awamutu is recommended to be deleted from the character cluster coverage.
61.2	Support in Part	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	All	The idea of 'character streets' is supported, however there must be a clear sense of character within the streetscape and development within private property should not dictate the 'character' of a street. Hall Street is an excellent example of streetscape providing the character of the street. Introducing a set of urban design guidelines into PC26 will help achieve a sense of character for new developments regardless of the boundary setback distance. As such, a 6m road boundary setback along an identified character street is excessive and should be reduced.	Reduce the 'Character Street' setback from 6m to 4m to be consistent with the rest of the plan. Or New urban design guidelines could be formulated to apply to character streets, negating the need for road boundary setbacks over and above the standard 1.5m setback.		That the point of submission is rejected A 6m setback is considered appropriate to maintain the particular character qualities of identified character streets (see body report). However, it is noted that the fieldwork undertaken as part of this report has resulted in a recommended reduction of character street coverage across Cambridge (reduced from 6 to 3), Leamington (reduced from 2 to zero) and Te Awamutu (reduced from 2 to 1), to more accurately identify those with a clear sense of character within the streetscape, as noted by this submitter. It is noted that guidelines are a different planning mechanism to a standard and do not have the same regulatory control, and as such would not achieve the regulatory outcome intended by PC 26. However, it is recommended that this suggestion is taken forward outside of the statutory planning process.

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Sub	Response
70.47	Oppose in Part	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	2A.1.22 2A.1.23	'Preserving the past' in a blanket way in character areas is simply not appropriate given the growing needs of the community and the scarcity of land. There needs to be adequate justification under s32 of the Act for these matters to be qualifying matters.	Review extent of and justification for character related qualifying matters and amend provisions/maps to reflect narrower scope of qualifying matters.		That the point of submission is accepted Agree for the need for review, and this has been undertaken accordingly as presented in this report. In particular, historical research and systematic site survey fieldwork has been undertaken to ascertain the specific context and characteristics of character streets and character clusters. This has resulted in recommended amendments to their extent and boundaries, enabling the resultant areas to be adequately justified as qualifying matters under s771 of the RMA-EHS. Recommendation: Amend PC 26 provisions and maps to reflect changes recommended in the Lifescapes report.
70.124	Oppose	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	Planning Maps 58 & 59	The submitter opposes the additional mapping of 'character clusters' and the policy protection afforded to these areas as this undermines the intent of the MDRS. Identification and protection of character clusters does not appropriately recognise that the character of residential zones will need to change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities	Delete Planning Maps 58 & 59.		That the point of submission is rejected Under the RMA-EHS s771, territorial authorities may make the MDRS and the relevant building height or density requirements less enabling of development to accommodate specific qualifying matters. Character clusters fall under s771(j), and they have been identified and justified with site-specific analysis as required by s77L.
71.1	Oppose	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	All	This plan change would adversely affect the environment and spatial feeling we have in Cambridge.	Would like to see areas where historic housing and greenspace be defined as not for intensification.		Submission noted Scheduled heritage places (individual properties) and character clusters (discrete property groupings) are included as qualifying matters, meaning that intensification is restricted and managed on these sites.
73.47	Oppose in Part	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	2A.1.22 2A.1.23	'Preserving the past' in a blanket way in character areas is simply not appropriate given the growing needs of the community and the scarcity of land. There needs to be adequate justification under s32 of the Act for these matters to be qualifying matters.	Review extent of and justification for character related qualifying matters and amend provisions/maps to reflect narrower scope of qualifying matters		Amendment supported Agree for the need for review, and this has been undertaken accordingly as presented in this report. In particular, historical research and systematic site survey fieldwork has been undertaken to ascertain the specific context and characteristics of character streets and character clusters. This has resulted in recommended amendments to their extent and boundaries, enabling the resultant areas to be adequately justified as qualifying matters under s771 of the RMA-EHS. Recommendation: Amend PC 26 provisions and maps to reflect changes recommended in this report.
73.124	Oppose	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	Planning Maps 58 & 59	The submitter opposes the additional mapping of 'character clusters' and the policy protection afforded to these areas as this undermines the intent of the MDRS. Identification and protection of character clusters does not appropriately recognise that the character of residential zones will need to change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities	Delete Planning Maps 58 & 59.		Amendment supported Agree for the need for review, and this has been undertaken accordingly as presented in this report. In particular, historical research and systematic site survey fieldwork has been undertaken to ascertain the specific context and characteristics of character streets and character clusters. This has resulted in recommended amendments to their extent and boundaries, enabling the resultant areas to be adequately justified as qualifying matters under s771 of the RMA-EHS. Recommendation: Amend PC 26 provisions and maps to reflect changes recommended in this report.
74.1	Oppose	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	All	The submitter is concerned that by allowing the proposed changes in PC26 the nature and look of some long-established neighbourhoods in Te Awamutu and Cambridge will be altered. Houses located towards the end of Bank Street leading into Puniu Road, and Hazelmere Crescent should be protected as they are probably the earliest examples of "state" housing in Te Awamutu. The need for some intensification is understood but not on established streets where there are groups of houses that have historical and cultural significance, such as those on Bank Street.	That the houses referred to in the submission (group of wooden houses which are located towards the end of Bank Street leading into Puniu Road, and bungalows on Bank Street) are protected against future development.		Amendment supported With thanks for the useful historical information this submitter provides. This report recommends retention and limited extension of the Bank Street character cluster, in line with this submission. Recommendation: Amend the character cluster coverage on Bank Street, Te Awamutu as shown in PC 26 maps to reflect changes recommended in this report.

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Sub	Response
79.14	Oppose	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	Various	The proposed new character clusters and character provisions as notified, and the approach to 'character clusters' in the Plan, conflates issues of 'streetscape character' with the 'built character' that is sought to be protected on identified sites. Many of the 'clusters' are located on streets with a mixed range of dwelling typologies, many of which are either modern or highly modified. As a result, many of the cluster sites do not form a sufficient collection or grouping of buildings that contribute to a strong sense of consistent streetscape character, in reference to the built form that is present	Delete the character cluster statements and overlays in their entirety and undertake further analysis to determine the exact values of the resources that the Council seeks to manage in the District Plan.		That the point of submission is accepted in part Further analysis as sought by this submitter has been undertaken and is presented in this report, with consequent recommended amendments to PC 26. Recommendation: Amend PC 26 provisions and maps to reflect changes recommended in this report.
79.15	Oppose	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	Planning Maps	In many cases 'character streets' have a limited number of 'character buildings' that contribute to the 'streetscape character'. The Character Street policy overlay and associated 6m setback is unwarranted and has not been sufficiently justified under ss77J-L of the Housing Supply Act due to the limitations they would otherwise place on MDRS-enabled development.	Opposes the existing and proposed spatial identification (and associated provisions) of 'Character Streets' and seeks deletion in PC26.	FS5 – support FS6 - support	That the point of submission is rejected A 6m setback is considered appropriate to maintain the particular character qualities of identified character streets (see body report). However, it is noted that the fieldwork undertaken as part of this report has resulted in a recommended reduction of character street coverage across Cambridge (reduced from 6 to 3), Leamington (reduced from 2 to zero) and Te Awamutu (reduced from 2 to 1), such that the remaining 4 character streets are adequately justified as qualifying matters under s771 of the RMA-EHS. Recommendation: Retain the provisions for character streets in PC 26, reduce their number / coverage as recommended in the Lifescapes report.
79.16	Amend	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	Various	The majority of streets subject to the proposed overlay feature generous road reserve widths, defined by very large street trees and berms. There is no justified need to impose a substantial 6m setback (where the MDRS otherwise enables a 1.5m setback from the front boundary) in such contexts, particularly where the character of those streets would be maintained as a result of being under the ownership and control of Council.	Seeks that where trees are a defining aspect of the 'street' character, they are specifically identified and scheduled due to their contribution to those streets.		That the point of submission is rejected A 6m setback is considered appropriate to maintain the particular character qualities of identified character streets (see body report). However, it is noted that the fieldwork undertaken as part of this report has resulted in a recommended reduction of character street coverage across Cambridge (reduced from 6 to 3), Leamington (reduced from 2 to zero) and Te Awamutu (reduced from 2 to 1), such that the remaining 4 character streets are adequately justified as qualifying matters under s771 of the RMA-EHS. Recommendation: Retain the provisions for character streets in PC 26, reduce their number / coverage as recommended in the Lifescapes report.
79.28	Support	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	Appendix DG2 and Volume 3: Planning Map	Council has undertaken a site-by-site analysis of sites within the existing 'Cambridge Character Area' as required by S77L(c) of the Housing Supply Act and concluded that the existing 'Cambridge Character Area' was "too broad in scope". The submitter is supportive of the removal of the existing 'Cambridge Character Area'.	Supports the removal in PC26 of the existing 'Cambridge Character Area'.		Support noted
79.29	Oppose	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	Appendix DG1 and Volume 3: planning maps - Character cluster overlay	The proposed new character clusters and character provisions conflates the issues of 'streetscape character' with the 'built character' that is sought to be protected on identified sites. Kāinga Ora questions the planning method and assessment undertaken to determine the proposed provisions and considers that further analysis of the buildings and clusters is needed and only those that meet the s.6 test be individually scheduled in the District Plan.	Delete the character cluster statements, the overlay and the associated provisions in their entirety and undertake further analysis is undertaken to determine the exact values of the resources that the Council seeks to manage in the District Plan.		That the point of submission is accepted in part Further analysis as sought by this submitter has been undertaken and is presented in this report, with consequent recommended amendments to PC 26. Recommendation: Amend PC 26 provisions and maps to reflect changes recommended in the Lifescapes report.
79.30	Oppose	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	Volume 3: planning maps - Character Streets overlay	Opposes the existing and proposed spatial identification (and associated provisions) on 'Character Streets' and seeks deletion in PC26. In many cases 'character streets' have a limited number of 'character buildings' that contribute to the 'streetscape character'. Kāinga Ora considers that the Character Street policy overlay and associated 6m setback is unwarranted and has not been sufficiently justified. The majority of streets subject to the proposed overlay feature generous road reserve widths, defined by very large street trees and berms. There is no justified need to impose a substantial 6m setback in such contexts.	Delete the character streets overlay and the associated provisions in their entirety.	FS5 – support FS6 - support	That the point of submission is rejected A 6m setback is considered appropriate to maintain the particular character qualities of identified character streets (see body report). However, it is noted that the fieldwork undertaken as part of this report has resulted in a recommended reduction of character street coverage across Cambridge (reduced from 6 to 3), Leamington (reduced from 2 to zero) and Te Awamutu (reduced from 2 to 1), such that the remaining 4 character streets are adequately justified as qualifying matters under s771 of the RMA-EHS. Recommendation: Retain the provisions for character streets in PC 26, reduce their number / coverage as recommended in the Lifescapes report.

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Sub	Response
79.31	Oppose	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	Appendix DG1 and Volume 3: planning maps- Character cluster overlay	Many of the 'clusters' are located on streets with a mixed range of dwelling typologies and do not form a sufficient grouping of buildings that contribute to a strong sense of consistent streetscape character, in reference to the built form that is present.	Appendix 4 identifies the character clusters and character streets that the submitter opposes and seeks deletion (refer to maps in Appendix 4 of the submission).		That the point of submission is rejected Character clusters inherently contain a mix of housing typologies in Waipā towns, due to very large original lot sizes and slow development over time that layered progressive patterns of subdivisions and new housing eras on older layout patterns. It is important to note that these areas are significant in the small towns that they are located within - to the specific historically-derived character and identity of the particular location.
79.32	Oppose	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	Volume 3 - Planning Maps - Character Streets Overlay	Considers that the Character Street policy overlay and associated 6m setback is unwarranted and has not been sufficiently justified. The majority of streets subject to the proposed overlay feature generous road reserve widths, defined by very large street trees and berms. There is no justified need to impose a substantial 6m setback in such contexts.	Identify and schedule specific trees where they are a defining aspect of the 'street' character.		That the point of submission is rejected A 6m setback is considered appropriate to maintain the particular character qualities of identified character streets (see body report). However, it is noted that the fieldwork undertaken as part of this report has resulted in a recommended reduction of character street coverage across Cambridge (reduced from 6 to 3), Leamington (reduced from 2 to zero) and Te Awamutu (reduced from 2 to 1), such that the remaining 4 character streets are adequately justified as qualifying matters under s771 of the RMA-EHS. Recommendation: Retain the provisions for character streets in PC 26, reduce their number / coverage as recommended in the Lifescapes report.
79.114	Support in part	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	2A.1 Introduction	Supports the notified provisions as it relates to historic heritage.	Retain the provisions 2A.1.19, 2A.1.20 and 2A.1.21 as notified with the exception that any reference to character is deleted. Consistent with the overall submission and relief sought.		Support noted re historic heritage. Amendment not supported - that the point of submission is rejected Agree for the need for review, and this has been undertaken accordingly as presented in this report. In particular, historical research and systematic site survey fieldwork has been undertaken to ascertain the specific context and characteristics of character streets and character clusters. This has resulted in recommended amendments to their extent and boundaries, enabling the resultant areas to be adequately justified as qualifying matters under s771 of the RMA-EHS. Recommendation: Amend PC 26 provisions and maps to reflect changes recommended in the Lifescapes report.
79.115	Support in part	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	2A.1 Introduction	Amendments are sought to any reference to character in the District Plan.	Delete 'and Character' from the heading above 2A.1.19 as follows: Qualifying Matters - Historic Heritage and Character 2A.1.19		That the point of submission is rejected Agree for the need for review, and this has been undertaken accordingly as presented in this report. In particular, historical research and systematic site survey fieldwork has been undertaken to ascertain the specific context and characteristics of character streets and character clusters. This has resulted in recommended amendments to their extent and boundaries, enabling the resultant areas to be adequately justified as qualifying matters under s771 of the RMA-EHS. Recommendation: Amend PC 26 provisions and maps to reflect changes recommended in the Lifescapes report.
79.116	Support in part	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	All	Amendments are sought to any reference to character in the District Plan.	Amendments are sought to any reference to character in the District Plan.		That the point of submission is rejected Agree for the need for review, and this has been undertaken accordingly as presented in this report. In particular, historical research and systematic site survey fieldwork has been undertaken to ascertain the specific context and characteristics of character streets and character clusters. This has resulted in recommended amendments to their extent and boundaries, enabling the resultant areas to be adequately justified as qualifying matters under s771 of the RMA-EHS. Recommendation: Amend PC 26 provisions and maps to reflect changes recommended in the Lifescapes report.

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Sub	Response
79.117	Support in part	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	Policy 2A.1.22	Amendments are sought to any reference to character in the District Plan.	Delete Policy 2A.1.22 and make consequential renumbering and references to these policies amendments.		That the point of submission is rejected Agree for the need for review, and this has been undertaken accordingly as presented in this report. In particular, historical research and systematic site survey fieldwork has been undertaken to ascertain the specific context and characteristics of character streets and character clusters. This has resulted in recommended amendments to their extent and boundaries, enabling the resultant areas to be adequately justified as qualifying matters under s771 of the RMA-EHS. Recommendation: Amend PC 26 provisions and maps to reflect changes recommended in the Lifescapes report.
79.118	Support in part	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	Policy 2A.1.23	Amendments are sought to any reference to character in the District Plan.	Delete Policy 2A.1.23 and make consequential renumbering and references to these policies amendments.		That the point of submission is rejected Agree for the need for review, and this has been undertaken accordingly as presented in this report. In particular, historical research and systematic site survey fieldwork has been undertaken to ascertain the specific context and characteristics of character streets and character clusters. This has resulted in recommended amendments to their extent and boundaries, enabling the resultant areas to be adequately justified as qualifying matters under s771 of the RMA-EHS. Recommendation: Amend PC 26 provisions and maps to reflect changes recommended in the Lifescapes report.
79.119	Oppose	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	Policy 2A.1.22	The proposed new character clusters and character provisions as notified, and the approach to 'character clusters' in the Plan, conflates issues of 'streetscape character' with the 'built character' that is sought to be protected on identified sites. Many of the 'clusters' are located on streets with a mixed range of dwelling typologies, many of which are either modern or highly modified. As a result, many of the cluster sites do not form a sufficient collection or grouping of buildings that contribute to a strong sense of consistent streetscape character, in reference to the built form that is present.	Delete Policy 2A.1.22.		That the point of submission is rejected Agree for the need for review, and this has been undertaken accordingly as presented in this report. In particular, historical research and systematic site survey fieldwork has been undertaken to ascertain the specific context and characteristics of character streets and character clusters. This has resulted in recommended amendments to their extent and boundaries, enabling the resultant areas to be adequately justified as qualifying matters under s771 of the RMA-EHS. Recommendation: Amend PC 26 provisions and maps to reflect changes recommended in the Lifescapes report.
79.120	Support in part	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	Planning Maps; Section 2A	The submitter is supportive of the removal of the existing 'Cambridge Character Area'.	Kāinga Ora is supportive of the removal of the existing 'Cambridge Character Area'.		Support noted
79.121	Oppose	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	Planning Maps; Section 2A	Amendments are sought to delete the character cluster statements and overlays in their entirety.	That the existing and proposed character clusters (and associated provisions as they relate to sites within the relevant Medium Density Residential Zone) be deleted in their entirety.		That the point of submission is rejected Agree for the need for review, and this has been undertaken accordingly as presented in this report. In particular, historical research and systematic site survey fieldwork has been undertaken to ascertain the specific context and characteristics of character streets and character clusters. This has resulted in recommended amendments to their extent and boundaries, enabling the resultant areas to be adequately justified as qualifying matters under s771 of the RMA-EHS. Recommendation: Amend PC 26 provisions and maps to reflect changes recommended in the Lifescapes report.
79.122	Oppose	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	Planning Maps; Section 2A	The proposed new character clusters and character provisions and the character clusters in the Plan, conflates issues of 'streetscape character' with 'built character'. Many of the clusters do not form a sufficient collection or grouping of buildings to form a consistent streetscape character. Any	The character cluster and character street provisions as proposed be deleted and that further analysis is undertaken to determine the exact values of the resources that the Council seeks to manage in the District Plan.		That the point of submission is accepted in part Further analysis as sought by this submitter has been undertaken and is presented in this report, with consequent recommended amendments to PC 26.

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Sub	Response
				such provisions and values identified should be 'managed' rather than 'protected' in the District Plan.			Recommendation: Amend PC 26 provisions and maps to reflect changes recommended in the Lifescapes report.
79.123	Support in part	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	Planning Maps; Section 2A	The site by site analysis undertaken by Council recommended the potential to include individual buildings or clusters within Council's Heritage Schedule but this recommendation was not adopted. Further analysis of these buildings and clusters should be undertaken and those that meet the test under s.6 RMA be individually scheduled in the District Plan.	That further analysis of the buildings and clusters is undertaken and those that meet the test under s.6 of the RMA are individually scheduled in the District Plan.		That the point of submission is rejected Under the RMA-EHS s771, territorial authorities may make the MDRS and the relevant building height or density requirements less enabling of development to accommodate specific qualifying matters. Character clusters fall under s771(j), and they have been identified and justified with site-specific analysis as required by s77L. Character clusters are a distinct planning tool that maintains and enhances collective historically-derived character. Along with individually-scheduled historic heritage items, archaeology and cultural heritage, they provide an important mechanism for retaining the legibility and distinct identities of towns. It is considered that the fieldwork that has been undertaken as part of this report provides greater transparency and robustness to the location and extent of character clusters included in PC 26.
79.124	Support in part	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	Planning Maps; Section 2A	The proposed new character clusters and character provisions and the character clusters in the Plan, conflates issues of 'streetscape character' with 'built character'. Many of the clusters do not form a sufficient collection or grouping of buildings to form a consistent streetscape character. Any such provisions and values identified should be 'managed' rather than 'protected' in the District Plan.	Make changes sought in Appendix 4 to the submission (which identifies the 'Character Clusters' and the 'Character Streets' that Kāinga Ora oppose).		That the point of submission is rejected Agree for the need for review, and this has been undertaken accordingly as presented in this report. In particular, historical research and systematic site survey fieldwork has been undertaken to ascertain the specific context and characteristics of character streets and character clusters. This has resulted in recommended amendments to their extent and boundaries, enabling the resultant areas to be adequately justified as qualifying matters under s771 of the RMA-EHS. Recommendation: Amend PC 26 provisions and maps to reflect changes recommended in the Lifescapes report.
79.125	Oppose	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	2A.1.23	In many cases 'character streets' have a limited number of 'character buildings' that contribute to the 'streetscape character'. Kāinga Ora considers that the Character Street policy overlay and associated 6m setback is unwarranted and has not been sufficiently justified under ss77J-L of the Housing Supply Act due to the limitations they would otherwise place on MDRS-enabled development.	Delete policy 2A.1.23.		That the point of submission is rejected A 6m setback is considered appropriate to maintain the particular character qualities of identified character streets (see body report). However, it is noted that the fieldwork undertaken as part of this report has resulted in a recommended reduction of character street coverage across Cambridge (reduced from 6 to 3), Leamington (reduced from 2 to zero) and Te Awamutu (reduced from 2 to 1), such that the remaining 4 character streets are adequately justified as qualifying matters under s771 of the RMA-EHS. Recommendation: Retain the provisions for character streets in PC 26, reduce their number / coverage as recommended in the Lifescapes report.
79.126	Oppose	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	Planning Maps; Section 2A	The proposed new character clusters and character provisions and the character clusters in the Plan, conflates issues of 'streetscape character' with 'built character'. Many of the clusters do not form a sufficient collection or grouping of buildings to form a consistent streetscape character. Any such provisions and values identified should be 'managed' rather than 'protected' in the District Plan.	The existing and proposed spatial identification (and associated provisions) on 'Character Streets' are deleted from PC26.		That the point of submission is rejected Agree for the need for review, and this has been undertaken accordingly as presented in this report. In particular, historical research and systematic site survey fieldwork has been undertaken to ascertain the specific context and characteristics of character streets and character clusters. This has resulted in recommended amendments to their extent and boundaries, enabling the resultant areas to be adequately justified as qualifying matters under s771 of the RMA-EHS. Recommendation: Amend PC 26 provisions and maps to reflect changes recommended in the Lifescapes report.
79.127	Oppose	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	Planning Maps; Section 2A	The proposed new character clusters and character provisions and the character clusters in the Plan, conflates issues of 'streetscape character' with 'built character'. Many of the clusters do not form a sufficient collection or grouping of buildings to form a consistent streetscape character. Any	Accept the changes sought in Appendix 4 (which identifies the 'Character Clusters' and the 'Character Streets' that Kāinga Ora oppose).		That the point of submission is rejected Agree for the need for review, and this has been undertaken accordingly as presented in this report. In particular, historical research and systematic site survey fieldwork has been undertaken to ascertain the specific context and characteristics of character streets and character clusters. This has resulted in

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Sub	Response
				such provisions and values identified should be 'managed' rather than 'protected' in the District Plan.			recommended amendments to their extent and boundaries, enabling the resultant areas to be adequately justified as qualifying matters under s771 of the RMA-EHS. Recommendation: Amend PC 26 provisions and maps to reflect changes recommended in the Lifescapes report.
79.128	Support in part	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	Planning Maps; Section 2A	The majority of streets subject to the proposed overlay feature generous road reserve widths, defined by very large street trees and berms. There is no justified need to impose a substantial 6m setback (where the MDRS otherwise enables a 1.5m setback from the front boundary) in such contexts, particularly where the character of those streets would be maintained as a result of being under the ownership and control of Council.	Where trees are a defining aspect of the 'street' character, seeks that they are specifically identified and scheduled due to their contribution to those streets.		That the point of submission is rejected A 6m setback is considered appropriate to maintain the particular character qualities of identified character streets (see body report). However, it is noted that the fieldwork undertaken as part of this report has resulted in a recommended reduction of character street coverage across Cambridge (reduced from 6 to 3), Leamington (reduced from 2 to zero) and Te Awamutu (reduced from 2 to 1), such that the remaining 4 character streets are adequately justified as qualifying matters under s771 of the RMA-EHS. Recommendation: Retain the provisions for character streets in PC 26, reduce their number / coverage as recommended in the Lifescapes report.
79.142	Oppose in part	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	2A.2.9	The provision reads as a statement rather than a resource management 'issue' to be addressed. There will be instances where some signage may be necessary for suitable non-residential activities that locate within the zone.	Amend 2A.2.9 as follows: The establishment of inappropriate signage in residential environments can adversely affect Signs are not consistent with the character of planned urban form character of residential neighbourhoods. Signs can also detract from the character and values associated with identified heritage items, and character clusters.		That the point of submission is rejected The signage rules have not been amended as part of PC26, and are not proposed to be altered.
79.143	Oppose in part	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	All	Reference to character clusters are opposed for the reasons outlined in the submission letter and the overall Kāinga Ora submission.	References to the anticipated character and form of development in the zone should use terminology consistent with the NPS-UD and MDRS in the Housing Supply Act.		No specific relief sought.
79.144	Oppose in part	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	All	Reference to character clusters are opposed for the reasons outlined in the submission letter and the overall Kāinga Ora submission.	Delete any reference to character clusters.		That the point of submission is rejected Under the RMA-EHS s771, territorial authorities may make the MDRS and the relevant building height or density requirements less enabling of development to accommodate specific qualifying matters. Character clusters fall under s771(j), and they have been identified and justified with site-specific analysis as required by s77L. Agree for the need for review, and this has been undertaken accordingly as presented in this report. In particular, historical research and systematic site survey fieldwork has been undertaken to ascertain the specific context and characteristics of character streets and character clusters. This has resulted in recommended amendments to their extent and boundaries, enabling the resultant areas to be adequately justified as qualifying matters under s771 of the RMA-EHS. Recommendation: Amend PC 26 provisions and maps to reflect changes recommended in the Lifescapes report.
79.170	Oppose in part	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	Section 2A	Consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission, character 'streets' and 'clusters' are opposed in the Medium Density Residential Zone.	Delete any reference to character clusters.		That the point of submission is rejected Under the RMA-EHS s771, territorial authorities may make the MDRS and the relevant building height or density requirements less enabling of development to accommodate specific qualifying matters. Character clusters fall under s771(j), and they have been identified and justified with site-specific analysis as required by s77L. Agree for the need for review, and this has been undertaken accordingly as presented in this report. In particular, historical research and systematic site survey fieldwork has been undertaken to ascertain the specific context and

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Sub	Response
							<p>characteristics of character streets and character clusters. This has resulted in recommended amendments to their extent and boundaries, enabling the resultant areas to be adequately justified as qualifying matters under s771 of the RMA-EHS.</p> <p>Recommendation: Amend PC 26 provisions and maps to reflect changes recommended in the Lifescapes report.</p>
79.175	Oppose in part	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	All	Consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission, character 'streets' and 'clusters' are opposed in the Medium Density Residential Zone.	Delete any reference to character clusters.		<p>That the point of submission is rejected</p> <p>Under the RMA-EHS s771, territorial authorities may make the MDRS and the relevant building height or density requirements less enabling of development to accommodate specific qualifying matters. Character clusters fall under s771(j), and they have been identified and justified with site-specific analysis as required by s77L.</p> <p>Agree for the need for review, and this has been undertaken accordingly as presented in this report. In particular, historical research and systematic site survey fieldwork has been undertaken to ascertain the specific context and characteristics of character streets and character clusters. This has resulted in recommended amendments to their extent and boundaries, enabling the resultant areas to be adequately justified as qualifying matters under s771 of the RMA-EHS.</p> <p>Recommendation: Amend PC 26 provisions and maps to reflect changes recommended in the Lifescapes report.</p>
79.176	Oppose	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	All	Consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission, character 'streets' and 'clusters' are opposed in the Medium Density Residential Zone.	Delete Policy-Character Clusters 2A.3.3.4 and any references to the policy. Make consequential numbering changes.		<p>That the point of submission is rejected</p> <p>Under the RMA-EHS s771, territorial authorities may make the MDRS and the relevant building height or density requirements less enabling of development to accommodate specific qualifying matters. Character clusters fall under s771(j), and they have been identified and justified with site-specific analysis as required by s77L.</p> <p>Agree for the need for review, and this has been undertaken accordingly as presented in this report. In particular, historical research and systematic site survey fieldwork has been undertaken to ascertain the specific context and characteristics of character streets and character clusters. This has resulted in recommended amendments to their extent and boundaries, enabling the resultant areas to be adequately justified as qualifying matters under s771 of the RMA-EHS.</p> <p>Recommendation: Amend PC 26 provisions and maps to reflect changes recommended in the Lifescapes report.</p>
79.177	Oppose in part	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	2A.3.3.5	Kāinga Ora supports the policy-intent to manage the effects of development on identified buildings protected under s.6 RMA.	Kāinga Ora supports the policy-intent to manage the effects of development on identified buildings protected under s.6 RMA.		Support noted
79.178	Oppose in part	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	2A.3.3.5	Policy 2A.3.3.5 implies the 'avoidance' of all adverse effects and this is inappropriate for reasons outlined throughout the Kāinga Ora submission. The extent to which views of a heritage building and setting may reduce the application of the MDRS (enablement of up to three dwellings per site) has not been sufficiently justified or assessed within the s.32 analysis required by s.77 of the Housing Supply Act on a site by site basis.	Amend Policy 2A.3.3.5 Subdivision and development adjoining Category A heritage items as follows: 2A.3.3.5 To ensure that subdivision and development and associated earthworks adjoining Category A heritage items manages and/or mitigates do not result in adverse effects on the listed heritage building including its setting and vistas to the building.		<p>That the point of submission is rejected</p> <p>The signage rules have not been amended as part of PC26, and are not proposed to be altered.</p>

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Sub	Response
79.182	Oppose	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	2A.3.4.2	The submitter opposes character streets and clusters for the reasons outlined in the overall Kāinga Ora submission.	Delete Policy 2A.3.4.2 and any reference to the policy.		That the point of submission is rejected A 6m setback is considered appropriate to maintain the particular character qualities of identified character streets (see body report). However, it is noted that the fieldwork undertaken as part of this report has resulted in a recommended reduction of character street coverage across Cambridge (reduced from 6 to 3), Leamington (reduced from 2 to zero) and Te Awamutu (reduced from 2 to 1), such that the remaining 4 character streets are adequately justified as qualifying matters under s771 of the RMA-EHS. Recommendation: Retain the provisions for character streets in PC 26, reduce their number / coverage as recommended in the Lifescapes report.
79.216	Oppose in part	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	2A.4.1.1	Consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission and 2A.4.1.3(d), character clusters are opposed and sought to be deleted. Consequential amendment is required to 2A.4.1(f) and (g).	A Consequential amendment is required to 2A.4.1(f) and (g) based on the submission to 2A.4.1.3(d) opposing character clusters as follows: 2A.4.1.1 Permitted activities... ... (f) Demolition and removal of buildings, except in character clusters and those listed in Appendix N1-Heritage Items. (g) Relocated buildings, except where located in a character cluster or listed in Appendix N1-Heritage items.		That the point of submission is rejected Agree for the need for review, and this has been undertaken accordingly as presented in this report. In particular, historical research and systematic site survey fieldwork has been undertaken to ascertain the specific context and characteristics of character streets and character clusters. This has resulted in recommended amendments to their extent and boundaries, enabling the resultant areas to be adequately justified as qualifying matters under s771 of the RMA-EHS. Recommendation: Amend PC 26 provisions and maps to reflect changes recommended in the Lifescapes report.
79.228	Oppose	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	2A.4.1.3(c); planning maps; various	Seeks that the existing and proposed character clusters and associated provisions be deleted in their entirety from PC26.	Delete the 'character cluster' overlays and provisions under PC26 in their entirety.		That the point of submission is rejected Agree for the need for review, and this has been undertaken accordingly as presented in this report. In particular, historical research and systematic site survey fieldwork has been undertaken to ascertain the specific context and characteristics of character streets and character clusters. This has resulted in recommended amendments to their extent and boundaries, enabling the resultant areas to be adequately justified as qualifying matters under s771 of the RMA-EHS. Recommendation: Amend PC 26 provisions and maps to reflect changes recommended in the Lifescapes report.
79.229	Oppose	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	2A.4.1.3(c)	Seeks that the existing and proposed character clusters and associated provisions be deleted in their entirety from PC26.	Delete the 'relocated buildings' provisions as they are more appropriately managed through the Building Act.		Amendment supported Recommendation: Delete the following text from 2A.4.1.3(d) : Additionally for relocated buildings; § Condition of the exterior of the building; and § Repairs and works identified for action in Council approved or certified Building Relocation Inspection Report; and § Reinstatement works; and § Timing for completing any required works.
79.230	Oppose	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	Various	The submitter does support the proposed removal of the existing 'Cambridge Character Area' overlay.	Support the proposed removal of the existing 'Cambridge Character Area' overlay.		Support noted
79.241	Oppose in part	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	Planning maps; various	The Character Street policy overlay and associated 6m setback is unwarranted. The majority of streets subject to that overlay feature generous road reserve widths, defined by very large street trees and berms. The character of those streets would be maintained as a result of being under the ownership and control of Council.	Delete the 'character street' overlay as it applies within the Medium Density Residential Zone and all associated provisions.		That the point of submission is rejected A 6m setback is considered appropriate to maintain the particular character qualities of identified character streets (see body report). However, it is noted that the fieldwork undertaken as part of this report has resulted in a recommended reduction of character street coverage across Cambridge (reduced from 6 to 3), Leamington (reduced from 2 to zero) and Te Awamutu (reduced from 2 to 1), such that the remaining 4 character streets are adequately justified as qualifying matters under s771 of the RMA-EHS.

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Sub	Response
							Recommendation: Retain the provisions for character streets in PC 26, reduce their number / coverage as recommended in the Lifescapes report.
79.269	Support in Part	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	15.4.1.1(e)	No reasons stated.	Delete all references to character clusters and character precinct areas.		That the point of submission is rejected Agree for the need for review, and this has been undertaken accordingly as presented in this report. In particular, historical research and systematic site survey fieldwork has been undertaken to ascertain the specific context and characteristics of character streets and character clusters. This has resulted in recommended amendments to their extent and boundaries, enabling the resultant areas to be adequately justified as qualifying matters under s771 of the RMA-EHS. Recommendation: Amend PC 26 provisions and maps to reflect changes recommended in the Lifescapes report.
79.272	Support	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	15.4.1.1 (o)	For the reasons outlined in the Kāinga Ora submission on Character Clusters. Kāinga Ora supports the deletion of provisions related to the operative Cambridge Residential Character Area.	Maintain the deletion of 15.4.1.1(o) as notified.		Support noted
79.311	Oppose	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	Various	Consistent with its overall submission, Kāinga Ora seeks that the existing and proposed character clusters (and associated provisions as they relate to sites within the relevant MDRZ) be deleted in their entirety.	Delete the 'character cluster' overlays and provisions under PC26 in their entirety.		That the point of submission is rejected Agree for the need for review, and this has been undertaken accordingly as presented in this report. In particular, historical research and systematic site survey fieldwork has been undertaken to ascertain the specific context and characteristics of character streets and character clusters. This has resulted in recommended amendments to their extent and boundaries, enabling the resultant areas to be adequately justified as qualifying matters under s771 of the RMA-EHS. Recommendation: Amend PC 26 provisions and maps to reflect changes recommended in the Lifescapes report.
79.322	Oppose	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	Appendix DG1; Planning Maps; various	Consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission, Kāinga Ora seeks that the existing and proposed character clusters (and associated provisions as they relate to sites within the relevant MDRZ) be deleted in their entirety. Those existing and additional buildings identified in the architectural site by site analysis may be appropriate as being identified as Category C heritage buildings as-per the recommendations within that report. Such inclusion is subject to the appropriate analysis under S77L being undertaken by the council, to ensure their protection is fully-justified under S6 of the RMA. Kāinga Ora considers that the existing district plan provisions under Section 22 - Heritage and Archeology, more appropriately manage the issues of 'built' character and heritage in relation to specific buildings.	Delete character cluster statements in Appendix DG1, consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission.		That the point of submission is rejected , although the need to modify these statements to provide more fulsome information is acknowledged. Agree for the need for review, and this has been undertaken accordingly as presented in this report. In particular, historical research and systematic site survey fieldwork has been undertaken to ascertain the specific context and characteristics of character streets and character clusters. This has resulted in recommended amendments to their extent and boundaries, enabling the resultant areas to be adequately justified as qualifying matters under s771 of the RMA-EHS. The character statements are incomplete and insufficient for identifying clusters' values against which land use applications should be considered. Recommendation: Amend character statements in ODP Appendix DG1 to provide fulsome descriptions to support future land use consent assessments. Amend PC 26 provisions and maps to reflect changes recommended in the Lifescapes report.
79.323	Oppose	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	Appendix DG1; Planning Maps; various	Consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission, Kāinga Ora seeks that the existing and proposed character clusters (and associated provisions as they relate to sites within the relevant MDRZ) be deleted in their entirety. Those existing and additional buildings identified in the architectural site by site analysis may be appropriate as being identified as	Delete Te Awamutu College Street Character Cluster in Appendix DG1.		Amendment supported See proposed amended extent of character cluster in this vicinity, identified as the Rewi Street Character Cluster. Recommendation:

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Sub	Response
				Category C heritage buildings as-per the recommendations within that report. Such inclusion is subject to the appropriate analysis under S77L being undertaken by the council, to ensure their protection is fully-justified under S6 of the RMA. Kāinga Ora considers that the existing district plan provisions under Section 22 - Heritage and Archeology, more appropriately manage the issues of 'built' character and heritage in relation to specific buildings.			As shown in this report's recommended planning maps - delete individually-identified properties on College Street from character cluster coverage; include the amended area on Rewi Street as the "Rewi Street Character Cluster."
79.324	Oppose	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	Appendix DG1; Planning Maps; various	Consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission, Kāinga Ora seeks that the existing and proposed character clusters (and associated provisions as they relate to sites within the relevant MDRZ) be deleted in their entirety. Those existing and additional buildings identified in the architectural site by site analysis may be appropriate as being identified as Category C heritage buildings as-per the recommendations within that report. Such inclusion is subject to the appropriate analysis under S77L being undertaken by the council, to ensure their protection is fully-justified under S6 of the RMA. Kāinga Ora considers that the existing district plan provisions under Section 22 - Heritage and Archeology, more appropriately manage the issues of 'built' character and heritage in relation to specific buildings.	Delete Te Awamutu: Alexandra Street Cluster in Appendix DG1.		Amendment supported The character cluster planning tool is not appropriate for individual properties unconnected from a contiguous streetscape "cluster." Delete Te Awamutu: Alexandra Street Cluster in Appendix DG1.
79.325	Oppose	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	Appendix DG1; Planning Maps; various	Consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission, Kāinga Ora seeks that the existing and proposed character clusters (and associated provisions as they relate to sites within the relevant MDRZ) be deleted in their entirety. Those existing and additional buildings identified in the architectural site by site analysis may be appropriate as being identified as Category C heritage buildings as-per the recommendations within that report. Such inclusion is subject to the appropriate analysis under S77L being undertaken by the council, to ensure their protection is fully-justified under S6 of the RMA. Kāinga Ora considers that the existing district plan provisions under Section 22 - Heritage and Archeology, more appropriately manage the issues of 'built' character and heritage in relation to specific buildings.	Delete Te Awamutu: Bridgeman Road Cluster in Appendix DG1.		Amendment supported The character cluster planning tool is not appropriate for individual properties unconnected from a contiguous streetscape "cluster." Delete Te Awamutu: Bridgeman Road Cluster in Appendix DG1.
79.326	Oppose	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	Appendix DG1; Planning Maps; various	Consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission, Kāinga Ora seeks that the existing and proposed character clusters (and associated provisions as they relate to sites within the relevant MDRZ) be deleted in their entirety. Those existing and additional buildings identified in the architectural site by site analysis may be appropriate as being identified as Category C heritage buildings as-per the recommendations within that report. Such inclusion is subject to the appropriate analysis under S77L being undertaken by the council, to ensure their protection is fully-justified under S6 of the RMA. Kāinga Ora considers that the existing district plan provisions under Section 22 - Heritage and Archeology, more appropriately manage the issues of 'built' character and heritage in relation to specific buildings.	Delete Cambridge Queen Street Cluster Appendix DG1.		That the point of submission is rejected See proposed amended extent of character cluster on Queen Street. Recommendation: Amend the coverage of the Queen Street character cluster as shown in the Lifescapes report's recommended planning maps.
79.327	Oppose	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	Appendix DG1; Planning Maps; various	Consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission, Kāinga Ora seeks that the existing and proposed character clusters (and associated provisions as they relate to sites within the relevant MDRZ) be deleted in their entirety. Those existing and additional buildings identified in the architectural site by site analysis may be appropriate as being identified as Category C heritage buildings as-per the recommendations within that report. Such inclusion is subject to the appropriate analysis under S77L being undertaken by the council, to ensure their protection is fully-justified under S6 of the RMA. Kāinga Ora considers that the existing district plan provisions under Section 22 - Heritage and Archeology, more appropriately manage the issues of 'built' character and heritage in relation to specific buildings.	Delete Victoria Street Cluster (between Hamilton Road and Victoria Street) in Appendix DG1.		That the point of submission is rejected See proposed amended extent of character cluster on Victoria Street. Recommendation: Amend the coverage of the Victoria Street character cluster as shown in the Lifescapes report's recommended planning maps.

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Sub	Response
79.328	Oppose	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	Appendix DG1; Planning Maps; various	Consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission, Kāinga Ora seeks that the existing and proposed character clusters (and associated provisions as they relate to sites within the relevant MDRZ) be deleted in their entirety. Those existing and additional buildings identified in the architectural site by site analysis may be appropriate as being identified as Category C heritage buildings as-per the recommendations within that report. Such inclusion is subject to the appropriate analysis under S77L being undertaken by the council, to ensure their protection is fully-justified under S6 of the RMA. Kāinga Ora considers that the existing district plan provisions under Section 22 - Heritage and Archeology, more appropriately manage the issues of 'built' character and heritage in relation to specific buildings.	Delete Princes Street Cluster (between Thornton Road and Stafford Street) in Appendix DG1.		That the point of submission is rejected See proposed amended / amalgamated extent of character cluster in this location, identified as the Thornton Rd / Princes St Character Cluster Recommendation: Amend and amalgamate identified character clusters on Bowen, Princes and Thornton Streets as shown in this report's recommended planning maps, identified as the "Thornton Rd / Princes St Character Cluster."
79.329	Oppose	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	Appendix DG1; Planning Maps; various	Consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission, Kāinga Ora seeks that the existing and proposed character clusters (and associated provisions as they relate to sites within the relevant MDRZ) be deleted in their entirety. Those existing and additional buildings identified in the architectural site by site analysis may be appropriate as being identified as Category C heritage buildings as-per the recommendations within that report. Such inclusion is subject to the appropriate analysis under S77L being undertaken by the council, to ensure their protection is fully-justified under S6 of the RMA. Kāinga Ora considers that the existing district plan provisions under Section 22 - Heritage and Archeology, more appropriately manage the issues of 'built' character and heritage in relation to specific buildings.	Delete Princes Street Cluster (between Grosvenor Road and Weld Street) in Appendix DG1.		That the point of submission is accepted The character cluster planning tool is not appropriate for individual properties unconnected from a contiguous streetscape "cluster." Delete Princes Street Cluster (between Grosvenor Road and Weld Street) in Appendix DG1.
79.330	Oppose	Historic Heritage and Character - Qualifying Matters	Appendix DG1; Planning Maps; various	Consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission, Kāinga Ora seeks that the existing and proposed character clusters (and associated provisions as they relate to sites within the relevant MDRZ) be deleted in their entirety. Those existing and additional buildings identified in the architectural site by site analysis may be appropriate as being identified as Category C heritage buildings as-per the recommendations within that report. Such inclusion is subject to the appropriate analysis under S77L being undertaken by the council, to ensure their protection is fully-justified under S6 of the RMA. Kāinga Ora considers that the existing district plan provisions under Section 22 - Heritage and Archeology, more appropriately manage the issues of 'built' character and heritage in relation to specific buildings.	Delete Bowen Street Cluster (between William and King Streets) in Appendix DG1.		That the point of submission is accepted The character cluster planning tool is not appropriate for individual properties unconnected from a contiguous streetscape "cluster." Delete Bowen Street Cluster (between William and King Streets) in Appendix DG1.

3.5 SNAs/Reserves (see s42a report pgs 81 to 86)

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Sub	Response
16.2	Oppose	Significant Natural Areas - Qualifying Matter	All	Objection to private landowners losing autonomy over SNA's on their own properties. For example, they should not lose autonomy over qualifying matters such as significance to mana whenua.	Objection to private landowners losing autonomy over SNA's on their own properties. For example, they should not lose autonomy over qualifying matters such as significance to mana whenua.		No specific relief sought Operative WDP has existing rules for SNAs. PC26 proposes in addition a 20m building setback. Considered to be necessary to protect and restore SNAs and achieve national, regional, and local biodiversity goals and to protect absolutely protected species such as pekapeka tou roa.
32.4	Amend	Significant Natural Areas - Qualifying Matter	2A.1.9	Significant natural areas are identified in the District Plan to protect areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna, as a matter of national importance pursuant to section 6(c) of the Act. An amendment is necessary to 2A.1 to clarify that the MDRS have been modified where necessary to protect significant natural areas, in order to accommodate a matter of national importance under s 6(c).	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> '.	FS1 support FS8 support	That the point of submission is accepted As it provides justification for proposed SNA setback.

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
		Qualifying Matter		Whaimana. An increase in the landscaping requirement within the River / Gully Proximity Qualifying Matter Overlay (from 20% to 30%), along with policy direction that this landscaping should be native species that support the ecological integrity and function of the river environment, is necessary to give effect to Te Ture Whaimana. This supports the overall Te Ture Whaimana principle of water quality betterment (expressed as restoration) rather than simply avoidance or mitigation.	Matter Overlay to require an increased provision of landscaped area, together with a requirement for that landscaping to be native species, as follows: "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 with native plants, and can include the canopy of trees regardless of the ground treatment below them." 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.	FS8 - oppose	Increase from 20% to 30% will help create buffer to biodiversity corridors and requirement for native planting which will help create buffer, provide food source and prevent weed incursion into SNA and restored areas.
53.4	Support in Part	River/Gully Proximity - Qualifying Matter	2A.4.2.8	We agree that a qualifying matter relating to Te Ture Whaimana and the National Policy Statement for Freshwater should be imposed. However, the correct method for controlling stormwater runoff is through limiting Impermeable surfaces - a reduced permitted impermeable surface within this qualifying matter area is a more appropriate method of controlling & assessing stormwater runoff and any potential effects on the Waikato River. Assessment criteria should relate only to matters relating to impermeable area and mitigation of impermeable area.	Remove Rule 2A.4.2.8 or amend the rule to refer to Impermeable surfaces rather than site coverage. Suggested Rule amendment: 2A.4.2.8 On sites located within the Stormwater Qualifying Matter and the River / Gully Proximity Qualifying Matter Overlays, the maximum building coverage impermeable area must not exceed 50% 40% of the net site area. Activities that fail to comply with this Rule 2A.4.2.7 to 2A.4.2.8 will require a resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity with the discretion being restricted over: •Building location, bulk and design; and •On-site amenity; and •Outlook for adjoining neighbours; and •Effects on existing trees; and •Landscaping; and •The impact on rivers and waterbodies and whether any potential adverse effects from a development can be avoided or mitigated; and •The impact of the development on indigenous flora and fauna and the ability to avoid, remedy or mitigate any adverse effects on these; and •An assessment of stormwater disposal and whether this can be accommodated on-site. These matters will be considered in accordance with the assessment criteria in Section 21.		That the point of submission is accepted in part The River Gully Overlay and Stormwater Overlay building coverage rules and there relevant matters of discretion are recommended to be separated to avoid confusion. The building coverage provisions in section 21.1.2A.9 have been adjusted to also avoid confusion.
79.20	Oppose	River/Gully Proximity - Qualifying Matter	Various	The implications of this overlay have not been sufficiently assessed or justified in accordance with ss77J and 77L of the Housing Supply Act and its purpose.	Opposes and seeks deletion of the river/gully proximity qualifying matter overlays including the spatial application and associated provisions in PC26.		That the point of submission is rejected Recommend retaining provisions with amendments proposed by Council in its submission and current extent shown on maps. Reducing building coverage from 50% to 40% in this overlay will not only reduce risk of overland flows adversely affecting awa but also will support awa as biodiversity corridors. Precautionary approach to awa that are all within Waikato and Waipa River catchments. Precautionary approach required because of s6 RMA matters, Te Ture Whaimana and cultural and environmental values associated with biodiversity corridors.
79.38	Oppose	River/Gully Proximity - Qualifying Matter	Volume 3: Planning Maps - River/Gully Proximity Overlays; and various	The implications of the river/gully proximity qualifying matter overlay have not been sufficiently assessed or justified in accordance with ss77J and 77L of the Housing Supply Act and its purpose. Alternative methods have not been explored to address the issues. Financial and development contributions are proposed to address effects and contribute to the restoration and protection of the Waikato and Waipā Rivers under Te Ture Whaimana.	Delete the 'river/gully proximity' qualifying matter overlays (including their spatial application and associated provisions).		That the point of submission is rejected Recommend retaining provisions with amendments proposed by Council in its submission and current extent shown on maps. Reducing building coverage from 50% to 40% in this overlay will not only reduce risk of overland flows adversely affecting awa but also will support awa as biodiversity corridors. Precautionary approach to awa that are all within Waikato and Waipa River catchments. Precautionary approach required because of s6 RMA matters, Te Ture Whaimana and cultural and environmental values associated with biodiversity corridors.
79.39	Oppose	River/Gully Proximity - Qualifying Matter	Volume 3: Planning Maps - River/Gully Proximity Overlays	The implications of the river/gully proximity qualifying matter overlay have not been sufficiently assessed or justified in accordance with ss77J and 77L of the Housing Supply Act and its purpose. Alternative methods have not been explored to address the issues. Financial and development contributions are proposed to address effects and contribute to the	Appendix 5 identifies the 'river/gully proximity' overlays that Kāinga Ora opposes and seeks deletion (refer Appendix 5 to the submission).		That the point of submission is rejected Recommend retaining provisions with amendments proposed by Council in its submission and current extent shown on maps. Reducing building coverage from 50% to 40% in this overlay will not only reduce risk of overland flows adversely affecting awa but also will support

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
				restoration and protection of the Waikato and Waipā Rivers under Te Ture Whaimana.			awa as biodiversity corridors. Precautionary approach to awa that are all within Waikato and Waipa River catchments. Precautionary approach required because of s6 RMA matters, Te Ture Whaimana and cultural and environmental values associated with biodiversity corridors.
79.243	Oppose in part	River/Gully Proximity - Qualifying Matter	Planning maps; various	Consistent with the overall submission, Kāinga Ora opposes and seeks deletion of the 'river / gully proximity' qualifying matter overlay.	Delete the 'river / gully proximity' qualifying matter overlay, including the spatial application and associated provisions in their entirety.		That the point of submission is rejected Recommend retaining provisions with amendments proposed by Council in its submission and current extent shown on maps. Reducing building coverage from 50% to 40% in this overlay will not only reduce risk of overland flows adversely affecting awa but also will support awa as biodiversity corridors. Precautionary approach to awa that are all within Waikato and Waipa River catchments. Precautionary approach required because of s6 RMA matters, Te Ture Whaimana and cultural and environmental values associated with biodiversity corridors.

4 Specific Changes

4.1 Strategic Policy Framework/Whole Plan Change (see s42a report - Topic 4.1 pgs 105 to 106)

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Sub	Response
30.34	Support in Part	Strategic Policy Framework	1.1.29	The reference to the current Waikato Regional Policy Statement plan change being undertaken by WRC should be more specific and refer to the name of the plan change.	Replace "the Waikato Regional Policy Statement plan change being prepared by the Waikato Regional Council" with " Waikato Regional Policy Statement Proposed Plan Change 1 - National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 and Future Proof Strategy Update ".		That the point of submission is accepted Amend 1.1.29 to give effect to submission point 30.34 but only referencing PC1 to the WRPS.
47.1	Support	Strategic Policy Framework	1.3.3.2	Supports new policy 1.3.3.2 as it enables council and developers to consider out of sequence and out of zone plan changes where the necessary infrastructure is available / provided for the proposed development. This is important to Fire and Emergency from both a water supply and transportation network perspective.	Retain Policy 1.3.3.2 notified.		Support noted.
49.3	Amend	Strategic Policy Framework	Section 1.1.33	To accurately reflect the name of the Waikato-Tainui Environmental Management Plan.	Amend Section 1.1.33 Clause (e) as follows: "1.1.33 The iwi management plans for the Waipā District are: ...(e) Tai Tūmu, Tai Pari, Taiae Ao..." And any consequential amendments or alternative relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.		That the point of submission is accepted Amend 1.1.33(e) to give effect to submission point 49.3.
56.7	Support in Part	Strategic Policy Framework	Policy 1.3.3.2	Supports the proposal to add a new Policy to address out of sequence and out of zone plan changes but considers reverse sensitivity matters are an important consideration for any out of sequence and out of zone plan changes. An additional matter is needed to address reverse sensitivity effects associated with development occurring in close proximity to established industrial activities including dairy manufacturing sites.	Amend Policy 1.3.3.2 to include the following additional matter: e) Avoid the potential for reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established industrial activities including dairy manufacturing sites.		That the point of submission is rejected This inclusion is too specific for this Policy which applies to the entire district.
70.17	Oppose in Part	Strategic Policy Framework	1.1.19 (d)	Supports the proposed amendments set out in section 1.1.19(d) to the extent these reflect the purpose of the NPSUD. However the submitter considers 1.1.19(d) should be amended to also reflect the needs for planning decisions to contribute to well-functioning urban environments, which includes the need to enable a "variety of homes" to	Amend 1.1.19(d) to read as follows: The National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 is focused on ensuring that New Zealand has well-functioning urban environments that enable all people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural wellbeing, and for their health and safety, now and into the future. It seeks to ensure that planning decisions		That the point of submission is rejected This repeats what is said earlier in the paragraph.

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Sub	Response
				meet the "needs... of different households" (as set out in Policy 1 of the NPSUD).	<u>contribute to well functioning urban environments</u> , improve housing affordability and that integrated decision making occurs.		
70.18	Oppose in Part	Strategic Policy Framework	1.1.35 - 1.1.37	The submitter supports the inclusion of the Waipā Growth Strategy as a relevant local direction, but it considers the description of the Strategy should be amended to refer to the key challenges facing the district which will have implications for how growth should be provided for and managed in the future, including "[a]n increasing and ageing population and how best to cater for this change". The submitter considers this challenge is particularly relevant in the context of the Enabling Housing Act.	Amend Sections 1.1.35-1.1.37 to refer to the need to consider the increasing and ageing population and how best to cater for this change as part of Waipā's growth strategy.		That the point of submission is rejected It is considered that PC26 adequately covers this.
70.19	Oppose	Strategic Policy Framework	1.2.17	Notes that PC26 does not propose to amend section 1.2.17, which address the design of new buildings to reflect the individual character towns and villages in the District. The submitter opposes section 1.2.17 as currently drafted as it does not appropriately capture the intent of the Enabling Housing Act or the NPSUD. 1.2.17 needs to recognise the diverse and changing needs of the District, and that the existing character and amenity of the towns and villages in the District will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.	Amend Section 1.2.17 to recognise that the diverse and changing needs of the District, and that the existing character and amenity of the towns and villages in the District will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.		That the point of submission is rejected PC26's approach to heritage is appropriate and consistent both with the objectives of the ODP and the new requirements of the RMA-EHS. No changes are recommended to 1.2.17.
70.20	Support	Strategic Policy Framework	1.3.2.2(b)	Supports Policy 1.3.2.2(b) as it aligns with Policy 2 of the MDRS.	Retain Policy 1.3.2.2(b) as notified.		Support noted
70.21	Support in Part	Strategic Policy Framework	1.3.2.2	Supports the existing drafting of Policy 1.3.1.2(b) in the District Plan (referred to as Policy 1.3.2.2 in PC26) as it provides for "a range of accommodation facilities and services to support the long term accommodation and care requirements for the existing and future elderly population". However, the submitter considers that this policy must be amended to refer to the new residential zone: the Medium Density Residential Zone.	Amend Policy 1.3.1.2(b) as identified in the District Plan, to read: "A range of accommodation facilities and services to support the long term accommodation and care requirements for the existing and future elderly population, some of which may need to occur on the periphery of towns outside of the current urban limits as well as within the Residential Zone and Medium Density Residential Zone".		That the point of submission is accepted Amend Policy 1.3.1.2(c) to give effect to submission point 70.21.
70.22	Oppose	Strategic Policy Framework	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 District Growth Strategy as these are not yet documents which have been produced.	Delete Policy 1.3.3.1.		That the point of submission is rejected Regardless of changes to the Waikato RPS, the ODP will at all times need to be consistent with the RPS. The sentiment and intended meaning of the provision is to be flexible to existing and future directions at a regional and district level.
70.23	Support in Part	Strategic Policy Framework	1.3.3.2	Supports Policy 1.3.3.2 to the extent it reflects Policy 8 of the NPSUD.	Retain Policy 1.3.3.2 as notified.		Support noted.
70.24	Oppose in Part	Strategic Policy Framework	1.3.2.3	Opposes the current drafting of Policy 1.3.2.3 (Policy – Sequencing and Staging: accommodation for the ageing population) as it considers it limits the provision of this type of accommodation in a way which is not consistent with the NPSUD or Enabling Housing Act.	Delete Policy 1.3.2.3 and replace with the following policy: <u>To recognise and enable the housing and care needs of the ageing population, provide for a diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the particular needs and characteristics of older persons, such as retirement villages.</u>		That the point of submission is rejected The request would completely change the intent of the policy.

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Sub	Response
72.7	Support	Strategic Policy Framework	1.3.3.2	It is important to provide for out of sequence development where it is well considered and necessary as required by Policy 8 of the NPS-UD.	Retain 1.3.3.2 Policy-Out of sequence and Out of Zone plan changes, as notified.		Support noted.
73.17	Oppose in Part	Strategic Policy Framework	1.1.19 (d)	Supports the proposed amendments set out in section 1.1.19(d) to the extent these reflect the purpose of the NPSUD. However the submitter considers 1.1.19(d) should be amended to also reflect the needs for planning decisions to contribute to well-functioning urban environments, which includes the need to enable a "variety of homes" to meet the "needs... of different households" (as set out in Policy 1 of the NPSUD).	Amend 1.1.19(d) to read as follows: The National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 is focused on ensuring that New Zealand has well-functioning urban environments that enable all people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural wellbeing, and for their health and safety, now and into the future. It seeks to ensure that planning decisions <u>contribute to well functioning urban environments</u> , improve housing affordability and that integrated decision making occurs.		That the point of submission is rejected This repeats what is said earlier in the paragraph.
73.18	Oppose in Part	Strategic Policy Framework	1.1.35 - 1.1.37	The RVA supports the inclusion of the Waipā Growth Strategy as a relevant local direction, but it considers the description of the Strategy should be amended to refer to the key challenges facing the district which will have implications for how growth should be provided for and managed in the future, including "[a]n increasing and ageing population and how best to cater for this change". The RVA considers this challenge is particularly relevant in the context of the Enabling Housing Act.	Amend Sections 1.1.35-1.1.37 to refer to the need to consider the increasing and ageing population and how best to cater for this change as part of Waipā's growth strategy.		That the point of submission is rejected It is considered that PC26 adequately covers this.
73.19	Oppose	Strategic Policy Framework	1.2.17	Notes that PC26 does not propose to amend section 1.2.17, which address the design of new buildings to reflect the individual character towns and villages in the District. The RVA oppose section 1.2.17 as currently drafted as it does not appropriately capture the intent of the Enabling Housing Act or the NPSUD. 1.2.17 needs to recognise the diverse and changing needs of the District, and that the existing character and amenity of the towns and villages in the District will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.	Amend Section 1.2.17 to recognise that the diverse and changing needs of the District, and that the existing character and amenity of the towns and villages in the District will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.		That the point of submission is rejected PC26's approach to historic heritage is appropriate and consistent both with the objectives of the ODP and the new requirements of the RMA-EHS. No changes are recommended to 1.2.17.
73.20	Support	Strategic Policy Framework	1.3.2.2(b)	Supports Policy 1.3.2.2(b) as it aligns with Policy 2 of the MDRS.	Retain Policy 1.3.2.2(b) as notified.		Support noted.
73.21	Support in Part	Strategic Policy Framework	1.3.2.2	Supports the existing drafting of Policy 1.3.1.2(b) in the District Plan (referred to as Policy 1.3.2.2 in PC26) as it provides for "a range of accommodation facilities and services to support the long term accommodation and care requirements for the existing and future elderly population". However, the RVA considers that this policy must be amended to refer to the new residential zone: the Medium Density Residential Zone.	Amend Policy 1.3.1.2(b) as identified in the District Plan, to read: "A range of accommodation facilities and services to support the long term accommodation and care requirements for the existing and future elderly population, some of which may need to occur on the periphery of towns outside of the current urban limits as well as within the Residential Zone and Medium Density Residential Zone".		That the point of submission is accepted Amendment supported Amend Policy 1.3.1.2(c) to give effect to submission point 73.21.
73.22	Oppose	Strategic Policy Framework	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 District Growth Strategy as	Delete Policy 1.3.3.1.	FS8 – support in part	That the point of submission is rejected Regardless of changes to the Waikato RPS, the ODP will at all times need to be consistent with the RPS. The sentiment and intended meaning of the provision is to be flexible to existing and future directions at a regional and district level. No changes to 1.3.3.1 are recommended.

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Sub	Response
				these are not yet documents which have been produced.			
73.23	Support in Part	Strategic Policy Framework	1.3.3.2	Supports Policy 1.3.3.2 to the extent it reflects Policy 8 of the NPSUD.	Retain Policy 1.3.3.2 as notified.		Support noted.
73.24	Oppose in Part	Strategic Policy Framework	1.3.2.3	Opposes the current drafting of Policy 1.3.2.3 (Policy – Sequencing and Staging: accommodation for the ageing population) as it considers it limits the provision of this type of accommodation in a way which is not consistent with the NPSUD or Enabling Housing Act.	Delete Policy 1.3.2.3 and replace with the following policy: <u>To recognise and enable the housing and care needs of the ageing population, provide for a diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the particular needs and characteristics of older persons, such as retirement villages.</u>		That the point of submission is rejected The request would completely change the intent of the policy.
79.2	Amend	Strategic Policy Framework	Section 1	Amendments are sought to ensure that the strategic objectives and associated policies in PC26 to the District Plan align with the NPS-UD and the Housing Supply Act. Kāinga Ora supports the incorporation of those provisions required under Schedule 3A of the Housing Supply Act and the required identification of those matters within PC26 as required under S80H of the Housing Supply Act. This will assist plan users in understanding the requirements of the MDRS and implementation of PC26 through the plan change process.	Amendments are sought to ensure that the strategic objectives and associated policies in PC26 to the District Plan align with the NPS-UD and the Housing Supply Act.		Submission point noted. This is a general submission point and does not request specific relief. Where appropriate, specific submission points have been addressed in the relevant sections of this submission summary document.
79.61	Support	Strategic Policy Framework	Section 1 Strategic Policy Framework	Supports the amendments and recognition of the relationship between Maniapoto and the Waipā River.	Include the 'Waipā River Agreement (Maniapoto Deed)' Introduction subsection of Section 1 - Strategic Policy Framework as notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission.		Support noted.
79.62	Support	Strategic Policy Framework	Section 1 Strategic Policy Framework	Supports the amendments to the proposed provisions as they better clarify the role of Iwi Management Plans.	Include the 'Iwi Management Plans' Introduction subsection of Section 1 - Strategic Policy Framework as notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission.		Support noted.
79.63	Support	Strategic Policy Framework	Section 1 Strategic Policy Framework	Supports the reference to Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato.	Include the 'Strategic Outcomes' Introduction subsection of Section 1 - Strategic Policy Framework as notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission.		Support noted.
79.67	Oppose in part	Strategic Policy Framework	Policy 1.3.1.2	Requiring certain features to be both 'maintained and enhanced' implies both outcomes must be achieved at the same time, which depending on topography, shape and orientation of the site in relation to the Waikato and/or Waipā rivers, may not be achievable.	Amend Policy 1.3.1.2 as follows: To maintain and, <u>where appropriate, enhance</u> public views and public access by development actively facing and providing access to the Waikato and Waipā Rivers.		Amendment supported. Amend 1.3.1.2 to give effect to submission point 79.67.
79.68	Support in part	Strategic Policy Framework	Policy 1.3.2.2	Generally supports the overall incorporation of the Medium Density Residential standards into the District Plan and the proposed spatial extent of the rezoning that applies the Medium Density Residential Zone.	Include Policy 1.3.2.2 as notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission and amendments sought.		Support noted.
79.72	Support in part	Strategic Policy Framework	Policy 1.3.2.2	Seeks a high density residential zone should be incorporated into the District Plan and applied within a 400m walkable catchment of both Cambridge and Te Awamutu town centres of up to 6 storeys to give effect to Policy 3(d) of the NPS-UD.	Amend Policy-Towns 1.3.2.2 as follows: 1.3.2.2 To provide for a consolidated settlement pattern by ensuring that new urban activities are focused within the urban limits of the towns of the District and in particular: ... <u>(c) To provide for high density residential development within a 400m walkable catchment of the town centres of Cambridge and Te Awamutu.</u>		That the point of submission is rejected An assessment of Policy 3(d) has been undertaken in this report and concluded that a high density residential zone is not required for PC26.
79.23	Support in part	Whole Plan Change	All	The Kāinga Ora submission relates to PC26 in its entirety.	Where proposed amendments to the District Plan are not included in this submission, those provisions are supported in part subject to the relief sought by the submitter in other points of submission.		Submission point noted. Specific submission points received from Kāinga Ora have been addressed and/or noted where appropriate and possible.

4.2 Climate Change (see s42a report - Topic 4.2 pgs 106 to 107)

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provision	Submission Summary	Decisions Requested	Further Submissions	Response
30.8	Oppose	Climate change	All	This plan change is an opportunity to give effect to national and regional climate change policy. This will assist in achieving 'well-functioning urban environments' as defined in Policy 1 of the NPS-UD.	Add new or amend objectives, policies, rules and standards around climate change and carbon emission reduction goals in the context of housing intensification.	FS4 – support in part FS5 – oppose in part FS6 – oppose in part	That the point of submission is accepted in part Provisions updated as per remainder of WRC submission.
30.10	Support in Part	Climate change	2A.3.7.1	Advises caution in relation to "maximising the potential for passive solar gain" given the likely effects of prolonged higher temperatures due to climate change.	Retain policy 2A.3.7.1 but amend (c) to read " maximising <u>considering</u> the potential for passive solar gain; and..." or words to similar effect.		Amendment supported
30.11	Support in Part	Climate change	15.3	Recommends including an objective and policy to ensure infrastructure is provided as part of subdivision and development in a way that is resilient to the impacts of climate change. This is consistent with the definition of well-functioning urban area under the NPS-UD.	Add an objective and policy to ensure that infrastructure is to be designed and constructed to be resilient to the likely current and future impacts of climate change.	FS4 - Support in part	That the point of submission is accepted in part This requirement is already embedded in Council design and development standards and is normal best practise.
30.12	Support	Climate change	15.4.2.27	Supports the requirement for the planting of street trees as they mitigate the heat island effect resulting from climate change.	Retain the requirement for planting of street trees in 15.4.2.27.		Support noted
30.15	Support in Part	Climate change	1.1.25	Recommends that this list also includes reference to policies and priorities that direct investment decisions to transform to a low carbon transport system that delivers emissions reductions and supports urban form that can facilitate this transition.	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.	FS8 - oppose	Amendment supported Noted that these changes came into effect after PC26 was advertised. A more comprehensive approach to climate change may be undertaken for the entire Plan at a later date. Amendment supported as follows: 1.1.25 The strategic objectives are supported by underlying objectives <u>and regional direction from the Waikato RPS</u> that inform decision-making in all areas. These are climate change and environmental sustainability – ensuring that transport plays its role in delivering an energy efficient, resilient, and low carbon sustainable future; and integrated land use and transport planning – ensuring that collaborative spatial-based approaches to decision-making continue to drive the best outcomes for Waikato's communities; <u>and low carbon transport system – investment decisions to transform to a low carbon transport system that support urban form that facilitates the transition.</u>
30.23	Oppose	Climate change	Section 16 - Transportation	Added intensification is likely to have an impact on the transport network. There are no amendments to Section 16 - "Transportation" to align integrated transport and emissions reduction policies with housing intensification and the objectives of PC26.	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.	FS4 – support in part FS8 - support	Amendment supported This is already embedded in Council design and development standards and is normal best practice. A more comprehensive approach to climate change may be undertaken for the entire Plan at a later date.

4.3 Papakainga And Marae (see 42a report - Topic 4.3 pgs 107 to 108)

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
41.18	Support	Papakāinga and Marae	21.1.2A.30	Supports assessment criteria (a), as this assessment criteria will assist the Plan to provide for RMA s6(e) Matters of National Importance.	That the assessment criteria 21.1.2A.30 (a) is retained.		Support noted

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
79.83	Oppose in part	Papakāinga and Marae	2.4.2 Activity Status Table 2.4.1.4 Activity Status Table	Papakāinga and Marae are currently discretionary activities in the zone and it is appropriate to enable a permitted activity level of development for Papakāinga housing on general title land, to align with permitted levels of development for residential activities and enable urban Papakāinga developments. This is enabled through cl 80E(1)(b)(ii) of the RMA.	Amend the activity status for Papakāinga in 2.4.2 <u>2.4.1.4</u> Activity Status Table to be permitted in line with residential activities and one primary dwelling and one secondary dwelling.		That the point of submission is rejected Currently papakāinga and marae are a Discretionary Activity in the Residential Zone. A separate plan change is proposed to address papakāinga development comprehensively throughout the entire Plan.
79.84	Oppose in part	Papakāinga and Marae	2.4.2 Activity Status Table 2.4.1.4 Activity Status Table	Marae development should be more enabling when in conjunction with papakāinga housing.	Amend marae to be 'Restricted Discretionary' instead of 'Discretionary' in 2.4.2 <u>2.4.1.4</u> Rule-Activity Status Table.		That the point of submission is rejected Currently papakāinga and marae are a Discretionary Activity in the Residential Zone. A separate plan change is proposed to address papakāinga development comprehensively throughout the entire Plan.
79.85	Oppose in part	Papakāinga and Marae	2.4.2 Activity Status Table	Papakāinga and Marae are currently discretionary activities in the zone and it is appropriate to enable a permitted activity level of development for Papakāinga housing on general title land, to align with permitted levels of development for residential activities and enable urban Papakāinga developments. This is enabled through cl 80E(1)(b)(ii) of the RMA.	Amend 2.4.2 Performance Standards, Rule-Activity Status Table, as follows: 2.4.1.1 Permitted activities (a) Residential Activities including Papakāinga (b) One principal dwelling and one secondary dwelling per site including Papakāinga.		That the point of submission is rejected Currently papakāinga and marae are a Discretionary Activity in the Residential Zone . A separate plan change is proposed to address papakāinga development comprehensively throughout the entire Plan.
79.86	Oppose in part	Papakāinga and Marae	2.4.2 Activity Status Table	Papakāinga and Marae are currently discretionary activities in the zone and it is appropriate to enable a permitted activity level of development for Papakāinga housing on general title land, to align with permitted levels of development for residential activities and enable urban Papakāinga developments. This is enabled through cl 80E(1)(b)(ii) of the RMA.	Amend 2.4.2 Performance Standards, Rule-Activity Status Table, as follows: 2.4.1.3 Restricted discretionary activities... (k) <u>Papakāinga that does not comply with the development and performance standards and/or where marae is associated with a Papakāinga development. Activities will require a resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity with discretion being restricted over:</u> <u>-the extent to which the scale, form, and appearance of the development is compatible with the planned urban form character of the neighbourhood.</u> <u>-The extent to which development delivers quality on-site amenity and occupant privacy that is appropriate for its scale.</u> <u>-The extent to which the development contributes to a safe and attractive public realm and streetscape.</u> <u>-The effects on three waters infrastructure, achieved by demonstrating that at the point of connection the infrastructure has the capacity to service the development.</u> <u>Additionally for where marae is associated with a Papakāinga development</u> <u>-The positive benefits the development has on cultural well-being, including the ability of tangata whenua to reconnect with traditional sites and areas.</u>		That the point of submission is rejected Currently papakāinga and marae are a Discretionary Activity in the Residential Zone. A separate plan change is proposed to address papakāinga development comprehensively throughout the entire Plan.
79.87	Oppose in part	Papakāinga and Marae	2.4.2 Activity Status Table	Papakāinga and Marae are currently discretionary activities in the zone and it is appropriate to enable a permitted activity level of development for Papakāinga housing on general title land, to align with permitted levels of development for residential activities and enable urban Papakāinga developments. This is enabled through cl 80E(1)(b)(ii) of the RMA.	Amend 2.4.2 Performance Standards, Rule Activity Status Table as follows: 4.1 Discretionary activities (a) Any permitted, controlled or restricted discretionary activity that fails to comply with: (i) Rule 2.4.2.7 Dwellings adjoining marae.		That the point of submission is rejected Currently papakāinga and marae are a Discretionary Activity in the Residential Zone. A separate plan change is proposed to address papakāinga development comprehensively throughout the entire Plan.
79.148	Support in part	Papakāinga and Marae	All	It is appropriate to enable Papakāinga housing, to align with permitted levels of development for residential activities and enable urban Papakāinga developments i.e.: up to 3 Papakāinga will be a permitted activity and 4 or more Papakāinga will be a restricted discretionary activity.	It is appropriate to enable Papakāinga housing, to align with permitted levels of development for residential activities and enable urban Papakāinga developments i.e.: up to 3 Papakāinga will be a permitted activity and 4 or more Papakāinga will be a restricted discretionary activity.		That the point of submission is rejected Currently papakāinga and marae are a Discretionary Activity in the Residential Zone. A separate plan change is proposed to address papakāinga development comprehensively throughout the entire Plan.
79.149	Support in part	Papakāinga and Marae	2A.2.15	It is appropriate to enable Papakāinga housing, to align with permitted levels of development for residential activities and enable urban Papakāinga developments i.e.: up to 3 Papakāinga will be a permitted activity and 4 or more Papakāinga will be a restricted discretionary activity.	Amend 2A.2.15 as follows: In the future there may be increased demand for m Marae and Papakāinga developments are encouraged and enabled within Medium Density Residential Zones.		That the point of submission is rejected A separate plan change is proposed to address papakāinga development comprehensively throughout the entire Plan.

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
79.150	Support in part	Papakāinga and Marae	All	Kāinga Ora consider that provisions for Marae development should be more enabling when in conjunction with Papakāinga housing.	Kāinga Ora consider that provisions for Marae development should be more enabling when in conjunction with Papakāinga housing.		No specific relief sought
79.195	Support	Papakāinga and Marae	2A.3.4.20	Supports policy 2A.3.4.20 as notified.	Include Policy -Dwellings adjoining marae 2A.3.4.20 as notified, to the extent consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.		Support noted
79.201	Support	Papakāinga and Marae	2A.3.6.2	Kāinga Ora supports policy 2A.3.6.2 as notified.	Include policy 2A.3.6.2 as notified, to the extent consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.		Support noted
79.217	Oppose in part	Papakāinga and Marae	2A.4.1.1	It is appropriate to enable a permitted level of development for Papakāinga housing to align with permitted levels of development for residential activities.	Include Papakāinga of up to three dwellings per site as a permitted activity in 2A.4.1.1.		That the point of submission is rejected A separate plan change is proposed to address papakāinga development comprehensively throughout the entire Plan.
79.224	Oppose in part	Papakāinga and Marae	2A.4.1.3	It is appropriate to enable a permitted level of development for Papakāinga housing to align with permitted levels of development for residential activities, and provisions for Marae development should be more enabling when in conjunction with Papakāinga housing.	Amendment sought with marae associated with a Papakāinga development as follows: 2A.4.1.3 Restricted discretionary activities... ... (b) Four or more dwellings per site <u>and Papakāinga containing four or more dwellings and/or where marae is associated with a Papakāinga development outside of the Infrastructure Constraint Qualifying Matter Overlay.</u> ... Activities that fail to comply with this rule will require a resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity with discretion being restricted over: ... <u>Additionally, for where marae is associated with a Papakāinga development</u> - The positive benefits the development has on cultural well-being, including the ability of tangata whenua to reconnect with traditional sites and areas.		That the point of submission is accepted in part A separate plan change is proposed to address papakāinga development comprehensively throughout the entire Plan. This submission has raised the issue of referring to outside the Inf. Constraint QM Overlay as an error. 2A.4.1.3 should refer to four or more dwellings in all areas (within or outside in inf. constraint). The following changes are therefore recommended: Four or more dwellings per site outside of the Infrastructure Constraint Qualifying Matter Overlay.
79.233	Support in part	Papakāinga and Marae	2A.4.1.4	It is appropriate to enable a permitted level of development for Papakāinga housing to align with permitted levels of development for residential activities, and Papakāinga should be removed as a discretionary activity.	Delete reference to Papakāinga in 2A.4.1.4(c).		That the point of submission is rejected A separate plan change is proposed to address papakāinga development comprehensively throughout the entire Plan.

4.4 Retirement Villages (see 42a report - Topic 4.4 pgs 108 to 110)

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Sub	Response
70.1	Oppose	Retirement Villages	All	PC26 represents an opportunity to enable the provision of a diverse range of retirement housing and care options. Retirement villages will be restricted discretionary activities under the MDRS; accordingly the submitter considers PC26 must include a restricted discretionary activity rule for retirement villages in all relevant residential zones. The Enabling Housing Act requires Policy 3 of the NPSUD regarding intensification of urban environments to be implemented, and PC26 needs to enable intensification, including by specifically and appropriately providing for and enabling retirement villages in all relevant residential and commercial/mixed use zones.	Specifically and appropriately provide for and enable retirement villages in all relevant residential and commercial/mixed use zones by providing for a retirement village-specific objective, policy and rule framework.		That the point of submission is rejected PC26 provides for retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity (rule 2A.4.1.3(e)) with matters of discretion and assessment criteria outlined. This is considered appropriate considering their potential scale and intensity (i.e., retirement villages will generally always be development beyond the scale anticipated by the MDRS, they are not considered to be consistent with the MDRS). PC26 has appropriately provided for retirement villages and associated care facilities and rest homes.
70.2	Oppose	Retirement Villages	All	Retirement villages are a residential activity as they provide permanent homes for the residents that live there. The residential nature of retirement villages is reflected in the definition in the National Planning Standards. The need to provide for 'age in place', the inappropriateness of traditional intensification models, and lack of appropriate sites for retirement villages, means that providing appropriate housing and care for older persons requires a planning framework that enables retirement villages in the Residential Zone and the Medium Density Residential Zone.	The construction of retirement villages (being four or more residential units on a site) can be regulated as a restricted discretionary activity.		That the point of submission is rejected PC26 provides for retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity (rule 2A.4.1.3(e)) with matters of discretion and assessment criteria outlined. This is considered appropriate considering their potential scale and intensity (i.e., retirement villages will generally always be development beyond the scale anticipated by the MDRS, they are not considered to be consistent with the MDRS). PC26 has appropriately provided for retirement villages and associated care facilities and rest homes.

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Sub	Response
70.3	Oppose	Retirement Villages	All	Although the MDRS generally capture retirement villages under the umbrella of residential activities, the framework fails to recognise the unique operational, functional and locational features of retirement villages. Specific provision is therefore necessary to enable much needed retirement housing and care.	PC26 needs to provide for change to existing urban environments in order to achieve the intensification envisaged in Policy 3 of the NPSUD. This provision for change should explicitly acknowledge that the functional and operational needs of retirement villages are a driver of appropriate and necessary change because of demographic ageing and the increasing housing needs of older people.		Submission noted
70.4	Oppose	Retirement Villages	All	Seeks that PC26 be amended to provide a retirement-village specific framework. The MDRS must be translated into the District Plan without amendment or other provisions that dilute, conflict or overlap with the MDRS.	Seeks that PC26 be amended to provide a retirement-village specific framework.		That the point of submission is rejected PC26 continues to provide for comprehensive development of sites, listing retirement villages specifically, as a restricted discretionary activity. This is considered appropriate considering their potential scale and intensity.
70.6	Oppose	Retirement Villages	All	The rapidly ageing population is a resource management issue and the objectives and policies of the Plan must enable appropriate accommodation and care for the ageing population.	Seeks an objective to provide for the housing and care needs of the population, a policy that recognises the need for change over time to the existing character and amenity of neighbourhoods to provide for the diverse and changing needs of the community; a policy that recognises the need to provide for a range of housing and care options for older people and to recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages; a policy to enable the efficient use of larger sites; and a policy that directs that density standards are to be used as a baseline for the assessment of effects of development.		No specific relief sought Addressed specifically in other submission points.
70.7	Support in Part	Retirement Villages	2A.3.6.5	PC26 proposes to include a specific retirement village policy in the MRZ to enable the development of this type of accommodation to meet the needs of an ageing population (Policy 2A.3.6.5) (as well as including retirement village-specific rules). The submitter generally supports the PC26's policy support for the provision of retirement villages. However, the submitter considers that the Policy must be amended to recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages	Policy 2A.3.6.5 be amended to recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages. 2A.3.6.5 To enable a <u>diverse range of housing and care options, including</u> the development of retirement villages accommodation and associated care facilities and rest homes, to meet the <u>particular needs and characteristics</u> of an ageing population providing that the development is comprehensively designed and developed. <u>To recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, including that they:</u> <u>a. May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services.</u> <u>b. Have a unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.</u>		That the point of submission is rejected PC26 proposes to carry over the existing Residential Zone provisions for retirement villages into the MDRZ. This includes the policy framework (at 2A.3.6.5 and 2.A.3.7.1) which provides for retirement villages to meet the needs of an aging population and a focus on comprehensive design and development respectively.
70.8	Oppose	Retirement Villages	2A.4.1	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.	Provide for retirement villages in the MDRZ with a rule that permits the use and operation of retirement villages, recognising that this 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.		That the point of submission is rejected It would be confusing if the activity status of retirement villages in the MDRS and construction of buildings for them were to have different activity statuses.
70.9	Oppose	Retirement Villages	2A.4.1	Opposes the default to full discretionary activity status where the retirement village does not comply with the restricted discretionary standards and terms as that activity status is inconsistent with the MDRS and the effects of retirement villages can be appropriately managed through bespoke matters of discretion.	Opposes discretionary activity status where the retirement village does not comply with the restricted discretionary standards and terms.		That the point of submission is rejected This is a standard progression for activity status.

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Sub	Response
70.10	Oppose	Retirement Villages	All	Retirement villages are different to typical residential dwellings, and therefore do not necessarily fit with the typical controls imposed on residential developments. It is therefore critical to provide a tailored and fit for purpose retirement village matters of discretion.	Provide a tailored and fit for purpose retirement village matters of discretion, as follows: - Recognise the positive effects of retirement villages; - Focus effects assessments on exceedances of relevant standards, effects on the safety of adjacent streets or public open spaces, and effects arising from the quality of the interface between the village and adjacent streets or public open spaces to reflect the policy framework within the Enabling Housing Act. A degree of control over longer buildings is also acknowledged as appropriate; and - Enable the need to provide for efficient use of larger sites and the functional and operational needs of retirement villages to be taken into account when assessing effects.		That the point of submission is rejected PC26 provides for retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity (rule 2A.4.1.3(e)) with matters of discretion and assessment criteria outlined. This is considered appropriate considering their potential scale and intensity (i.e., retirement villages will generally always be development beyond the scale anticipated by the MDRS, they are not considered to be consistent with the MDRS). PC26 has appropriately provided for retirement villages and associated care facilities and rest homes.
70.11	Oppose	Retirement Villages	2A.4.1.3, 2.4.1.3	Opposes the matters for discretion that apply to retirement villages as well as information requirements as they are not sufficiently focused on the effects of retirement villages that should be regulated in line with the MDRS, and do not allow for the positive effects, the functional and operational needs and the need to provide for the efficient use of large sites.	Opposes the matters for discretion and information requirements that apply to retirement villages.		That the point of submission is rejected PC26 provides for retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity (rule 2A.4.1.3(e)) with matters of discretion and assessment criteria outlined. This is considered appropriate considering their potential scale and intensity (i.e., retirement villages will generally always be development beyond the scale anticipated by the MDRS, they are not considered to be consistent with the MDRS). PC26 has appropriately provided for retirement villages and associated care facilities and rest homes. Requests to amend and add new retirement village provisions in zones other than the MDRZ are considered beyond the scope of PC26.
70.12	Oppose	Retirement Villages	2A.4.1A, 2.4.2	Consistent with the direction of the Enabling Housing Act relating to four or more residential units, applications for retirement villages in the relevant residential zones should not be publicly notified based on density effects.	Supports appropriately focused notification rules, and considers that proposals for the construction of retirement villages should also be precluded from public and limited notification.		That the point of submission is rejected PC26 provides for retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity (rule 2A.4.1.3(e)) with matters of discretion and assessment criteria outlined. This is considered appropriate considering their potential scale and intensity (i.e., retirement villages will generally always be development beyond the scale anticipated by the MDRS, they are not considered to be consistent with the MDRS). PC26 has appropriately provided for retirement villages and associated care facilities and rest homes. Requests to amend and add new retirement village provisions in zones other than the MDRZ are considered beyond the scope of PC26.
70.13	Oppose	Retirement Villages	2A.4.2, 2.4.2	Development standards for retirement villages should reflect the MDRS, except where amendments are necessary to reflect the particular characteristics of retirement villages. No additional development standards should apply.	Seeks amendments to development standards to reflect the MDRS except where amendments are necessary to reflect the particular characteristics of retirement villages and seeks the removal of standards that go beyond the scope of the MDRS for consistency with the Enabling Housing Act.		That the point of submission is rejected Requests to amend and add new retirement village provisions in zones other than the MDRZ are considered beyond the scope of PC26.
70.14	Oppose	Retirement Villages		In order to give effect to Policy 3 of the NPSUD, PC26 must provide for intensification in commercial zones.	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.		That the point of submission is rejected PC26 may provide for intensification in commercial zones. Requests to amend and add new retirement village provisions in zones other than the MDRZ are considered beyond the scope of PC26.
70.15	Oppose	Retirement Villages	Part B - Definitions	The definition of 'retirement village accommodation and associated care facilities' contained in the District Plan is inconsistent with the National Planning Standards.	Seeks the definition in the Proposed Plan be amended to comply with the National Planning Standards as follows: <u>Retirement village means a managed comprehensive residential complex or facilities used to provide residential accommodation for people who are retired and any spouses or partners of such people. It may also include any of the</u>		That the point of submission is rejected The Waipa Plan is yet to be aligned with the National Planning Standards. Requests to amend and add new retirement village provisions in zones other than the MDRZ are considered beyond the scope of PC26.

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Sub	Response
					<u>following for residents within the complex: recreation, leisure, supported residential care, welfare and medical facilities (inclusive of hospital care) and other non-residential activities.</u>		
70.16	Support	Retirement Villages	Part B - Definitions	Seeks to include a new definition for 'retirement units' in the District Plan as this term has been sought to be included in multiple provisions within this submission. This definition acknowledges the differences from typical residential activities in terms of layout and amenity needs.	Seeks to include a new definition for 'retirement units' as follows: <u>Retirement Unit means any unit within a retirement village that is used or designed to be used for a residential activity (whether or not it includes cooking, bathing, and toilet facilities). A retirement unit is not a residential unit.</u>		That the point of submission is rejected Requests to amend and add new retirement village provisions in zones other than the MDRZ are considered beyond the scope of PC26.
70.31	Oppose	Retirement Villages	2.3.5.1	Opposes Policy 2.3.5.1 as it does not enable retirement villages or recognise their substantial benefits. It considers that the proposed policy below entitled 'provision of housing for an ageing population' better encompasses the diverse range of housing and care options provided at retirement villages and is preferred over Policy 2.3.5.1.	Delete reference to "retirement village accommodation and associated care facilities" (or replacement definition "retirement villages") in Policy 2.3.5.1.		That the point of submission is rejected Requests to amend and add new retirement village provisions in zones other than the MDRZ are considered beyond the scope of PC26.
70.36	Oppose	Retirement Villages	2.4.1.1	Opposes the restricted discretionary activity status of retirement villages in the Residential Zone. The submitter seeks that retirement villages are provided for as a permitted activity, with the construction of the retirement village being a restricted discretionary activity under a separate rule, recognising that retirement villages are residential activities that are appropriate in residential zones and provide substantial benefit in residential zones including enabling older people to remain in familiar community environments for longer (close to family and support networks), while also freeing up a number of dwellings for families to move into.	Amend 2.4.1.1 to provide for retirement villages as a permitted activity and integrate a new rule that provides for the construction of retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity, with a specific set of retirement village matters of discretion (Rule 2.4.1.3(e) below). 2.4.1 Activity status table 2.4.1.1 Permitted activities (x) Retirement Villages, excluding the construction of buildings - P ...		That the point of submission is rejected It would be confusing if the activity status of retirement villages in the MDRS and construction of buildings for them were to have different activity statuses. Requests to amend and add new retirement village provisions in zones other than the MDRZ are considered beyond the scope of PC26.
70.37	Oppose	Retirement Villages	2.4.1.3	Seeks that Rule 2.4.1.3(e) is amended to reflect the changes sought by the submitter in relation to Rule 2.4.1.1(x). This includes the removal of retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity in Rule 2.4.1.3(e) and the inclusion of a new rule that identifies the construction of retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity. The submitter considers that the construction of retirement villages should have focused matters of discretion (so to provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities). The submitter opposes the current matters of discretion as they are broad and not sufficiently focused on the effects of retirement villages. The submitter considers the matters of discretion applicable to retirement villages need to appropriately provide for / support the efficient use of larger sites for retirement villages, and the functional and operational needs of retirement villages. This will require the deletion of the matters of discretion associated with Rule 2.4.1.3(e) and its replacement with a specific set of assessment matters.	Delete Rule 2.4.1.3(e) as notified and replace with: 2.4.1.3 Restricted discretionary activities The following activities shall comply with the performance standards of this zone <u>e. Construction of buildings for a Retirement Village</u> - RD <u>Assessment will be restricted to the following matters:</u> <u>1. The effects arising from exceeding any of the following standards: 2.4.2.1 – 2.4.2.2 (Building Setback), 2.4.2.9 (Maximum height), 2.4.2.12 (Maximum site coverage), and where relevant, 2.4.2.8 (Maximum building length) and 2.4.2.19 (Outdoor living area).</u> <u>2. The effects of the retirement village on the safety of adjacent streets or public open spaces.</u> <u>3. The effects arising from the quality of the interface between the retirement village and adjacent streets or public open spaces.</u> <u>4. The extent to which articulation, modulation and materiality addresses adverse visual dominance effects associated with building length.</u> <u>5. When assessing the matters in (1), (2), (3) and (4), consider a. The need to provide for efficient use of larger sites. b. The functional and operational needs of the retirement village.</u> <u>6. The positive effects of the construction, development and use of the Retirement Village.</u> <u>For clarity, no other rules or matters of discretion relating to the effects of density apply to buildings for a Retirement Village.</u> The submitter seeks consequential amendments to the assessment criteria in Section 21.		That the point of submission is rejected It would be confusing if the activity status of retirement villages in the MDRZ and construction of buildings for them were to have different activity statuses. Requests to amend and add new retirement village provisions in zones other than the MDRZ are considered beyond the scope of PC26.

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Sub	Response
70.38	Oppose in part	Retirement Villages	2.4.1.4	The construction of retirement villages should be considered as restricted discretionary activity. The matters of discretion included in relation to Rule 2.4.1.3(e) above provide a complete set of assessment matters to manage all potential adverse effects on the environment and neighbouring sites that may arise from retirement village developments (including those that do not comply with height and site coverage standards). A default discretionary activity status for retirement villages that do not comply with particular standards is not considered necessary nor appropriate.	Amend Rule 2.4.1.4 Discretionary Activities so that it does not apply to retirement villages or the construction of retirement villages.		That the point of submission is rejected This is a standard progression for activity status. Requests to amend and add new retirement village provisions in zones other than the MDRZ are considered beyond the scope of PC26.
70.39	Support	Retirement Villages	New Provision	Proposals for the construction of retirement villages should also be precluded from being publicly notified and should be precluded from limited notification where relevant standards are complied with.	Seeks the insertion of the following Rule: 2.4.1A Public and Limited Notification The following rules apply to the matter of notification of resource consent applications required under this section of the district plan: <u>(a) An application for the construction of a retirement village will be considered without public notification.</u> <u>(b) An application for the construction of a retirement village that complies with standards 2.4.2.1 – 2.4.2.2 (Building Setback), 2.4.2.10 (Maximum height), 2.4.2.11 (Daylight control), 2.4.2.12 (Maximum site coverage) will be considered without public or limited notification.</u>		That the point of submission is rejected Requests to amend and add new retirement village provisions in zones other than the MDRZ are considered beyond the scope of PC26..
70.42	Support in Part	Retirement Villages	2A.1.2	Supports the recognition that the population is projected to increase due to "changing demographics (an ageing population and greater demand for single occupancy households)", but considers that reference should also be made to a greater demand for retirement and care options.	Amend Section 2A.1.2 to read: Over the lifetime of this Plan most of the new residential growth will be directed to Cambridge and Te Awamutu and by 2050 it is anticipated that these two towns will have nearly doubled in size. Development within the Medium Density Residential Zone is anticipated to be consistent with the Strategic Policy Framework and should uphold the objectives of Te Ture Whaimana. The projected increase in population is due to: (a) Changing demographics (an ageing population and greater demand for single occupancy households, <u>as well as retirement accommodation and care options</u>); and (b) ...		That the point of submission is rejected PC26 provides for retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity (rule 2A.4.1.3(e)) with matters of discretion and assessment criteria outlined. This is considered appropriate considering their potential scale and intensity (i.e., retirement villages will generally always be development beyond the scale anticipated by the MDRS, they are not considered to be consistent with the MDRS). PC26 has appropriately provided for retirement villages and associated care facilities and rest homes.
70.51	Support in Part	Retirement Villages	2A.2.13 - 2A.2.15	Supports the reference to an ageing population in the description of the changing housing demands issue. However, the submitter considers that amendment is required to explicitly acknowledge the need to provide for retirement village housing to support the ageing population.	Amend issue 2A.2.14 as follows: 2A.2.14 In order to meet the needs of an ageing population there is a need to provide a range of housing options and types, <u>including retirement villages</u> , with an appropriate range of facilities.		That the point of submission is rejected PC26 provides for retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity (rule 2A.4.1.3(e)) with matters of discretion and assessment criteria outlined. This is considered appropriate considering their potential scale and intensity (i.e., retirement villages will generally always be development beyond the scale anticipated by the MDRS, they are not considered to be consistent with the MDRS). PC26 has appropriately provided for retirement villages and associated care facilities and rest homes.
70.68	Oppose	Retirement Villages	2A.3.4.11	The policy does not provide for signs relating to the use of the site, e.g. a retirement village name.	Amend policy to provide for signs associated with a retirement village.		That the point of submission is rejected PC26 provides for retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity (rule 2A.4.1.3(e)) with matters of discretion and assessment criteria outlined. This is considered appropriate considering their potential scale and intensity (i.e., retirement villages will generally always be development beyond the scale anticipated by the MDRS, they are not considered to be consistent with the MDRS). PC26 has appropriately provided for retirement villages and associated care facilities and rest homes.
70.78	Support in Part	Retirement Villages	2A.3.6.5	Generally supports the policy as it provides policy support for retirement villages. Amendment is required as a consequence of the submitter's submission on the District Plan definitions, above. Amendment is also required to recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages.	Amend Policy 2A.3.6.5 as follows: 2A.3.6.5 To enable <u>a diverse range of housing and care options, including</u> the development of retirement villages <u>accommodation and associated care facilities</u> and rest homes, to meet the <u>particular needs and characteristics</u> of an ageing population		That the point of submission is rejected PC26 proposes to carry over the existing Residential Zone provisions for retirement villages into the MDRZ. This includes the policy framework (at 2A.3.6.5 and 2A.3.7.1) which provides for retirement villages to meet the needs of an aging population and a focus on comprehensive design and development respectively.

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Sub	Response
					<p>providing that the development is comprehensively designed and developed.</p> <p><u>To recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, including that they:</u></p> <p><u>a. May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services.</u></p> <p><u>b. Have a unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.</u></p>		
70.80	Oppose	Retirement Villages	2A.3.7.1	Opposes Policy 2A.3.7.1 in so far it applies to retirement villages as it conflicts with the MDRS (e.g. the requirement in (b) to avoid long continuous lengths of walls is inconsistent with the MDRS expectation of common walls) and seeks to manage matters not covered by the MDRS (e.g. the requirement in (c) to maximise the potential for passive solar gain). It also fails to appropriately recognise the unique features of retirement villages.	Amend Policy 2A.3.7.1 to delete any reference to "retirement village accommodation and associated care facilities".		<p>That the point of submission is rejected</p> <p>The need to comprehensively design retirement village accommodation is considered to be unchanged by the implementation of the MDRS. PC26 provides for retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity (rule 2A.4.1.3(e)) with matters of discretion and assessment criteria outlined. This is considered appropriate considering their potential scale and intensity (i.e., retirement villages will generally always be developed beyond the scale anticipated by the MDRS, they are not considered to be consistent with the MDRS). PC26 has appropriately provided for retirement villages and associated care facilities and rest homes.</p>
70.88	Oppose	Retirement Villages	2A.4.1.1	Opposes the restricted discretionary activity status of retirement villages in the Medium Density Residential Zone. Seeks that retirement villages are provided for as a permitted activity, with the construction of the retirement village being a restricted discretionary activity under a separate rule.	<p>Seeks to amend 2.4.1.1 to provide for retirement villages as a permitted activity and integrate a new rule that provides for the construction of retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity, with a specific set of retirement village matters of discretion (Rule 2A.4.1.3(e) below).</p> <p>2A.4.1 Activity status table 2A.4.1.1 Permitted activities <u>g. Retirement Villages, excluding the construction of buildings – P</u></p>		<p>That the point of submission is rejected.</p> <p>This is a standard progression for activity status.</p> <p>PC26 provides for retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity (rule 2A.4.1.3(e)) with matters of discretion and assessment criteria outlined. This is considered appropriate considering their potential scale and intensity (i.e., retirement villages will generally always be developed beyond the scale anticipated by the MDRS, they are not considered to be consistent with the MDRS). PC26 has appropriately provided for retirement villages and associated care facilities and rest homes.</p>
70.89	Oppose	Retirement Villages	2A.4.1.3	Seeks that Rule 2A.4.1.3(e) is amended to reflect the changes sought above in relation to Rule 2A.4.1.1(q). This includes the removal of retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity in 2A.4.1.3(e) and the inclusion of a new rule that identifies the construction of retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity. The construction of retirement villages should have focused matters of discretion (to provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities). The submitter opposes the current matters of discretion as they are overly broad and not sufficiently focused on the effects of retirement villages which should be regulated in line with the MDRS.	<p>Amend 2A.4.1.3(b) and delete 2A.4.1.3(c) to align with the relief sought by the submitter in relation to 2A.4.1.1(b) and (c). Delete 2A.4.1.3(e) and replace with:</p> <p>2A.4.1.3 Restricted discretionary activities <u>e. Construction of buildings for a Retirement Village –RD</u> <u>Assessment will be restricted to the following matters:</u></p> <p><u>1. The effects arising from exceeding any of the following standards: 2A.4.2.1 – 2A.4.2.5, 2A.4.2.7 – 2A.4.2.8, and where relevant, 2A.4.2.10 - 2A.4.2.21 & 2A.4.2.23 - 2A.4.2.24, 2A.4.2.31.</u></p> <p><u>2. The effects of the retirement village on the safety of adjacent streets or public open spaces.</u></p> <p><u>3. The extent to which articulation, modulation and materiality addresses adverse visual dominance effects associated with building length;</u></p> <p><u>4. The effects arising from the quality of the interface between the retirement village and adjacent streets or public open spaces.</u></p> <p><u>5. When assessing the matters in (1), (2), (3) and (4), consider:</u></p> <p><u>a. The need to provide for efficient use of larger sites.</u></p> <p><u>b. The functional and operational needs of the retirement village.</u></p> <p><u>6. The positive effects of the construction.</u></p>		<p>That the point of submission is rejected</p> <p>It would be confusing if the activity status of retirement villages and construction of buildings for them were to have different activity statuses.</p> <p>PC26 provides for retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity (rule 2A.4.1.3(e)) with matters of discretion and assessment criteria outlined. This is considered appropriate considering their potential scale and intensity (i.e., retirement villages will generally always be developed beyond the scale anticipated by the MDRS, they are not considered to be consistent with the MDRS). PC26 has appropriately provided for retirement villages and associated care facilities and rest homes.</p>

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Sub	Response
					<u>development and use of the Retirement Village.</u> <u>For clarity, no other rules or matters of discretion relating to the effects of density apply to the construction of buildings for a Retirement Village.</u>		
70.90	Oppose in Part	Retirement Villages	2A.4.1.4	Considers that retirement villages construction should be considered as restricted discretionary activity. The matters of discretion included in relation to Rule 2A.4.1.3(e) above provide a complete set of assessment matters to manage all potential adverse effects on the environment and neighbouring sites that may arise from retirement village developments. A default discretionary activity status for retirement villages that do not comply with particular standards is not considered necessary nor appropriate.	Amend Rule 2A.4.1.4 Discretionary Activities so that it does not apply to retirement villages or the construction of retirement villages.		That the point of submission is rejected This is a standard progression for activity status. PC26 provides for retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity (rule 2A.4.1.3(e)) with matters of discretion and assessment criteria outlined. This is considered appropriate considering their potential scale and intensity (i.e., retirement villages will generally always be developed beyond the scale anticipated by the MDRS, they are not considered to be consistent with the MDRS). PC26 has appropriately provided for retirement villages and associated care facilities and rest homes.
70.91	Oppose in Part	Retirement Villages	2A.4.1A	Supports Rule 2A.4.1A as it prevents proposals for certain residential activities from being processed as publicly notified and limited notified. The submitter considers that proposals for the construction of retirement villages should also be precluded from being publicly notified. In accordance with Schedule 3A (5)(2) of the Enabling Housing Act, the submitter also considers that a retirement village that is compliant with standards 2A.4.2.1 –2A.4.2.5 & 2A.4.2.7 – 2A.4.2.8 (Building Height, Height in relation to Boundary, Building Setbacks, and Building Coverage) should also be precluded from limited notification.	Seeks the following amendment to Rule 2A.4.1A: 2A.4.1A Public and Limited Notification The following rules apply to the matter of notification of resource consent applications required under this section of the district plan: (a) ... (b) ... <u>(c) An application for the construction of a retirement village will be considered without public notification.</u> <u>(d) An application for the construction of a retirement village that complies with standards 2A.4.2.1 –2A.4.2.5 and 2A.4.2.7 – 2A.4.2.8 will be considered without public or limited notification.</u>		That the point of submission is rejected PC26 provides for retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity (rule 2A.4.1.3(e)) with matters of discretion and assessment criteria outlined. This is considered appropriate considering their potential scale and intensity (i.e., retirement villages will generally always be developed beyond the scale anticipated by the MDRS, they are not considered to be consistent with the MDRS). PC26 has appropriately provided for retirement villages and associated care facilities and rest homes.
70.92	Support in Part	Retirement Villages	2A.4.2.1	Considers that the matters of discretion for a restricted discretionary activity under Rule 2A.4.2.1 are not appropriate for retirement villages. The submitter therefore seek to exclude retirement villages from these matters of discretion, with retirement village specific matters of discretion applying instead.	Seeks to amend Rule 2A.4.2.1 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).		That the point of submission is rejected PC26 provides for retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity (rule 2A.4.1.3(e)) with matters of discretion and assessment criteria outlined. This is considered appropriate considering their potential scale and intensity (i.e., retirement villages will generally always be developed beyond the scale anticipated by the MDRS, they are not considered to be consistent with the MDRS). PC26 has appropriately provided for retirement villages and associated care facilities and rest homes.
70.94	Support in Part	Retirement Villages	2A.4.2.3	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.	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).		That the point of submission is rejected PC26 provides for retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity (rule 2A.4.1.3(e)) with matters of discretion and assessment criteria outlined. This is considered appropriate considering their potential scale and intensity (i.e., retirement villages will generally always be developed beyond the scale anticipated by the MDRS, they are not considered to be consistent with the MDRS). PC26 has appropriately provided for retirement villages and associated care facilities and rest homes.
70.98	Support in Part	Retirement Villages	2A.4.2.7 and 2A.4.2.8	The submitter considers that the matters of discretion for a restricted discretionary activity under Rule 2A.4.2.8 are not appropriate for retirement villages. The submitter seeks that retirement village specific matters of discretion apply instead.	Amend Rules 2A.4.2.7 and 2A.4.2.8 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).		That the point of submission is rejected PC26 provides for retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity (rule 2A.4.1.3(e)) with matters of discretion and assessment criteria outlined. This is considered appropriate considering their potential scale and intensity (i.e., retirement villages will generally always be developed beyond the scale anticipated by the MDRS, they are not considered to be consistent with the MDRS). PC26 has appropriately provided for retirement villages and associated care facilities and rest homes.

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Sub	Response
70.100	Oppose in Part	Retirement Villages	2A.4.2.10 and 2A.4.2.11	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.	Seeks the addition of Rule 2A.4.2.11A to enable the communal outdoor living spaces of retirement villages to count towards the amenity standard. Outdoor Living Space <u>(a) 2A.4.2.11A For retirement units, clauses (a)-(e) of Rule 2A.4.2.10 and clauses (a)-(c) of Rule 2A.4.2.11 apply with the following modifications:</u> <u>(a) the outdoor living space may be in whole or in part grouped cumulatively in 1 or more communally accessible location(s) and/or located directly adjacent to each retirement unit; and</u> <u>(b) a retirement village may provide indoor living spaces in one or more communally accessible locations in lieu of up to 50% of the required outdoor living space.</u>		That the point of submission is rejected PC26 provides for retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity (rule 2A.4.1.3(e)) with matters of discretion and assessment criteria outlined. This is considered appropriate considering their potential scale and intensity (i.e., retirement villages will generally always be developed beyond the scale anticipated by the MDRS, they are not considered to be consistent with the MDRS). PC26 has appropriately provided for retirement villages and associated care facilities and rest homes.
70.101	Oppose in Part	Retirement Villages	2A.4.2.10 and 2A.4.2.11	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.	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 amendment requested by the submitter to Rule 2A.4.1.3(e) in another point of submission).		That the point of submission is rejected PC26 provides for retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity (rule 2A.4.1.3(e)) with matters of discretion and assessment criteria outlined. This is considered appropriate considering their potential scale and intensity (i.e., retirement villages will generally always be developed beyond the scale anticipated by the MDRS, they are not considered to be consistent with the MDRS). PC26 has appropriately provided for retirement villages and associated care facilities and rest homes.
70.102	Oppose in Part	Retirement Villages	2A.4.2.12 - 2A.4.2.20	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.	Seeks the addition of Rule 2A.4.2.20A to provide for outlook space requirements that are appropriate for retirement villages. Outlook Space (per dwelling) <u>2A.4.2.20A For retirement units, Rules 2A.4.2.12 – 2A.4.2.20 apply with the following modification: The minimum dimensions for a required outlook space are 1 metre in depth and 1 metre in width for a principal living room and all other habitable rooms.</u> The submitter 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).		That the point of submission is rejected PC26 provides for retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity (rule 2A.4.1.3(e)) with matters of discretion and assessment criteria outlined. This is considered appropriate considering their potential scale and intensity (i.e., retirement villages will generally always be development beyond the scale anticipated by the MDRS, they are not considered to be consistent with the MDRS). PC26 has appropriately provided for retirement villages and associated care facilities and rest homes
70.103	Oppose in Part	Retirement Villages	2A.4.2.20	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.	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 amendment requested by the submitter to Rule 2A.4.1.3(e) in another point of submission).		That the point of submission is rejected PC26 provides for retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity (rule 2A.4.1.3(e)) with matters of discretion and assessment criteria outlined. This is considered appropriate considering their potential scale and intensity (i.e., retirement villages will generally always be development beyond the scale anticipated by the MDRS, they are not considered to be consistent with the MDRS). PC26 has appropriately provided for retirement villages and associated care facilities and rest homes.
70.104	Oppose in Part	Retirement Villages	2A.4.2.21	Considers amendment to the rule is required to clarify that the standard also applies to retirement units. It should also only apply to public streets and not internal/private streets.	Amend Rule 2A.4.2.21 to provide for retirement units facing a public street. 2A.4.2.21 Any residential dwelling or retirement unit facing the public street must have a minimum of 20% of the street-facing façade in glazing. This can be in the form of windows or doors.		That the point of submission is rejected This request requires several consequential amendments throughout the plan.

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Sub	Response
70.105	Oppose in Part	Retirement Villages	2A.4.2.21	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.	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).		That the point of submission is rejected PC26 provides for retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity (rule 2A.4.1.3(e)) with matters of discretion and assessment criteria outlined. This is considered appropriate considering their potential scale and intensity (i.e., retirement villages will generally always be development beyond the scale anticipated by the MDRS, they are not considered to be consistent with the MDRS). PC26 has appropriately provided for retirement villages and associated care facilities and rest homes.
70.107	Oppose in Part	Retirement Villages	2A.4.2.23 - 2A.4.2.24	Supports Rule 2A.4.2.23 and 2A.4.2.24 and the landscape area provisions in principle. Considers amendment to these rules is required to clarify that the standards also apply to retirement units.	Amend Rule 2A.4.2.23 and 2A.4.2.24 to provide for retirement units. (b) 2A.4.2.23 A residential dwelling <u>or retirement unit</u> at ground floor level has a landscaped area of a minimum of 20% of a developed site with grass or plants, and can include the canopy of trees regardless of the ground treatment below them. (c) 2A.4.2.24 The landscaped area may be located on any part of the development site and does not need to be associated with each residential dwelling <u>or retirement unit</u> .		That the point of submission is rejected This request requires several consequential amendments throughout the plan.
70.108	Oppose in Part	Retirement Villages	2A.4.2.24	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.	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 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).		That the point of submission is rejected Other points that relate to this request have not been accepted.
70.110	Oppose in Part	Retirement Villages	2.5	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.	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).		That the point of submission is rejected Requests to amend and add new retirement village provisions in zones other than the MDRZ are considered beyond the scope of PC26.
70.112	Support	Retirement Villages	6.4	Opposes the non-complying activity status of retirement villages in the commercial zone and in line with the relief sought in the residential zones by the submitter in other points of submission, the submitter considers that the Commercial Zone should provide for retirement village activities as a permitted activity (with the construction of the retirement village being a restricted discretionary activity) recognising that retirement villages provide substantial benefits.	Amend Rule 6.4.1.1 to provide for retirement villages as a permitted activity and integrate a new rule that provides for the construction of retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity, with a specific set of retirement village matters of discretion (Rule 6.4.1.3(g)). <u>6.4.1 Activity status table</u> <u>6.4.1.1 Permitted activities</u> <u>ab. Retirement Villages, excluding the construction of buildings – P</u>		That the point of submission is rejected The requests by Ryman Healthcare and Retirement Villages Association of NZ to enable the development of retirement villages and aged care facilities within the Commercial Zone as a permitted or restricted discretionary activity are not supported, noting these activities are generally residential in nature, function, effects, and definition (except for aged care units). The Commercial Zone is primarily intended to provide for the retail, office and commercial service needs of the centre, along with residential in the mixed-use context (above ground-level).
70.113	Support	Retirement Villages	6.4.1.3	Considers that the construction of retirement villages should be a restricted discretionary activity under a specific retirement village rule, and that the construction of retirement villages should have their own set of focused matters of discretion (so to provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities).	Include a new rule in 6.4.1.3(g) as follows: 6.4.1.3 Restricted discretionary activities <u>g. Construction of buildings for a Retirement Village</u> = <u>RD Assessment will be restricted to the following matters:</u> <u>1. The effects arising from exceeding any of the following standards: 6.4.2.2 (Minimum building setback from internal site boundaries), 6.4.2.3 (Maximum height), 6.4.2.4 (Daylight control), and where relevant, 6.4.2.1, 6.4.2.8 – 6.4.2.9 & 6.4.2.10</u> = <u>6.4.2.13</u> <u>2. The effects of the retirement village on the safety</u>		That the point of submission is rejected Requests to amend and add new retirement village provisions in zones other than the MDRZ are considered beyond the scope of PC26.

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Sub	Response
					<p><u>of adjacent streets or public open spaces.</u></p> <p><u>3. The effects arising from the quality of the interface between the retirement village and adjacent streets or public open spaces.</u></p> <p><u>4. When assessing the matters in (1), (2) and (3), consider:</u></p> <p><u>a. The need to provide for efficient use of larger sites.</u></p> <p><u>b. The functional and operational needs of the retirement village.</u></p> <p><u>5. The positive effects of the construction, development and use of the Retirement Village.</u></p> <p><u>For clarity, no other rules or matters of discretion relating to the effects of density apply to buildings for a Retirement Village.</u></p>		
70.114	Oppose in Part	Retirement Villages	6.4.1.5(d)	For retirement villages that do not comply with specified standards, the submitter does not consider that a discretionary activity status is appropriate for retirement villages within the Commercial Zones. This activity status departs from the Enabling Housing Act which has the purpose of enabling accommodation activities. The submitter considers that any infringements to the MDRS can be adequately managed via the assessment matters that apply to each of the standards, as well as the specific assessment matters for retirement villages. A default to a full discretionary status is therefore inconsistent with the MDRS and not appropriate.	Seeks to amend Rule 6.4.1.5 is amended as follows: 6.4.1.5 Discretionary activities The following are Discretionary Activities: ... <u>This rule does not apply to the construction of retirement villages</u>		That the point of submission is rejected Requests to amend and add new retirement village provisions in zones other than the MDRZ are considered beyond the scope of PC26.
70.115	Support	Retirement Villages	New Provision	Considers that proposals for the construction of retirement villages within the Commercial Zone should be precluded from being publicly notified. In accordance with Schedule 3A (5)(2) of the Enabling Housing Act, the submitter also considers that a retirement village that is compliant with standards 6.4.2.2 (Minimum building setback from internal site boundaries), 6.4.2.3 (Maximum height), 6.4.2.4 (Daylight control), should also be precluded from limited notification.	Seeks the insertion of a new Rule in Section 6 as follows: 6.4.1A Public and Limited Notification The following rules apply to the matter of notification of resource consent applications required under this section of the district plan: <u>(a) An application for the construction of a retirement village will be considered without public notification.</u> <u>(b) An application for the construction of a retirement village that complies with standards 6.4.2.2, 6.4.2.3, 6.4.2.4 will be considered without public or limited notification.</u>		That the point of submission is rejected Requests to amend and add new retirement village provisions in zones other than the MDRZ are considered beyond the scope of PC26.
70.117	Oppose	Retirement Villages	21.1.2.4	Opposes the list of assessment criteria for retirement villages as they do not align with the matters of discretion sought for the construction of retirement villages in respect of Rule 2.4.1.3(e) in other points of submission made by the submitter.	Delete the assessment criteria for retirement villages or amend to reflect the matters of discretion.		That the point of submission is rejected This section has been deleted.
70.118	Oppose in Part	Retirement Villages	21.1.2.5	Seeks that these additional provisions in 21.1.2.5 do not apply to retirement villages.	Amend assessment criteria 21.1.2.5 to clarify that it does not apply to retirement villages or the construction of retirement villages.		That the point of submission is rejected This section relates to character clusters, which if a retirement village was located in would apply.
70.119	Oppose	Retirement Villages	21.1.2A.3	Opposes the list of assessment criteria for retirement villages as they are overly extensive, seek to manage matters not relevant under the MDRS and do not align with the matters of discretion sought for the construction of retirement villages in respect of Rule 2A.4.1.3(e) in other points of submission made by the submitter.	Delete the assessment criteria for retirement villages or amend to reflect the matters of discretion.		That the point of submission is rejected PC26 provides for retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity (rule 2A.4.1.3(e)) with matters of discretion and assessment criteria outlined. This is considered appropriate considering their potential scale and intensity (i.e., retirement villages will generally always be development beyond the scale anticipated by the MDRS, they are not considered to be consistent with the MDRS). PC26 has appropriately provided for retirement villages and associated care facilities and rest homes.
70.120	Oppose in Part	Retirement Villages	21.1.2A.4	Seeks that these additional provisions in 21.1.2A.4 do not apply to retirement villages.	Amend assessment criteria 21.1.2A.4 to clarify that this assessment criteria does not apply to retirement villages or the construction of retirement villages.		That the point of submission is rejected This section has been deleted.

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Sub	Response
70.121	Oppose in Part	Retirement Villages	21.1.2A.5-32	Opposes the list of assessment criteria that apply to breaches of standards as they do not align with the matters of discretion sought for the construction of retirement villages in respect of Rule 2A.4.1.3(e) in other points of submission made by the submitter.	Amend assessment criteria 21.1.2A.5-32 to clarify that they do not apply to retirement villages or the construction of retirement villages.		That the point of submission is rejected These criteria may apply to retirement villages depending on the infringements of an application.
72.2	Oppose	Retirement Villages	Section 2	Seeks that provisions for the Residential Zone recognise the need for retirement villages and that existing residential character and amenity will change over time.	Seeks that provisions for the Residential Zone recognise the need for retirement villages and that existing residential character and amenity will change over time.		That the point of submission is rejected . Requests to amend and add new retirement village provisions in zones other than the MDRZ are considered beyond the scope of PC26.
72.3	Oppose	Retirement Villages	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.	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.	FS8 - support	That the point of submission is rejected PC26 provides for retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity (rule 2A.4.1.3(e)) with matters of discretion and assessment criteria outlined. This is considered appropriate considering their potential scale and intensity (i.e., retirement villages will generally always be development beyond the scale anticipated by the MDRS, they are not considered to be consistent with the MDRS). PC26 has appropriately provided for retirement villages and associated care facilities and rest homes.
72.5	Oppose	Retirement Villages	All	It is critical that the Plan Change adequately recognise development constraints and provide clear direction for the establishment of retirement villages in appropriate locations in the Waipā District by ensuring the objectives, policies and rules clearly recognise the functional and operation needs of this housing typology.	Seeks that the objectives, policies, rules and standards applicable to retirement village development recognise the social and health benefits of the activity and provide for the functional and operational needs of this type of development.		That the point of submission is rejected PC26 provides for retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity (rule 2A.4.1.3(e)) with matters of discretion and assessment criteria outlined. This is considered appropriate considering their potential scale and intensity (i.e., retirement villages will generally always be development beyond the scale anticipated by the MDRS, they are not considered to be consistent with the MDRS). PC26 has appropriately provided for retirement villages and associated care facilities and rest homes.
72.9	Support	Retirement Villages	2.2	The focus of the Residential Zone Provisions are on maintaining and enhancing existing elements of towns that given them their unique character. Metlifecare recognise this desire but consider the plan must reflect and adapt the changing needs of society, including the aging population	Provide the following, as a resource management issue (or words to similar effect): <u>Aging population</u> <u>New Zealand has an aging population and, as a result, greater consideration needs to be given to the health, welfare and housing needs of older people in the community. As New Zealand's population grows and ages, the continued supply of retirement village housing will be crucial to ensure that the elderly population have suitable housing that meets their needs. There is a need to recognise and provide for retirement village development and recognise that the existing character and amenity of the Residential zone will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.</u>		That the point of submission is rejected Requests to amend and add new retirement village provisions in zones other than the MDRZ are considered beyond the scope of PC26.
72.10	Support in Part	Retirement Villages	2.3.5.1	Seeks that Policy 2.3.5.1 also recognises the planned built form, and the operational and functional needs of retirement villages.	Amend 2A.3.5 as shown below (or words to similar effect): 2A.3.5 –Objective –On-site and neighbourhood amenity values <u>To enhance safety maintain and enhance and encourage high amenity values within and around dwellings and sites in the Medium Density Residential Zone through the location, layout and design of dwellings and buildings, while recognising the functional and operational requirements of activities.</u>		That the point of submission is rejected This objective has been written for development of dwellings in the MDRZ and the submitter's changes are to slanted to cater for retirement villages.

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Sub	Response
72.11	Oppose	Retirement Villages	2.4.1.3	Generally supports the matters of discretion. However, it should be made clear which of the rules apply to retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity. The relevant rules have been set out in Metlifecare's proposed relief. They recognise that retirement village development is different from other types of residential development and therefore should not be required to comply with, or be assessed against, all of the rules as a restricted discretionary activity.	Amend 2.4.1.3 as shown below (or words to similar effect): <u>The following rules apply to retirement village development and associated care facilities and rest homes:</u> 2A.4.2.1 –Height (as amended below) 2A.2.4.2 –Height in relation to boundary 2A.4.2.4 –6 –Setbacks 2A.4.2.7 –8 –Building coverage(as amended below) 2A.4.2.9 –Impermeable surfaces 2A.4.2.23 –Landscaped area 2A.4.2.37 –Noise 2A.4.2.38 –Vibration 2A.4.2.39 –Construction noise 2A.4.2.40 –42 –Noise insulation: noise sensitive activities 2A.4.2.44 –Signs 2.A.4.2.48 –49 –Buildings and structures within the National Grid Yard 2A.4.2.50 –52 –Housing and keeping of animals Discretion will be restricted to the following matters: •Building location, bulk and design; and •Landscaping; and •Location of parking areas and vehicle manoeuvring; and •CPTED; and •Traffic generation and connectivity; and •The functional and operational needs of a retirement village; and •Benefits provided to residents from onsite communal facilities; and •Noise; and •Stormwater disposal. The matters will also be considered in accordance with the assessment criteria in Section 21.		That the point of submission is rejected PC26 provides for retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity (rule 2A.4.1.3(e)) with matters of discretion and assessment criteria outlined. This is considered appropriate considering their potential scale and intensity (i.e., retirement villages will generally always be development beyond the scale anticipated by the MDRS, they are not considered to be consistent with the MDRS). PC26 has appropriately provided for retirement villages and associated care facilities and rest homes.
72.12	Oppose	Retirement Villages	2.4.1.3	Generally supports the matters of discretion. However, it should be made clear which of the rules apply to retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity.	It should be clarified in 2.4.1.3 that retirement village development is a restricted discretionary activity regardless of any infrastructure or stormwater constraints which will be considered as part of the application.		That the point of submission is rejected Activities that fail to meet listed rules become Discretionary Activities (2.4.1.4).
72.13	Oppose	Retirement Villages	2.4.1.3	The relevant rules have been set out in the submitters relief sought (submission 72.11). They recognise that retirement village development is different from other types of residential development and therefore should not be required to comply with, or be assessed against, all of the rules as a restricted discretionary activity.	Opposes the individual rules in 2.4.1.3 that should not be applied to retirement village development.		That the point of submission is rejected Requests to amend and add new retirement village provisions in zones other than the MDRZ are considered beyond the scope of PC26.
72.14	Support	Retirement Villages	2.4.1.3	Retirement villages are provided for as a restricted discretionary activity. However, any restricted activity that does not comply with certain standards or one or more of the rules for a restricted discretionary activity is a discretionary activity. Metlifecare seeks more certainty on the assessment of retirement village applications that do not comply with the relevant rules. It is appropriate for retirement villages that do not comply with the relevant rules and standards to remain a restricted discretionary activity. The matters of discretion will then relate to the effects of not complying with the relevant rules and standards and any applicable policies.	Provide a new rule as follows (or words to similar effect): <u>Retirement village development and associated care facilities and rest homes are restricted discretionary activities that fail to comply with the following set out in 2.4.1.3(e) (as set out in Submission 72.11)</u> <u>Discretion will be restricted to the following matters:</u> <u>a. The extent and effect of non-compliance with the particular rule; and</u> <u>b. Policy 2.3.5.1.</u>		That the point of submission is rejected The requested change does not appear to improve the standards for assessing these applications.
72.21	Support	Retirement Villages	2A.3.6.5	Supports enabling the development of retirement village accommodation and associated care facilities and rest homes, to meet the needs of an ageing population providing that the development is comprehensively designed and developed.	Retain 2A.3.6.5 Policy-Retirement Village accommodation and associated care facilities and rest homes as notified.		Support noted

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Sub	Response
72.24	Oppose in Part	Retirement Villages	2A.4.1.3	Generally supports the matters of discretion in 2A.4.1.3. However, it should be made clear which of the rules apply to retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity. The relevant rules have been set out in Metlifecare's proposed relief. They recognise that retirement village development is different from other types of residential development and therefore should not be required to comply with, or be assessed against, all of the rules as a restricted discretionary activity. The matters of discretion should also recognise that retirement villages provide necessary accommodation and care for elderly people who have different housing and care needs compared to the rest of the population. Metlifecare otherwise opposes the individual rules that should not be applied to retirement village development.	Amend 2A.4.1.3 as shown (or words to similar effect): <u>The following rules apply to retirement village development and associated care facilities and rest homes: 2A.4.2.1 -Height 2A.4.2 -Height in relation to boundary 2A.4.2.4 -6 -Setbacks 2A.4.2.7 -8 -Building coverage 2A.4.2.9 -Impermeable surfaces 2A.4.2.23 -Landscaped area 2A.4.2.37 -Noise 2A.4.2.38 -Vibration 2A.4.2.39 -Construction noise 2A.4.2.40 -42 -Noise insulation: noise sensitive activities 2A.4.2.44 -Signs 2A.4.2.48 -49 -Buildings and structures within the National Grid Yard 2A.4.2.50 -52 -Housing and keeping of animals</u> Discretion will be restricted to the following matters: •Building location, bulk and design; and •Landscaping; and •Location of parking areas and vehicle manoeuvring; and •CPTED; and •Traffic generation and connectivity; and •The functional and operational needs of a retirement village; and •Benefits provided to residents from onsite communal facilities; and •Noise; and •Stormwater disposal. The matters will also be considered in accordance with the assessment criteria in Section 21.		That the point of submission is rejected PC26 provides for retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity (rule 2A.4.1.3(e)) with matters of discretion and assessment criteria outlined. This is considered appropriate considering their potential scale and intensity (i.e., retirement villages will generally always be development beyond the scale anticipated by the MDRS, they are not considered to be consistent with the MDRS). PC26 has appropriately provided for retirement villages and associated care facilities and rest homes.
72.25	Oppose in Part	Retirement Villages	2A.4.1.3	Generally supports the matters of discretion. However, it should be made clear which of the rules apply to retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity.	It should be clarified in 2A.4.1.3 that retirement village development is a restricted discretionary activity regardless of any infrastructure or stormwater constraints which will be considered as part of the application.		That the point of submission is rejected Activities that fail to meet listed rules become Discretionary Activities (2.4.1.4).
72.26	Support	Retirement Villages	2A.4.1.3	Seeks more certainty on the assessment of retirement village applications that do not comply with the relevant rules. It is appropriate for retirement villages that do not comply with the relevant rules and standards to remain a restricted discretionary activity. The matters of discretion will then relate to the effects of not complying with the relevant rules and standards and any applicable policies.	Provide a new rule as follows (or words to similar effect): <u>Retirement village development and associated care facilities and rest homes are restricted discretionary activities that fail to comply with the following set out in 2A.4.1.3(e) (as set out in Submissions 72.24 and 72.25).</u> <u>Discretion will be restricted to the following matters:</u> <u>c. The extent and effect of non-compliance with the particular rule; and</u> <u>d. Policy 2A.3.7.1.</u>		That the point of submission is rejected The requested change does not appear to improve the standards for assessing these applications.
72.28	Oppose	Retirement Villages	21.1.2.4	As stated in submission 72.29	Amend 21.1.2.4 Retirement village accommodation and associated care facilities and rest homes as set out in submission 72.29 and otherwise remove (o) as notified.		That the point of submission is rejected Avoidance or mitigation of natural hazards is considered a suitable matter of discretion.
72.29	Oppose	Retirement Villages	21.1.2A.3	The Council has sought to apply the current assessment criteria in section 21 of the District Plan to restricted discretionary activities in the new Residential - Medium Density zone. These should not provide a range of additional rules, they should require more detailed consideration of certain relevant matters that are relevant in light of the new planning framework. They have also been removed in relation to the Residential zone.	Amend 21.1.2A.3 as follows (or words to similar effect): Retirement village accommodation and associated care facilities and rest homes within or outside the compact housing overlay identified on the Planning Maps <u>(a) Building design including:</u> <u>(i) The extent to which solar potential and good solar aspect is optimized within the development; and</u> <u>(ii) Colours; and</u> <u>(iii) The materials to be used and how they are to be repeated within the development; and</u> <u>(iv) Detail of roof pitches; and</u> <u>(v) Details of doorways and the provision of shelter for visitors; and</u> <u>(vi) Windows, revetment, balconies and recesses; and</u> <u>(vii) Garaging to create visual continuity and cohesion and reflect a residential character; and (viii) Whether designs</u>		That the point of submission is rejected Urban design and layout of complex developments like retirement villages is considered a justified assessment criteria.

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Sub	Response
					<p>avoid monolithic walls in favour of designs that incorporate smaller scale building elements to promote feelings of interest and diversity.</p> <p>(b) Visually permeable fences and glazing of façades that provide for surveillance from the dwelling to the street and other public places such as walkways and reserves.</p> <p>(c) Integration with neighbouring residential development that is responsive to local residential character in terms of its façade treatment, including building proportions, detailing, materials and landscape treatment.</p> <p>(d) Outdoor living spaces for independent living units that are private and have good access to sunlight in midwinter and/or have access to a range of communal landscaped outdoor areas that are orientated such that they have good solar aspect.</p> <p>(e) The location of outdoor storage areas and rubbish and recycling compounds such that the appearance from the street is not adversely affected and on-site amenity, such as the provision of outdoor living spaces is not compromised.</p> <p>(f) The design of the road boundary setback:</p> <p>(i) Street definition – the extent to which units as opposed to garages orient and face the street creating a strong interface between the public and private domains. Designs need to avoid street frontages that are dominated by garages and outdoor storage areas; and</p> <p>(ii) Landscaping – the type and nature of the landscaping both within the front yard setback and throughout the development so that it contributes both to the neighbourhood and to on-site amenity; and</p> <p>(iii) Access way design – the width and proportion of the frontage as well as the landscaping and the materials to be used.</p> <p>(g) The provision of connections to public walkways/cycleways and the road network.</p> <p>(h) Open space character including on-site landscaping, retention of mature trees, and provision of shared driveways.</p> <p>(i) Adequate and safe vehicle access parking (excluding consideration of the number of parking spaces for cars) and the provision of safe vehicle entrances for pedestrians and vehicles, car parking and maneuvering and vehicle access to rubbish and recycling compounds, and access for emergency vehicles.</p> <p>(j) The provision of lighting for amenity and crime prevention without being a nuisance to residents.</p> <p>(k) The extent of effects on the surrounding road network including the function of intersections.</p> <p>(l) Aural privacy including the noise levels anticipated from on-site and adjacent land uses and the provision of acoustic treatment.</p> <p>(m) The adequacy of on-site stormwater disposal methods.</p> <p>(n) The adequacy of the servicing proposed for the development.</p> <p>(o) The extent to which the site is suitable for the development.</p> <p>(p) The benefits provided to residents from communal facilities being provided on site.</p>		
73.1	Oppose	Retirement Villages	All	PC26 represents an opportunity to enable the provision of a diverse range of retirement housing and care options. Retirement villages will be restricted discretionary activities under the MDRS; accordingly the submitter considers PC26 must include a restricted discretionary activity rule for retirement villages in all relevant residential zones. The Enabling Housing Act requires Policy 3 of the NPSUD regarding intensification of urban environments to be implemented, and PC26 needs to enable intensification, including by specifically and appropriately providing for and enabling retirement villages in all relevant residential and commercial/mixed use zones.	Specifically and appropriately provide for and enable retirement villages in all relevant residential and commercial/mixed use zones by providing for a retirement village-specific objective, policy and rule framework.		That the point of submission is rejected Requests to amend and add new retirement village provisions in zones other than the MDRZ are considered beyond the scope of PC26.
73.2	Oppose	Retirement Villages	All	Retirement villages are a residential activity as they provide permanent homes for the residents that live there. The residential nature of retirement villages is reflected in the definition in the National Planning Standards. The need to	The construction of retirement villages (being four or more residential units on a site) can be regulated as a restricted discretionary activity.		That the point of submission is rejected

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Sub	Response
				provide for 'age in place', the inappropriateness of traditional intensification models, and lack of appropriate sites for retirement villages, means that providing appropriate housing and care for older persons requires a planning framework that enables retirement villages in the Residential Zone and the Medium Density Residential Zone.			An escalation of activity status to discretionary when certain rules are infringed is considered to be standard and acceptable for complex applications such as retirement villages.
73.3	Oppose	Retirement Villages	All	Although the MDRS generally capture retirement villages under the umbrella of residential activities, the framework fails to recognise the unique operational, functional and locational features of retirement villages. Specific provision is therefore necessary to enable much needed retirement housing and care.	PC26 needs to provide for change to existing urban environments in order to achieve the intensification envisaged in Policy 3 of the NPSUD. This provision for change should explicitly acknowledge that the functional and operational needs of retirement villages are a driver of appropriate and necessary change because of demographic ageing and the increasing housing needs of older people.		That the point of submission is accepted in part Agree the MDRZ needs to provide for change. Changes to introduction of MDRZ (2A.1.1) recommended. (see 79.107)
73.4	Oppose	Retirement Villages	All	Seeks that PC26 be amended to provide a retirement-village specific framework. The MDRS must be translated into the District Plan without amendment or other provisions that dilute, conflict or overlap with the MDRS.	Seeks that PC26 be amended to provide a retirement-village specific framework.		That the point of submission is rejected PC26 provides for retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity (rule 2A.4.1.3(e)) with matters of discretion and assessment criteria outlined. This is considered appropriate considering their potential scale and intensity (i.e., retirement villages will generally always be development beyond the scale anticipated by the MDRS, they are not considered to be consistent with the MDRS). PC26 has appropriately provided for retirement villages and associated care facilities and rest homes.
73.6	Oppose	Retirement Villages	All	The rapidly ageing population is a resource management issue and the objectives and policies of the Plan must enable appropriate accommodation and care for the ageing population.	Seeks an objective to provide for the housing and care needs of the population, a policy that recognises the need for change over time to the existing character and amenity of neighbourhoods to provide for the diverse and changing needs of the community; a policy that recognises the need to provide for a range of housing and care options for older people and to recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages; a policy to enable the efficient use of larger sites; and a policy that directs that density standards are to be used as a baseline for the assessment of effects of development.		That the point of submission is rejected PC 26's purpose is to implement the MDRS. This request seeks a change not anticipated by the MDRS. PC26 provides for retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity (rule 2A.4.1.3(e)) with matters of discretion and assessment criteria outlined. This is considered appropriate considering their potential scale and intensity (i.e., retirement villages will generally always be development beyond the scale anticipated by the MDRS, they are not considered to be consistent with the MDRS). PC26 has appropriately provided for retirement villages and associated care facilities and rest homes.
73.7	Support in Part	Retirement Villages	2A.3.6.5	PC26 proposes to include a specific retirement village policy in the MRZ to enable the development of this type of accommodation to meet the needs of an ageing population (Policy 2A.3.6.5) (as well as including retirement village-specific rules). The RVA generally supports the PC26's policy support for the provision of retirement villages. However, the RVA considers that the Policy must be amended to recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages.	Policy 2A.3.6.5 be amended to recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages.		That the point of submission is rejected PC26 proposes to carry over the existing Residential Zone provisions for retirement villages into the MDRZ. This includes the policy framework (at 2A.3.6.5 and 2A.3.7.1) which provides for retirement villages to meet the needs of an aging population and a focus on comprehensive design and development respectively.
73.8	Oppose	Retirement Villages	2A.4.1	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.	Provide for retirement villages in the MDRZ with a rule that permits the use and operation of retirement villages, recognising that this 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.	FS8 – not stated	That the point of submission is rejected PC26 provides for retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity (rule 2A.4.1.3(e)) with matters of discretion and assessment criteria outlined. This is considered appropriate considering their potential scale and intensity (i.e., retirement villages will generally always be development beyond the scale anticipated by the MDRS, they are not considered to be consistent with the MDRS). PC26 has appropriately provided for retirement villages and associated care facilities and rest homes.
73.9	Oppose	Retirement Villages	2A.4.1	Opposes the default to full discretionary activity status where the retirement village does not comply with the restricted discretionary standards and terms as that activity status is inconsistent with the MDRS and the effects of retirement villages can be appropriately managed through bespoke matters of discretion.	Opposes discretionary activity status where the retirement village does not comply with the restricted discretionary standards and terms.		That the point of submission is rejected An escalation of activity status to discretionary when certain rules are infringed is considered to be standard and acceptable for complex applications such as retirement villages.
73.10	Oppose	Retirement Villages	All	Retirement villages are different to typical residential dwellings, and therefore do not necessarily fit with the typical controls imposed on residential developments. It is therefore critical to provide a tailored and fit for purpose retirement village matters of discretion.	Provide a tailored and fit for purpose retirement village matters of discretion, as follows: - Recognise the positive effects of retirement villages;		That the point of submission is rejected

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Sub	Response
					- Focus effects assessments on exceedances of relevant standards, effects on the safety of adjacent streets or public open spaces, and effects arising from the quality of the interface between the village and adjacent streets or public open spaces to reflect the policy framework within the Enabling Housing Act. A degree of control over longer buildings is also acknowledged as appropriate; and - Enable the need to provide for efficient use of larger sites and the functional and operational needs of retirement villages to be taken into account when assessing effects.		PC26 provides for retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity (rule 2A.4.1.3(e)) with matters of discretion and assessment criteria outlined. This is considered appropriate considering their potential scale and intensity (i.e., retirement villages will generally always be development beyond the scale anticipated by the MDRS, they are not considered to be consistent with the MDRS). PC26 has appropriately provided for retirement villages and associated care facilities and rest homes.
73.11	Oppose	Retirement Villages	2A.4.1.3, 2.4.1.3	Opposes the matters for discretion that apply to retirement villages as well as information requirements as they are not sufficiently focused on the effects of retirement villages that should be regulated in line with the MDRS, and do not allow for the positive effects, the functional and operational needs and the need to provide for the efficient use of large sites.	Opposes the matters for discretion and information requirements that apply to retirement villages.		That the point of submission is rejected PC26 provides for retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity (rule 2A.4.1.3(e)) with matters of discretion and assessment criteria outlined. This is considered appropriate considering their potential scale and intensity (i.e., retirement villages will generally always be development beyond the scale anticipated by the MDRS, they are not considered to be consistent with the MDRS). PC26 has appropriately provided for retirement villages and associated care facilities and rest homes.
73.12	Oppose	Retirement Villages	2A.4.1A, 2.4.2	Consistent with the direction of the Enabling Housing Act relating to four or more residential units, applications for retirement villages in the relevant residential zones should not be publicly notified based on density effects.	Supports appropriately focused notification rules, and considers that proposals for the construction of retirement villages should also be precluded from public and limited notification.		That the point of submission is rejected Consideration of notification for retirement village application is still considered relevant.
73.13	Oppose	Retirement Villages	2A.4.2, 2.4.2	Development standards for retirement villages should reflect the MDRS, except where amendments are necessary to reflect the particular characteristics of retirement villages. No additional development standards should apply.	Seeks amendments to development standards to reflect the MDRS except where amendments are necessary to reflect the particular characteristics of retirement villages and seeks the removal of standards that go beyond the scope of the MDRS for consistency with the Enabling Housing Act.		That the point of submission is rejected Development of retirement villages is generally beyond the development capacity enabled by the MDRS.
73.14	Oppose	Retirement Villages		In order to give effect to Policy 3 of the NPSUD, PC26 must provide for intensification in commercial zones.	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.	FS8 - oppose	That the point of submission is rejected It would be confusing if the activity status of retirement villages and construction of buildings for them were to have different activity statuses. Requests to amend and add new retirement village provisions in zones other than the MDRZ are considered beyond the scope of PC26.
73.15	Oppose	Retirement Villages	Part B - Definitions	The definition of 'retirement village accommodation and associated care facilities' contained in the District Plan is inconsistent with the National Planning Standards.	Seeks the definition in the Proposed Plan be amended to comply with the National Planning Standards as follows: <u>Retirement village means a managed comprehensive residential complex or facilities used to provide residential accommodation for people who are retired and any spouses or partners of such people. It may also include any of the following for residents within the complex: recreation, leisure, supported residential care, welfare and medical facilities (inclusive of hospital care) and other non-residential activities.</u>		That the point of submission is rejected The Waipa Plan is yet to be aligned with the National Planning Standards
73.16	Support	Retirement Villages	Part B - Definitions	Seeks to include a new definition for 'retirement units' in the District Plan as this term has been sought to be included in multiple provisions within this submission. This definition acknowledges the differences from typical residential activities in terms of layout and amenity needs.	Seeks to include a new definition for 'retirement units' as follows: <u>Retirement Unit means any unit within a retirement village that is used or designed to be used for a residential activity (whether or not it includes cooking, bathing, and toilet facilities). A retirement unit is not a residential unit.</u>		That the point of submission is rejected This definition addition may have implications throughout the Plan.

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Sub	Response
73.31	Oppose	Retirement Villages	2.3.5.1	Opposes Policy 2.3.5.1 as it does not enable retirement villages or recognise their substantial benefits. It considers that the proposed policy below entitled 'provision of housing for an aging population' better encompasses the diverse range of housing and care options provided at retirement villages and is preferred over Policy 2.3.5.1.	Delete reference to "retirement village accommodation and associated care facilities" (or replacement definition "retirement villages") in Policy 2.3.5.1.		That the point of submission is rejected Requests to amend and add new retirement village provisions in zones other than the MDRZ are considered beyond the scope of PC26.
73.36	Oppose	Retirement Villages	2.4.1.1	Opposes the restricted discretionary activity status of retirement villages in the Residential Zone. The submitter seeks that retirement villages are provided for as a permitted activity, with the construction of the retirement village being a restricted discretionary activity under a separate rule, recognising that retirement villages are residential activities that are appropriate in residential zones and provide substantial benefit in residential zones including enabling older people to remain in familiar community environments for longer (close to family and support networks), while also freeing up a number of dwellings for families to move into.	Amend 2.4.1.1 to provide for retirement villages as a permitted activity and integrate a new rule that provides for the construction of retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity, with a specific set of retirement village matters of discretion (Rule 2.4.1.3(e) below). 2.4.1 Activity status table 2.4.1.1 Permitted activities (x) Retirement Villages, excluding the construction of buildings - P ...	FS4 - oppose	That the point of submission is rejected It would be confusing if the activity status of retirement villages and construction of buildings for them were to have different activity statuses. Requests to amend and add new retirement village provisions in zones other than the MDRZ are considered beyond the scope of PC26.
73.37	Oppose	Retirement Villages	2.4.1.3	Seeks that Rule 2.4.1.3(e) is amended to reflect the changes sought by the submitter in relation to Rule 2.4.1.1(x). This includes the removal of retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity in Rule 2.4.1.3(e) and the inclusion of a new rule that identifies the construction of retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity. The submitter considers that the construction of retirement villages should have focused matters of discretion (so to provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities). The submitter opposes the current matters of discretion as they are broad and not sufficiently focused on the effects of retirement villages. The submitter considers the matters of discretion applicable to retirement villages need to appropriately provide for / support the efficient use of larger sites for retirement villages, and the functional and operational needs of retirement villages. This will require the deletion of the matters of discretion associated with Rule 2.4.1.3(e) and its replacement with a specific set of assessment matters.	Delete Rule 2.4.1.3(e) as notified and replace with: 2.4.1.3 Restricted discretionary activities The following activities shall comply with the performance standards of this zone e. Construction of buildings for a Retirement Village – RD <u>Assessment will be restricted to the following matters:</u> 1. The effects arising from exceeding any of the following standards: 2.4.2.1 – 2.4.2.2 (Building Setback), 2.4.2.9 (Maximum height), 2.4.2.12 (Maximum site coverage), and where relevant, 2.4.2.8 (Maximum building length) and 2.4.2.19 (Outdoor living area). 2. The effects of the retirement village on the safety of adjacent streets or public open spaces. 3. The effects arising from the quality of the interface between the retirement village and adjacent streets or public open spaces. 4. The extent to which articulation, modulation and materiality addresses adverse visual dominance effects associated with building length. 5. When assessing the matters in (1), (2), (3) and (4), consider a. The need to provide for efficient use of larger sites. b. The functional and operational needs of the retirement village. 6. The positive effects of the construction, development and use of the Retirement Village. <u>For clarity, no other rules or matters of discretion relating to the effects of density apply to buildings for a Retirement Village.</u> The RVA seeks consequential amendments to the assessment criteria in Section 21.		That the point of submission is rejected Requests to amend and add new retirement village provisions in zones other than the MDRZ are considered beyond the scope of PC26.
73.38	Oppose in part	Retirement Villages	2.4.1.4	The construction of retirement villages should be considered as restricted discretionary activity. The matters of discretion included in relation to Rule 2.4.1.3(e) above provide a complete set of assessment matters to manage all potential adverse effects on the environment and neighbouring sites that may arise from retirement village developments (including those that do not comply with height and site coverage standards). A default discretionary activity status for retirement villages that do not comply with particular standards is not considered necessary nor appropriate.	Amend Rule 2.4.1.4 Discretionary Activities so that it does not apply to retirement villages or the construction of retirement villages.		That the point of submission is rejected An escalation of activity status to discretionary when certain rules are infringed is considered to be standard and acceptable for complex applications such as retirement villages.
73.39	Support	Retirement Villages	New Provision	Proposals for the construction of retirement villages should also be precluded from being publicly notified and should be precluded from limited notification where relevant standards are complied with.	Seeks the insertion of the following Rule: 2.4.1A Public and Limited Notification The following rules apply to the matter of notification of resource consent applications required under this section of the district plan: (a) An application for the construction of a retirement village will be considered without public notification.		That the point of submission is rejected Public notification of retirement villages is considered an appropriate in certain circumstances considering their potential scale and intensity.

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Sub	Response
					(b) An application for the construction of a retirement village that complies with standards 2.4.2.1 – 2.4.2.2 (Building Setback), 2.4.2.10 (Maximum height), 2.4.2.11 (Daylight control), 2.4.2.12 (Maximum site coverage) will be considered without public or limited notification.		
73.42	Support in Part	Retirement Villages	2A.1.2	Supports the recognition that the population is projected to increase due to “changing demographics (an ageing population and greater demand for single occupancy households)”, but considers that reference should also be made to a greater demand for retirement and care options.	Amend Section 2A.1.2 to read: Over the lifetime of this Plan most of the new residential growth will be directed to Cambridge and Te Awamutu and by 2050 it is anticipated that these two towns will have nearly doubled in size. Development within the Medium Density Residential Zone is anticipated to be consistent with the Strategic Policy Framework and should uphold the objectives of Te Ture Whaimana. The projected increase in population is due to: (a) Changing demographics (an ageing population and greater demand for single occupancy households, <u>as well as retirement accommodation and care options</u>); and (b) ...		That the point of submission is rejected The request does not appear to add value to the section.
73.51	Support in Part	Retirement Villages	2A.2.13 - 2A.2.15	Supports the reference to an ageing population in the description of the changing housing demands issue. However, the submitter considers that amendment is required to explicitly acknowledge the need to provide for retirement village housing to support the ageing population.	Amend issue 2A.2.14 as follows: 2A.2.14 In order to meet the needs of an ageing population there is a need to provide a range of housing options and types, <u>including retirement villages, with an appropriate range of facilities.</u>		That the point of submission is rejected The request does not appear to add value to the section.
73.68	Oppose	Retirement Villages	2A.3.4.11	The policy does not provide for signs relating to the use of the site, e.g. a retirement village name.	Amend policy to provide for signs associated with a retirement village.		That the point of submission is rejected The focus of PC 26 is not the amendment of the signage provisions.
73.78	Support in Part	Retirement Villages	2A.3.6.5	Generally supports the policy as it provides policy support for retirement villages. Amendment is required as a consequence of the submitter's submission on the District Plan definitions, above. Amendment is also required to recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages.	Amend Policy 2A.3.6.5 as follows: 2A.3.6.5 To enable <u>a diverse range of housing and care options, including</u> the development of retirement villages <u>accommodation and associated care facilities</u> and rest homes, to meet the <u>particular needs and characteristics</u> of an ageing population <u>providing that the development is comprehensively designed and developed.</u> <u>To recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, including that they:</u> <u>a. May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services.</u> <u>b. Have a unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.</u>		That the point of submission is rejected PC26 proposes to carry over the existing Residential Zone provisions for retirement villages into the MDRZ. This includes the policy framework (at 2A.3.6.5 and 2A.3.7.1) which provides for retirement villages to meet the needs of an aging population and a focus on comprehensive design and development respectively.
73.80	Oppose	Retirement Villages	2A.3.7.1	Opposes Policy 2A.3.7.1 in so far it applies to retirement villages as it conflicts with the MDRS (e.g. the requirement in (b) to avoid long continuous lengths of walls is inconsistent with the MDRS expectation of common walls) and seeks to manage matters not covered by the MDRS (e.g. the requirement in (c) to maximise the potential for passive solar gain). It also fails to appropriately recognise the unique features of retirement villages.	Amend Policy 2A.3.7.1 to delete any reference to “retirement village accommodation and associated care facilities”		That the point of submission is rejected This is considered a relevant consideration for retirement village applications.
73.88	Oppose	Retirement Villages	2A.4.1.1	Opposes the restricted discretionary activity status of retirement villages in the Medium Density Residential Zone. Seeks that retirement villages are provided for as a permitted activity, with the construction of the retirement village being a restricted discretionary activity under a separate rule.	Seeks to amend 2.4.1.1 to provide for retirement villages as a permitted activity and integrate a new rule that provides for the construction of retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity, with a specific set of retirement village matters of discretion (Rule 2A.4.1.3(e) below). 2A.4.1 Activity status table 2A.4.1.1 Permitted activities g. Retirement Villages, excluding the construction of	FS4 - oppose	That the point of submission is rejected This policy is considered relevant to retirement villages.

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Sub	Response
					buildings – P ...		
73.89	Oppose	Retirement Villages	2A.4.1.3	Seeks that Rule 2A.4.1.3(e) is amended to reflect the changes sought above in relation to Rule 2A.4.1.1(q). This includes the removal of retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity in 2A.4.1.3(e) and the inclusion of a new rule that identifies the construction of retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity. The construction of retirement villages should have focused matters of discretion (to provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities). The submitter opposes the current matters of discretion as they are overly broad and not sufficiently focused on the effects of retirement villages which should be regulated in line with the MDRS.	Amend 2A.4.1.3(b) and delete 2A.4.1.3(c) to align with the relief sought by the submitter in relation to 2A.4.1.1(b) and (c). Delete 2A.4.1.3(e) and replace with: 2A.4.1.3 Restricted discretionary activities <u>e. Construction of buildings for a Retirement Village –RD Assessment will be restricted to the following matters:</u> <u>1. The effects arising from exceeding any of the following standards: 2A.4.2.1 – 2A.4.2.5, 2A.4.2.7 – 2A.4.2.8, and where relevant, 2A.4.2.10 – 2A.4.2.21 & 2A.4.2.23 – 2A.4.2.24, 2A.4.2.31.</u> <u>2. The effects of the retirement village on the safety of adjacent streets or public open spaces.</u> <u>3. The extent to which articulation, modulation and materiality addresses adverse visual dominance effects associated with building length.</u> <u>4. The effects arising from the quality of the interface between the retirement village and adjacent streets or public open spaces.</u> <u>5. When assessing the matters in (1), (2), (3) and (4), consider:</u> <u>a. The need to provide for efficient use of larger sites.</u> <u>b. The functional and operational needs of the retirement village.</u> <u>6. The positive effects of the construction, development and use of the Retirement Village.</u> <u>For clarity, no other rules or matters of discretion relating to the effects of density apply to the construction of buildings for a Retirement Village.</u>		That the point of submission is rejected It would be confusing if the activity status of retirement villages in the MDRS and construction of buildings for them were to have different activity statuses.
73.90	Oppose in Part	Retirement Villages	2A.4.1.4	Considers that retirement villages construction should be considered as restricted discretionary activity. The matters of discretion included in relation to Rule 2A.4.1.3(e) above provide a complete set of assessment matters to manage all potential adverse effects on the environment and neighbouring sites that may arise from retirement village developments. A default discretionary activity status for retirement villages that do not comply with particular standards is not considered necessary nor appropriate.	Amend Rule 2A.4.1.4 Discretionary Activities so that it does not apply to retirement villages or the construction of retirement villages.		That the point of submission is rejected An escalation of activity status to discretionary when certain rules are infringed is considered to be standard and acceptable for complex applications such as retirement villages.
73.91	Oppose in Part	Retirement Villages	2A.4.1A	Supports Rule 2A.4.1A as it prevents proposals for certain residential activities from being processed as publicly notified and limited notified. The submitter considers that proposals for the construction of retirement villages should also be precluded from being publicly notified. In accordance with Schedule 3A (5)(2) of the Enabling Housing Act, the submitter also considers that a retirement village that is compliant with standards 2A.4.2.1 –2A.4.2.5 & 2A.4.2.7 – 2A.4.2.8 (Building Height, Height in relation to Boundary, Building Setbacks, and Building Coverage) should also be precluded from limited notification.	Seeks the following amendment to Rule 2A.4.1A: 2A.4.1A Public and Limited Notification The following rules apply to the matter of notification of resource consent applications required under this section of the district plan: (a) ... (b) ... <u>(c) An application for the construction of a retirement village will be considered without public notification.</u> <u>(d) An application for the construction of a retirement village that complies with standards 2A.4.2.1 –2A.4.2.5 and 2A.4.2.7 – 2A.4.2.8 will be considered without public or limited notification.</u>		That the point of submission is rejected Public notification is a relevant consideration for retirement village applications considering their potential scale and intensity.
73.92	Support in Part	Retirement Villages	2A.4.2.1	Considers that the matters of discretion for a restricted discretionary activity under Rule 2A.4.2.1 are not appropriate for retirement villages. The submitter therefore seek to exclude retirement villages from these matters of discretion, with retirement village specific matters of discretion applying instead.	Seeks to amend Rule 2A.4.2.1 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).		That the point of submission is rejected The other points of this request have not been accepted.
73.94	Support in Part	Retirement Villages	2A.4.2.3	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	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	FS8 - oppose	That the point of submission is rejected Height in relation to boundary is a relevant consideration for retirement village applications considering their potential scale and intensity. .

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Sub	Response
				appropriate for retirement villages. The submitter seeks that retirement village specific matters of discretion apply instead.	requested by the submitter to Rule 2A.4.1.3(e) in another point of submission).		
73.98	Support in Part	Retirement Villages	2A.4.2.7 and 2A.4.2.8	The submitter considers that the matters of discretion for a restricted discretionary activity under Rule 2A.4.2.8 are not appropriate for retirement villages. The submitter seeks that retirement village specific matters of discretion apply instead.	Amend Rules 2A.4.2.7 and 2A.4.2.8 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).		That the point of submission is rejected The other points of this request have not been accepted..
73.100	Oppose in Part	Retirement Villages	2A.4.2.10 and 2A.4.2.11	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.	Seeks the addition of Rule 2A.4.2.11A to enable the communal outdoor living spaces of retirement villages to count towards the amenity standard. Outdoor Living Space (a) 2A.4.2.11A For retirement units, clauses (a)-(e) of Rule 2A.4.2.10 and clauses (a)-(c) of Rule 2A.4.2.11 apply with the following modifications: (a) the outdoor living space may be in whole or in part grouped cumulatively in 1 or more communally accessible location(s) and/or located directly adjacent to each retirement unit; and (b) a retirement village may provide indoor living spaces in one or more communally accessible locations in lieu of up to 50% of the required outdoor living space.		That the point of submission is rejected This rule provides for grouping of the outdoor living areas communally.
73.101	Oppose in Part	Retirement Villages	2A.4.2.10 and 2A.4.2.11	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.	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 amendment requested by the submitter to Rule 2A.4.1.3(e) in another point of submission).	FS8 - oppose	That the point of submission is rejected The other points relevant to this request have not been accepted.
73.102	Oppose in Part	Retirement Villages	2A.4.2.12 - 2A.4.2.20	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.	Seeks the addition of Rule 2A.4.2.20A to provide for outlook space requirements that are appropriate for retirement villages. Outlook Space (per dwelling) 2A.4.2.20A For retirement units, Rules 2A.4.2.12 - 2A.4.2.20 apply with the following modification: The minimum dimensions for a required outlook space are 1 metre in depth and 1 metre in width for a principal living room and all other habitable rooms. 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).	FS8 - oppose	That the point of submission is rejected Outlook space requirements are still considered to be relevant for retirement villages.
73.103	Oppose in Part	Retirement Villages	2A.4.2.20	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.	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 amendment requested by the submitter to Rule 2A.4.1.3(e) in another point of submission).	FS8 - oppose	That the point of submission is rejected The other points relevant to this request have not been accepted.

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Sub	Response
73.104	Oppose in Part	Retirement Villages	2A.4.2.21	Considers amendment to the rule is required to clarify that the standard also applies to retirement units. It should also only apply to public streets and not internal/private streets.	Amend Rule 2A.4.2.21 to provide for retirement units facing a public street. 2A.4.2.21 Any residential dwelling or retirement unit facing the public street must have a minimum of 20% of the street-facing façade in glazing. This can be in the form of windows or doors.		That the point of submission is rejected This is an MDRS.
73.105	Oppose in Part	Retirement Villages	2A.4.2.21	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.	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).	FS8 - oppose	That the point of submission is rejected The other points relevant to this request have not been accepted
73.107	Oppose in Part	Retirement Villages	2A.4.2.23 - 2A.4.2.24	Supports Rule 2A.4.2.23 and 2A.4.2.24 and the landscape area provisions in principle. Considers amendment to these rules is required to clarify that the standards also apply to retirement units.	Amend Rule 2A.4.2.23 and 2A.4.2.24 to provide for retirement units. (b) 2A.4.2.23 A residential dwelling or retirement unit at ground floor level has a landscaped area of a minimum of 20% of a developed site with grass or plants, and can include the canopy of trees regardless of the ground treatment below them. (c) 2A.4.2.24 The landscaped area may be located on any part of the development site and does not need to be associated with each residential dwelling or retirement unit.		That the point of submission is rejected This request requires several consequential amendments throughout the plan.
73.108	Oppose in Part	Retirement Villages	2A.4.2.24	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.	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 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).	FS8 - oppose	That the point of submission is rejected PC26 provides for retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity (rule 2A.4.1.3(e)) with matters of discretion and assessment criteria outlined. This is considered appropriate considering their potential scale and intensity (i.e., retirement villages will generally always be development beyond the scale anticipated by the MDRS, they are not considered to be consistent with the MDRS). PC26 has appropriately provided for retirement villages and associated care facilities and rest homes.
73.110	Oppose in Part	Retirement Villages	2.5	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.	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).	FS8 - oppose	That the point of submission is rejected Requests to amend and add new retirement village provisions in zones other than the MDRZ are considered beyond the scope of PC26.
73.112	Support	Retirement Villages	6.4	Opposes the non-complying activity status of retirement villages in the commercial zone and in line with the relief sought in the residential zones by the submitter in other points of submission, the submitter considers that the Commercial Zone should provide for retirement village activities as a permitted activity (with the construction of the retirement village being a restricted discretionary activity) recognising that retirement villages provide substantial benefits.	Amend Rule 6.4.1.1 to provide for retirement villages as a permitted activity and integrate a new rule that provides for the construction of retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity, with a specific set of retirement village matters of discretion (Rule 6.4.1.3(g)). <u>6.4.1 Activity status table</u> <u>6.4.1.1 Permitted activities</u> <u>ab. Retirement Villages, excluding the construction of buildings – P</u>		That the point of submission is rejected It would be confusing if the activity status of retirement villages in the MDRS and construction of buildings for them were to have different activity statuses.
73.113	Support	Retirement Villages	6.4.1.3	Considers that the construction of retirement villages should be a restricted discretionary activity under a specific retirement village rule, and that the construction of retirement villages should have their own set of focused matters of discretion (so to provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities).	Include a new rule in 6.4.1.3(g) as follows: 6.4.1.3 Restricted discretionary activities <u>g. Construction of buildings for a Retirement Village – RD Assessment will be restricted to the following matters:</u> <u>1. The effects arising from exceeding any of the following standards: 6.4.2.2 (Minimum building setback from internal site boundaries), 6.4.2.3 (Maximum</u>		That the point of submission is rejected Requests to amend and add new retirement village provisions in zones other than the MDRZ are considered beyond the scope of PC26.

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Sub	Response
					height) 6.4.2.4 (Daylight control), and where relevant, 6.4.2.1, 6.4.2.8 – 6.4.2.9 & 6.4.2.10 – 6.4.2.13 2. The effects of the retirement village on the safety of adjacent streets or public open spaces. 3. The effects arising from the quality of the interface between the retirement village and adjacent streets or public open spaces. 4. When assessing the matters in (1), (2) and (3), consider: a. The need to provide for efficient use of larger sites. b. The functional and operational needs of the retirement village. 5. The positive effects of the construction, development and use of the Retirement Village. For clarity, no other rules or matters of discretion relating to the effects of density apply to buildings for a Retirement Village.		
73.114	Oppose in Part	Retirement Villages	6.4.1.5(d)	For retirement villages that do not comply with specified standards, the submitter does not consider that a discretionary activity status is appropriate for retirement villages within the Commercial Zones. This activity status departs from the Enabling Housing Act which has the purpose of enabling accommodation activities. The submitter considers that any infringements to the MDRS can be adequately managed via the assessment matters that apply to each of the standards, as well as the specific assessment matters for retirement villages. A default to a full discretionary status is therefore inconsistent with the MDRS and not appropriate.	Seeks to amend Rule 6.4.1.5 is amended as follows: 6.4.1.5 Discretionary activities The following are Discretionary Activities: ... <u>This rule does not apply to the construction of retirement villages</u>		That the point of submission is rejected Requests to amend and add new retirement village provisions in zones other than the MDRZ are considered beyond the scope of PC26.
73.115	Support	Retirement Villages	New Provision	Considers that proposals for the construction of retirement villages within the Commercial Zone should be precluded from being publicly notified. In accordance with Schedule 3A (5)(2) of the Enabling Housing Act, the submitter also considers that a retirement village that is compliant with standards 6.4.2.2 (Minimum building setback from internal site boundaries), 6.4.2.3 (Maximum height), 6.4.2.4 (Daylight control), should also be precluded from limited notification.	Seeks the insertion of a new Rule in Section 6 as follows: 6.4.1A Public and Limited Notification The following rules apply to the matter of notification of resource consent applications required under this section of the district plan: (a) <u>An application for the construction of a retirement village will be considered without public notification.</u> (b) <u>An application for the construction of a retirement village that complies with standards 6.4.2.2, 6.4.2.3, 6.4.2.4 will be considered without public or limited notification.</u>		That the point of submission is rejected Requests to amend and add new retirement village provisions in zones other than the MDRZ are considered beyond the scope of PC26.
73.117	Oppose	Retirement Villages	21.1.2.4	Opposes the list of assessment criteria for retirement villages as they do not align with the matters of discretion sought for the construction of retirement villages in respect of Rule 2.4.1.3(e) in other points of submission made by the submitter.	Delete the assessment criteria for retirement villages or amend to reflect the matters of discretion.		That the point of submission is rejected Requests to amend and add new retirement village provisions in zones other than the MDRZ are considered beyond the scope of PC26.
73.118	Oppose in Part	Retirement Villages	21.1.2.5	Seeks that these additional provisions in 21.1.2.5 do not apply to retirement villages.	Amend assessment criteria 21.1.2.5 to clarify that it does not apply to retirement villages or the construction of retirement villages.		That the point of submission is rejected These provisions apply to character clusters, if a retirement village was in a character cluster these criteria would apply to them although unlikely it is not recommended the exclusion be added.
73.119	Oppose	Retirement Villages	21.1.2A.3	Opposes the list of assessment criteria for retirement villages as they are overly extensive, seek to manage matters not relevant under the MDRS and do not align with the matters of discretion sought for the construction of retirement villages in respect of Rule 2A.4.1.3(e) in other points of submission made by the submitter.	Delete the assessment criteria for retirement villages or amend to reflect the matters of discretion.		That the point of submission is rejected PC26 provides for retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity (rule 2A.4.1.3(e)) with matters of discretion and assessment criteria outlined. This is considered appropriate considering their potential scale and intensity (i.e., retirement villages will generally always be development beyond the scale anticipated by the MDRS, they are not considered to be consistent with the MDRS). PC26 has appropriately provided for retirement villages and associated care facilities and rest homes.
73.120	Oppose in Part	Retirement Villages	21.1.2A.4	Seeks that these additional provisions in 21.1.2A.4 do not apply to retirement villages.	Amend assessment criteria 21.1.2A.4 to clarify that this assessment criteria does not apply to retirement villages or the construction of retirement villages.		That the point of submission is rejected These provisions apply to character clusters, if a retirement village was in a character cluster these criteria would apply to them although unlikely it is not recommended the exclusion be added.

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Sub	Response
73.121	Oppose in Part	Retirement Villages	21.1.2A.5-32	Opposes the list of assessment criteria that apply to breaches of standards as they do not align with the matters of discretion sought for the construction of retirement villages in respect of Rule 2A.4.1.3(e) in other points of submission made by the submitter.	Amend assessment criteria 21.1.2A.5-32 to clarify that they do not apply to retirement villages or the construction of retirement villages.		That the point of submission is rejected Some of these may apply to retirement villages depending on what rules the proposal infringes.

4.5 Industrial Zone – (Corrections Facilities) (see s42a report Topic 4.5 - pgs 110 to 111)

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submission	Response
55.3	Oppose	Section 7 – Industrial Zone	Industrial Zone - 7.4.1.1	Amend rules for Industrial Zone to enable 'community corrections activities' as a permitted activity. Intensification and population growth in urban areas create more demand for these facilities. Specifically with the higher population, the proportion of people needing these facilities will increase. It is important that provision is made to enable non-custodial community corrections sites to establish, operate and redevelop, within appropriate areas.	Amend the Activity Status Table in the Industrial Zone to enable "community corrections activities" to be undertaken as a permitted activity: 7.4.1.1 Permitted activities The following activities shall comply with the performance standards of this zone ... <u>(w) Community corrections activities</u>		That the point of submission is rejected PC26 is focused on the implementation of the MDRS so it is not recommended that community corrections facilities be inserted into the Industrial Zone as part of PC26. It is considered that this request is beyond the scope of PC26 and would be better evaluated as part of a separate plan change.

4.6 Section 21 (see 42a report - Topic 4.6 pgs 111 to 113)

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
41.7	Support	Section 21 - Assessment Criteria and Information Requirements	21.1.2A.6	Supports the wide range of assessment criteria for sites where there are more than three dwellings within the Medium Density Residential Zone.	Supports 21.1.2A.6 assessment criteria		Support noted.
41.8	Support	Section 21 - Assessment Criteria and Information Requirements	21.1.2A.6	Supports building height assessment criteria that gives regard to the impacts of the proposed development on adjacent sites.	That the building height assessment criteria are retained.		Support noted.
41.10	Support in Part	Section 21 - Assessment Criteria and Information Requirements	21.1.2A.7	Supports the height in relation to boundary assessment criteria that gives regard to the impacts of the proposed development on adjacent sites.	That the height in relation to boundary assessment criteria are retained.		Support noted.
41.12	Support in Part	Section 21 - Assessment Criteria and Information Requirements	21.1.2A.8	Supports the wide range of assessment criteria for sites where there are more than three dwellings within the Medium Density Residential Zone, particularly the assessment criteria related to setbacks that gives regard to the impacts of the proposed development on adjacent sites.	That the assessment criteria 21.1.2A.8 Setbacks are retained.		Support noted.
47.34	Support	Section 21 - Assessment Criteria and Information Requirements	21.1.2A	Generally supports the Medium Density Residential Zone assessment criteria insofar that the matters of control and matters for discretion listed for each activity or built standard are comprehensive and address potential adverse effects on infrastructure.	Retain 21.1.2A as notified.		Support noted
47.35	Support in Part	Section 21 - Assessment Criteria and Information Requirements	21.1.2A.8	Generally supports the proposed matters of discretion set out in 21.1.2A.8 however request a new matter of discretion be included in 21.1.2A.8 to specifically consider 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.	Add new matter of discretion to 21.1.2A.8: 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.	FS5 – oppose FS6 – oppose FS8 - oppose	That the point of submission is rejected Addition does not make sense.

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
49.7	Amend	Section 21 - Assessment Criteria and Information Requirements	2A.4.1; 2A.4.1.3	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 Council's ability to provide for the health and wellbeing of the awa and to provide for betterment. Tai Tumu, Tai Pari, Tai Ao outlines a clear consultation and engagement process that is under-utilised by applicants/developers.	Amend proposed Section 2A as follows: Add a new standard to the General Standards for all residential rules as follows: <u>Applications for activities that are required under Rule 2A.4.1.1(b) or (c) and Rule 2A.4.1.3 (b) or (c) must provide in the assessment of environmental effects for the proposal, identification of any measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects recommended by representatives of Mana Whenua in any engagement carried out for the proposal by the applicant in accordance with consultation and engagement processes identified by mana whenua, Chapter 6 of Tai Tumu, Tai Pari, Tai Ao – Waikato-Tainui Environmental Management Plan or any other iwi management plan.</u> And any consequential amendments or alternative relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	FS8 - oppose	That the point of submission is rejected This request is acknowledged, and I note that the Joint Management Agreement provides an appropriate forum to engage on matters as appropriate.
49.9	Amend	Section 21 - Assessment Criteria and Information Requirements	2A.4.2	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.	Insert the following wording into the relevant section to read: <u>Applications for activities that are required under Rule 2A.4.1.1(b) or (c) and Rule 2A.4.1.3(b) or (c) must provide in the assessment of environmental effects for the proposal an assessment of any Iwi Management Plans.</u> And any consequential amendments or alternative relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	FS8 - oppose	That the point of submission is rejected In relation to rule 2A.4.1.3(b) iwi management plans should be assessed in all relevant applications, not just in relation to this rule. It would be incomplete to mention this just in this matter of discretion. Reference to iwi management plans is better described generally (as they are) in section 1.1.31/32 and 33. Rules 2A.4.1.1 (b) and (c) are permitted activity rules so matters of discretion do not apply. Matters of discretion for rule 2A.4.1.3 (c) have been restricted to matters relating to infrastructure assessment.
79.13	Amend	Section 21 - Assessment Criteria and Information Requirements	Section 21	Amendments are sought to ensure consistency across the Kāinga Ora submission, particularly in relation to: acknowledging that the amenity of urban environments will change (as-per Policy 6(B) of the NPS-UD), the revised assessment criteria for four or more dwellings in the MDRZ and 7 or more dwellings in the proposed HDRZ, and the removal of criteria associated with activities that are sought to be deleted.	Amendments are sought to ensure consistency across the Kāinga Ora submission, particularly in relation to: acknowledging that the amenity of urban environments will change (as-per Policy 6(B) of the NPS-UD), the revised assessment criteria for four or more dwellings in the MDRZ and 7 or more dwellings in the proposed HDRZ, and the removal of criteria associated with activities that are sought to be deleted.		Submission point noted This is a general submission point and does not request specific relief. Where appropriate, specific submission points have been addressed in the relevant sections of this submission summary document.
79.308	Oppose	Section 21 - Assessment Criteria and Information Requirements	21.1.2A.2	Opposes (other than being a permitted activity) standards for relocated buildings. The standard seeks to manage matters that are more-appropriately addressed through the Building Act and are not valid resource management issues. This is neither efficient nor effective as there is the potential for resource consents to be triggered on the basis of Building Act matters that do not directly address specific 'environmental' effects. Any building relocating on a site would be a new building and subject to the various activities and standards within the zone.	Delete the 'relocated buildings' provision in 21.1.2A.2.		That the point of submission is rejected The Plan includes policies to support the exterior of relocated building been to a standard that does not detract from residential amenity. This rule supports the implementation of this policy.
79.312	Oppose	Section 21 - Assessment Criteria and Information Requirements	21.1.2A.4	Relocated buildings are more appropriately managed through the Building Act.	Delete the 'relocated buildings' provisions in 21.1.2A.4.		That the point of submission is rejected The Plan includes policies to support the exterior of relocated building been to a standard that does not detract from residential amenity. This rule supports the implementation of this policy.
79.313	Oppose in part	Section 21 - Assessment Criteria and Information Requirements	21.1.2A.5	Consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission, Kāinga Ora seeks consequential amendments to the criteria to reflect the relief sought in relation to: •Enabling up to three dwellings per site and papakāinga development; •Deletion on the infrastructure constraint and stormwater	Amend the activity described in 21.1.2A.5, delete the criteria in 21.1.2A.5 (a)-(t) and replace with the criteria (a) - (e) as shown below to be consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission and relief sought:		That the point of submission is rejected The corresponding requests have not been supported as papakāinga development is

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
				<p>constraint qualifying matter overlays in their entirety (and associated provisions);•Building coverage;•Impervious areas;•Compact housing;•Building setbacks;•Character Clusters;•Character Streets.</p>	<p>More than two Four or more dwellings per site and Papakāinga containing four or more dwellings and/or where marae is associated with Papakāinga development within the Infrastructure Constraint Qualifying Matter Overlay or more than three dwellings per site outside the Infrastructure Constraint Qualifying Matter Overlay</p> <p>(a) The extent to which the scale, form, and appearance of the development is compatible with the planned urban built form character of the neighbourhood, having regard to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The relevant objectives and policies of the zone. ii. Compatibility of the proposed development with the existing and likely future surrounding environment. iii. The extent to which solar potential and good solar aspect is optimized within the development. iv. The materials to be used and how they are to be repeated within the development. v. Detail of roof form. vi. Details of doorways and the provision of shelter for visitors. vii. Windows, revetment, balconies and recesses. viii. Garaging to create visual continuity and cohesion and reflect a residential character. <p>(b) The extent to which the development delivers quality on-site amenity and occupant privacy that is appropriate for its scale, having regard to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The provision of lighting for amenity and crime prevention, without being a nuisance to residents. ii. Facilitates an internal movement network that provides for dedicated vehicle access to each dwelling, such as may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Using rear lanes where vehicle access off a public street is difficult or compromises pedestrian and visual amenity. •Providing shared vehicular access layout for larger developments. •Uses surface treatments to clearly demarcate vehicular entrances. •Takes into account safety and accessibility if visitor car parking is provided within the development. iii. Provides clearly visible main pedestrian entries from the street or lane to each dwelling at ground floor level. iv. Maximises the visual relationship between dwellings and adjacent streets, lanes and public open spaces, through provision of windows and balconies at upper levels. v. Minimises the number of dwellings with internal and outdoor living areas oriented to the south. vi. Dwellings are designed to provide private outdoor areas adjacent to living areas. vii. Orientates windows to maximise daylight and outlook, without compromising dwelling privacy or the privacy of neighbouring dwellings. viii. Provides adequate storage space for each residential unit, including for larger items such as bicycles and outdoor equipment. ix. For apartment style developments, provides communal open spaces with edges that are activated or overlooked by adjacent streets, lanes or dwellings. x. Integrates proposed communal open spaces with the development's wider pedestrian network. xi. The extent to which development involving seven or more dwellings within the C1 and C2 / C3 structure plan areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Includes 'universal access' design principles within design, maximising accessibility for all users. •Provides an internal movement network layout that is legible and enables good connectivity. •Maximises safety for pedestrians. <p>(c) The extent to which the development contributes to a safe and attractive public realm and streetscape, having regard to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The provision of connections to public walkways/cycleways and the road network. ii. Visually permeable fences and glazing of façades that provide for 		<p>been addressed throughout the Plan in a separate plan change..</p>

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
					<p>surveillance from the dwelling to the street and other public places such as walkways and reserves.</p> <p>iii. The location of outdoor storage areas and rubbish and recycling compounds so that the appearance from the street is not adversely affected and on-site amenity such as the provision of outdoor living spaces is not compromised.</p> <p>iv. The extent of adverse effects on the surrounding road network, including on the function of intersections.</p> <p>Vetha extent to which adequate vehicle parking and the provision of safe vehicle entrances for both pedestrians and vehicles, car parking and manoeuvring and vehicle access to rubbish and recycling compounds, and access for emergency vehicles has been provided.</p> <p>(d) The effects on three waters infrastructure, achieved by demonstrating that at the point of connection the infrastructure has the capacity to service the development.</p> <p>(e) Where marae is associated with a papakāinga development, the positive benefits the development has on cultural well-being, including the ability of tāngata whenua to reconnect with traditional sites and areas.</p>		
79.314	Support in part	Section 21 - Assessment Criteria and Information Requirements	21.1.2A.6	Opposes the criteria (c) which conflicts with Policy 6(b) of the NPS-UD that acknowledges the amenity values of existing neighbourhood will change as a result of intensification. The criteria must be amended to reflect this, consistent with the comments made throughout the Kāinga Ora submission, and to be consistent with what the zone enables.	Delete Building Height 21.1.2A.6(c).		That the point of submission is rejected Change recommended to 21.1.2A.6(c) as follows: <i>(c) Whether consistency has been achieved with respect of the appearance and design of the development with the character and values of the area, including existing buildings on site and adjoining sites.</i>
79.315	Support in part	Section 21 - Assessment Criteria and Information Requirements	21.1.2A.7	The submitter does not support criteria (b) unless such tree was specifically scheduled.	Delete Height in Relation to Boundary 21.1.2A.7(b).		That the point of submission is rejected This matter is considered a valid matter of discretion when infringement of height to boundary occurs.
79.316	Support in part	Section 21 - Assessment Criteria and Information Requirements	21.1.2A.8	Generally supports criteria 21.1.2A.8 Setbacks as notified, but proposed an amendment for consistency with the Kāinga Ora submissions concerning 'character clusters' and the effects on trees that are not specifically scheduled. Kāinga Ora notes that terraced dwellings are an expected typology within the medium density zone, with the rear of middle terraces often unable to be accessed unless through the dwelling.	Delete 21.1.2A.8(e) and 21.1.2A.8(i), and amend 21.1.2A.8(a) as follows to the extent consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora: (a) The extent to which the road boundary setback is appropriate in the location, particularly where located adjoining a Character Street.		That the point of submission is rejected These matters are not proposed to be deleted as responded to in other submissions.
79.317	Support in part	Section 21 - Assessment Criteria and Information Requirements	21.1.2A.9	Generally supports the criteria as notified, but proposes an amendment for consistency with the Kāinga Ora submissions relating to the 'maintenance and enhancement' of amenity values and ensuring that any assessment of effects on the broader 'character' of the zone is undertaken in reference to the planned built form outcomes. This is consistent with policy 6(b) of the NPS-UD that acknowledges the character of residential environments will change as a result of planned intensification, and that such a change is not itself an effect. It is also noted that the MDRZ will not include generous areas of open space and garden plantings as required under (a).	Include criteria 21.1.2A.9 as notified and delete 21.1.2A.9(a) and amend 21.1.2A.9(c) and 21.1.2A.9(d) as follows to the extent consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora: 21.1.2A.9 Building Coverage (c) The extent to which any proposed buildings will be compatible with the scale of other buildings in the surrounding area and will not result in visual domination that is out of character with the planned built form outcomes of the surrounding environment. (d) The ability to provide adequate on site vehicle parking and manoeuvring where provided.		Amendment supported in part. Deletion of (a) not supported, valid matter of discretion. Amend (c) to give effect to the submitter's point and Policy 6(b) of the NPS-UD. References to minimum on-site parking requirements have been amendment already as follows: (d) Where provided, on-site vehicle parking and manoeuvring is adequate.
79.318	Oppose	Section 21 - Assessment Criteria and Information Requirements	21.1.2A.14; various	Opposes this standard as it is restrictive and specific which does not enable a variety of roof lines to add interest to the streetscape.	Delete 21.1.2A.14 Roof Pitch and associated provisions.		That the point of submission is rejected These provisions have been retained in relation to heritage areas.

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
79.319	Support in Part	Section 21 - Assessment Criteria and Information Requirements	21.1.2A.15	The submitter notes that the MDRZ will not include generous areas of open space and garden plantings as required under (a).	Delete criterion Landscaped Area 21.1.2A.15(a)		Support amendment in part. Assessment criteria applies if <20% landscaped so agree with submission point and support removing a. Recommend amending b and deleting c to make assessment criteria very narrow to limit non-compliance: amend b to limit to retention and protection of existing mature vegetation e.g. scheduling of trees, add new criteria that allows for consideration of alternatives e.g. green roofs and/or green walls, and add new criteria that allows for consideration of how development contributes to residential amenity through off-site mitigation over an above FCs Residential Development. Delete 21.1.2A.15(a) and (c). Amend (b) and re-number as follows: (b) (a) <u>Where relevant, the extent to which existing mature vegetation including heritage and character values is retained and landscaping adds to the amenity of the development.</u> Add (b) as follows: (b) The appropriateness of any landscaping for the local environment and maintenance programme for landscaping.
79.320	Support in part	Section 21 - Assessment Criteria and Information Requirements	21.1.2A.29	Generally supports the criteria as notified, but proposes amendments for consistency with the Kāinga Ora submissions relating to the use of the terms 'avoid', given that vehicle access onto a strategic road is not identified as a prohibited activity. Amendments are also proposed for consistency with the Kāinga Ora submission.	Include criteria 21.1.2A.29 as notified to the extent consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora and amend as follows: 21.1.2A.29 Papakāinga, m Marae, churches and community centres. ... (b) the avoidance of <u>Ensuring that development does not</u> fronting onto, and having vehicular access directly from, a strategic road as shown on the Planning Maps. ... (e) The design and appearance of buildings in order that they are not a detraction from the <u>planned</u> character and amenity of the area. ...		That the point of submission is rejected A separate plan change is proposed to address papakāinga development comprehensively throughout the entire Plan.
79.321	Support	Section 21 - Assessment Criteria and Information Requirements	21.1.15.6	Supports the criteria as notified, consistent with its submission on subdivision activities in the medium density residential zone. Kāinga Ora seeks the deletion of 21.1.15.6(u) consistent with the submission on character clusters and streets.	Include criteria 21.1.15.6 as notified to the extent consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora and delete 21.1.15.6(u).		Support noted.

4.7 Planning Maps (see s42a report - Topic 4.7 pgs 113 to 114)

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submission	Response
65.31	Amend	Planning Maps	Zone Map 8 - Ohaupo Deferred Large Lot Residential Zone	Due to the lack of available land for development in Ohaupo, Futureproof support the development of the O3 and O4 ahead of the 2035 deferral. Therefore, in alignment with the aspirations for the urban Growth, this growth cell should be bought forward as part of Plan Change 26.	Remove deferred status on Ohaupo growth cell areas O3 and O4 to make the zoning Large Lot Residential Zone.		That the point of submission is rejected Ohaupo is outside of the urban areas that PC26 is focused on.
65.32	Amend	Planning Maps	Map 39 - Te Awamutu East	The urban limits line on the plan does not match the equivalent policy plan in the ODP.	Amend plan (Zone Map 39) to reflect policy plan area.		That the point of submission is rejected Although the urban limit appears out of sync with the growth cells on Planning Maps 39 and 40 the focus of PC26 is not on the urban limit, and in fact the urban limit will no longer be relied on. The work on lifting the urban limit is recommended to be pursued in a separate plan change.

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submission	Response
65.33	Amend	Planning Maps	Zone Map 40 - St Leger	The urban limits line and structure plan line on the plan does not match the equivalent policy plan (in the ODP). (This occurs on a number of maps and we suggest others are checked for consistency).	Amend plan (Zone Map 40) to reflect policy plan area. o		That the point of submission is rejected Although the urban limit appears out of sync with the growth cells on Planning Maps 39 and 40 the focus of PC26 is not on the urban limit, and in fact the urban limit will no longer be relied on. The work on lifting the urban limit is recommended to be pursued in a separate plan change.
67.3	Amend	Planning Maps	Zone Map 39 - Te Awamutu East	There is a discrepancy between the Urban Limit on the proposed zoning map 39 and the extent of the zoning allowing residential development. Further the urban limit is not consistent with the location of it in the current zone and policy maps within the Operative District Plan. This discrepancy is located where the Urban Limit traverses the T11 growth cell.	Amend Planning Zone Map 39 to rectify an error in the mapping of the Urban Limit where it traverses T11 growth cell.		That the point of submission is rejected Although the urban limit appears out of sync with the growth cells on Planning Maps 39 and 40 the focus of PC26 is not on the urban limit, and in fact the urban limit will no longer be relied on. The work on lifting the urban limit is recommended to be pursued in a separate plan change.
70.122	Oppose in Part	Planning Maps	Planning Maps	Opposes the need for development within areas subject to structure plans to be undertaken in general accordance with the requirements of structure plans. The submitter considers these outcomes/requirements are inconsistent with the intent of the Enabling Housing Act and NPSUD as they inappropriately and unnecessarily restrict development.	Reconsider the use of structure plans.		That the point of submission is rejected Structure planning remains a valid approach for carrying out Council's functions under sections 30 and 31 of the RMA.
70.125	Oppose	Planning Maps	Deferred Zones on Planning Maps	The submitter questions why the Waipā District Plan has retained several large areas of land zoned 'Deferred Residential Zone', 'Deferred Medium Density Residential Zone', and 'Deferred Commercial Zone'. Given the housing crisis, and the Enabling Housing Act legislation that has been passed to address this crisis, the retention of these 'deferred' zones is questioned as this land could be made available now, as part of Plan Change 26, for residential and retirement village development to increase the supply of developable land.	Reconsider the retention of the deferred zones and rezone the land for immediate development as appropriate. The submitter also seeks that the deferred Residential Zoned Land is rezoned Medium Density Residential Zone.		That the point of submission is rejected This request to 'live' zone post-2035 growth cells, on the outskirts of Cambridge and Te Awamutu if enabled under PC26 would represent out of sequence development – that is unplanned. The request would be inconsistent with the NPS-UD, which Waipā along with its Future Proof partners has sought to respond to in the updated strategy, in confirming the preferred land use pattern across the sub-region and its associated processes to manage growth.
73.122	Oppose in Part	Planning Maps	Planning Maps	Opposes the need for development within areas subject to structure plans to be undertaken in general accordance with the requirements of structure plans. The submitter considers these outcomes/requirements are inconsistent with the intent of the Enabling Housing Act and NPSUD as they inappropriately and unnecessarily restrict development.	Reconsider the use of structure plans.		That the point of submission is rejected Structure planning remains a valid approach for carrying out Council's functions under sections 30 and 31 of the RMA.
73.125	Oppose	Planning Maps	Deferred Zones on Planning Maps	The submitter questions why the Waipā District Plan has retained several large areas of land zoned 'Deferred Residential Zone', 'Deferred Medium Density Residential Zone', and 'Deferred Commercial Zone'. Given the housing crisis, and the Enabling Housing Act legislation that has been passed to address this crisis, the retention of these 'deferred' zones is questioned as this land could be made available now, as part of Plan Change 26, for residential and retirement village development to increase the supply of developable land.	Reconsider the retention of the deferred zones and rezone the land for immediate development as appropriate. The submitter also seeks that the deferred Residential Zoned Land is rezoned Medium Density Residential Zone.		That the point of submission is rejected This request to 'live' zone post-2035 growth cells, on the outskirts of Cambridge and Te Awamutu if enabled under PC26 would represent out of sequence development – that is unplanned. The request would be inconsistent with the NPS-UD, which Waipā along with its Future Proof partners has sought to respond to in the updated strategy, in confirming the preferred land use pattern across the sub-region and its associated processes to manage growth.

4.8 Residential Zone (see s42a report - Topic 4.8 pgs 114 to 115)

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
47.2	Support in Part	Section 2 – Residential Zone	2.3.2.4	Requests that Policy 2.3.2.4 be amended to include consideration of the health and safety of residents where reduced side boundary setbacks are enabled.	Amend Policy 2.3.2.4 as follows: 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 unduly</u> dominate outdoor living areas on adjoining sites.	FS8 - oppose	That the point of submission is rejected This request relating to the Residential Zone is not related to the focus of PC26, which is to implement the MDRS.

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
49.5	Amend	Section 2 – Residential Zone	2.3 Objectives and Policies	<p>Plan Change 26 does little to recognise and provide for the relationship mana whenua have with the the awa.</p> <p>The relief sought also better implements Te Ture Whaimana and ensures achievement of the objectives.</p>	<p>Amend Section 2.3 as follows:</p> <p>Add a new Objective and subsequent policies to Section 2.3 as follows:</p> <p><u>"Objective X - Mana whenua</u> <u>The relationship mana whenua have with the Waipā District is recognised and promoted.</u></p> <p><u>Policy X</u> <u>Decisions on land use, subdivision and development include ongoing consultation and collaboration with mana whenua.</u></p> <p><u>Policy XX</u> <u>Identifying and providing for mana whenua freshwater and other values and aspirations through the preparation and implementation of Catchment Management Plans and Structure Plans.</u></p> <p><u>Policy XXX</u> <u>Development and the decisions on developments are to consider any relevant Iwi Management Plan.</u></p> <p><u>Policy XXXX</u> <u>Development considers effects on the unique mana whenua relationships, values, aspirations, roles and responsibilities with respect to an area."</u></p> <p>And any consequential amendments or alternative relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.</p>	FS5 – oppose FS6 - oppose	<p>That the point of submission is rejected</p> <p>This request relating to the Residential Zone is not related to the focus of PC26, which is to implement the MDRS.</p>
55.5	Support	Section 2 – Residential Zone	All	The Operative District Plan currently includes definitions for "residential activity" and "dwelling" which PC26 has not proposed to amend. This collective package of definitions appropriately covers residential activities with support that Ara Poutama provides in the community. The proposed changes to the Residential Zone Section, together with the retention of the existing "residential activity" and "dwelling" definitions (and associated provisions elsewhere in the Operative District Plan) will enable Ara Poutama to implement residential activities with support, subject to an appropriate regulatory framework, within the Waipā District.	Retain as notified the PC26 'Residential Zone' Section, including the provisions relating to "residential activities" and "dwellings".	FS8 - support	Support noted
70.25	Oppose in Part	Section 2 – Residential Zone	2.1.1	Opposes the proposed deletion addressing the projected increase in population due to changing demographics, as an ageing population. This factor is still relevant for areas subject to the Residential Zone, including any future residential zones.	Amend Section 2.1.1 to reinstate the reference to the projected increase in population due to changing demographics, such as an ageing population.		<p>That the point of submission is rejected</p> <p>This request relating to the Residential Zone is not related to the focus of PC26, which is to implement the MDRS.</p>
70.26	Oppose in Part	Section 2 – Residential Zone	2.1.2	The introduction to the Residential Zone chapter does not appropriately recognise that the character and amenity of residential areas will change over time and that significant change to an area is not necessarily an adverse effect.	Amend Section 2.1.2 to recognise that the character and amenity of residential areas will change over time and that significant change to an area is not necessarily an adverse effect.		<p>That the point of submission is rejected</p> <p>This request relating to the Residential Zone is not related to the focus of PC26, which is to implement the MDRS.</p>
70.27	Oppose in Part	Section 2 – Residential Zone	2.3.1	Opposes Objective 2.3.1 to the extent it is inconsistent with the NPSUD. The objective should recognise that amenity values will change over time in accordance with Objective 4 of the NPUSD.	<p>Amend Objective 2.3.1:</p> <p>Objective - Key elements of residential character</p> <p>2.3.1 To maintain and enhance the existing <u>provide for the</u> elements of the Residential Zone that give each town, village or settlement its own character <u>while recognising that amenity values will change over time in response to the diverse and changing housing needs of people and communities.</u></p>		<p>That the point of submission is rejected</p> <p>This request relating to the Residential Zone is not related to the focus of PC26, which is to implement the MDRS.</p>

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
70.28	Oppose	Section 2 – Residential Zone	2.3.2.5	Opposes Policy 2.3.2.5 as the policy as currently drafted creates uncertainty to plan users and may inappropriately limit development.	Delete Policy 2.3.2.5		That the point of submission is rejected This request relating to the Residential Zone is not related to the focus of PC26, which is to implement the MDRS.
70.29	Support in Part	Section 2 – Residential Zone	2.3	Seeks an additional objective, which is required to be included in the Residential Zone chapter of the District Plan to recognise the need to enable a variety of homes to meet the needs of different households, as recognised by the NPSUD.	Seeks that a new objective is inserted in the Objectives for the Residential Zone section that enables a variety of housing types and sizes that respond to housing needs and demand.		That the point of submission is rejected This request relating to the Residential Zone is not related to the focus of PC26, which is to implement the MDRS.
70.30	Support	Section 2 – Residential Zone	2.3	In addition to the current objectives for the Residential Zone, the submitter considers that an ageing population specific objective should be included that recognises and enables the housing and care needs of the ageing population.	Seeks that a new objective is inserted in the Objectives for the Residential Zone section that provides for the housing and care needs of the ageing population. <u>2.3.X Ageing population</u> <u>Recognise and enable the housing and care needs of the ageing population.</u>		That the point of submission is rejected This request relating to the Residential Zone is not related to the focus of PC26, which is to implement the MDRS.
70.32	Support	Section 2 – Residential Zone	2.3	In addition to the proposed policies for the Residential Zone, the submitter considers that 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.	Seeks that a new Policy is included in the Policies of the Residential Zone section, as follows: <u>2.3.X Changing communities</u> <u>To provide for the diverse and changing residential needs of communities and 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>		That the point of submission is rejected This request relating to the Residential Zone is not related to the focus of PC26, which is to implement the MDRS.
70.33	Support	Section 2 – Residential Zone	2.3	A policy regarding the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites should be included in the District Plan.	Seeks that a new Policy is included in the Policies of the Residential Zone section that recognises the intensification opportunities provided for by larger sites: <u>2.3.X Larger sites</u> <u>Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within the Residential Zone by providing for more efficient use of those sites.</u>		That the point of submission is rejected This request relating to the Residential Zone is not related to the focus of PC26, which is to implement the MDRS.
70.34	Support	Section 2 – Residential Zone	2.3	A policy to provide for and acknowledge the following should be integrated into the District Plan: - The diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the particular needs and characteristics of older persons; and - The functional and operational needs of retirement villages.	Seeks that a new Policy is included in the Policies of the Residential Zone section, as follows: <u>2.3.X Provision of housing for an ageing population</u> <u>1. Provide for a diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the particular needs and characteristics of older persons in residential areas, such as retirement villages.</u> <u>2. Recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, including that they:</u> <u>a. May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services;</u> <u>b. Have a unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.</u>		That the point of submission is rejected This request relating to the Residential Zone is not related to the focus of PC26, which is to implement the MDRS.
70.35	Support	Section 2 – Residential Zone	2.3	It would be appropriate to enable the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments.	Seeks that a new Policy is included in the Policies of the Residential Zone section, as follows: <u>2.3.X 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>		That the point of submission is rejected This request relating to the Residential Zone is not related to the focus of PC26, which is to implement the MDRS.
72.8	Oppose	Section 2 – Residential Zone	2.1	An amendment is required to reflect the intent of the Amendment Act which is to recognise the changing nature of residential areas and encourage high-quality developments, rather than require maintenance of character and amenity values.	Amend 2.1 Introduction as shown below (or words to similar effect): Providing for changing housing demands while <u>encouraging high-quality developments will be important to create a well-functioning urban environment maintaining existing character and amenity expectations will be challenging.</u> There are Town Concept Plans 2010 prepared for Ngāhinapōuri, Ōhaupo and Pirongia. Cambridge, Te Awamutu and Kihikihi. The Town Concepts Plans provide guidance on how these competing demands can be managed.		That the point of submission is rejected This request relating to the Residential Zone is not related to the focus of PC26, which is to implement the MDRS.

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
72.15	Oppose	Section 2 – Residential Zone	2.4.2.9	The Plan proposes to provide that buildings in the residential zone will have a maximum height of 9m (or no more than two storeys). This does not give effect to the Amendment Act and should be increased to 11m (or three storeys). New residential areas may be established in this zone. They are required to implement the MDRS under the Amendment Act.	Amend Rule 2.4.2.9 Maximum Height to align with the MDRS in the Amendment Act.		That the point of submission is rejected This request relating to the Residential Zone is not related to the focus of PC26, which is to implement the MDRS.
72.16	Oppose	Section 2 – Residential Zone	2.4.2.12	The Plan proposes to require site coverage to be no more than 40% of the net site area.	Amend Rule 2.4.2.12 to align with the MDRS in the Amendment Act.		That the point of submission is rejected This request relating to the Residential Zone is not related to the focus of PC26, which is to implement the MDRS.
73.25	Oppose in Part	Section 2 – Residential Zone	2.1.1	Opposes the proposed deletion addressing the projected increase in population due to changing demographics, as an ageing population. This factor is still relevant for areas subject to the Residential Zone, including any future residential zones.	Amend Section 2.1.1 to reinstate the reference to the projected increase in population due to changing demographics, such as an ageing population.		That the point of submission is rejected This request relating to the Residential Zone is not related to the focus of PC26, which is to implement the MDRS.
73.26	Oppose in Part	Section 2 – Residential Zone	2.1.2	The introduction to the Residential Zone chapter does not appropriately recognise that the character and amenity of residential areas will change over time and that significant change to an area is not necessarily an adverse effect.	Amend Section 2.1.2 to recognise that the character and amenity of residential areas will change over time and that significant change to an area is not necessarily an adverse effect.		That the point of submission is rejected This request relating to the Residential Zone is not related to the focus of PC26, which is to implement the MDRS.
73.27	Oppose in Part	Section 2 – Residential Zone	2.3.1	Opposes Objective 2.3.1 to the extent it is inconsistent with the NPSUD. The objective should recognise that amenity values will change over time in accordance with Objective 4 of the NPUSD.	Amend Objective 2.3.1: Objective - Key elements of residential character 2.3.1 To maintain and enhance the existing provide for the elements of the Residential Zone that give each town, village or settlement its own character <u>while recognising that amenity values will change over time in response to the diverse and changing housing needs of people and communities.</u>		That the point of submission is rejected This request relating to the Residential Zone is not related to the focus of PC26, which is to implement the MDRS.
73.28	Oppose	Section 2 – Residential Zone	2.3.2.5	Opposes Policy 2.3.2.5 as the policy as currently drafted creates uncertainty to plan users and may inappropriately limit development.	Delete Policy 2.3.2.5.		That the point of submission is rejected This request relating to the Residential Zone is not related to the focus of PC26, which is to implement the MDRS.
73.29	Support in Part	Section 2 – Residential Zone	2.3	Seeks an additional objective, which is required to be included in the Residential Zone chapter of the District Plan to recognise the need to enable a variety of homes to meet the needs of different households, as recognised by the NPSUD.	Seeks that a new objective is inserted in the Objectives for the Residential Zone section that enables a variety of housing types and sizes that respond to housing needs and demand.		That the point of submission is rejected This request relating to the Residential Zone is not related to the focus of PC26, which is to implement the MDRS.
73.30	Support	Section 2 – Residential Zone	2.3	In addition to the current objectives for the Residential Zone, the submitter considers that an ageing population specific objective should be included that recognises and enables the housing and care needs of the ageing population.	Seeks that a new objective is inserted in the Objectives for the Residential Zone section that provides for the housing and care needs of the ageing population. <u>2.3.X Ageing population</u> <u>Recognise and enable the housing and care needs of the ageing population.</u>		That the point of submission is rejected This request relating to the Residential Zone is not related to the focus of PC26, which is to implement the MDRS.
73.32	Support	Section 2 – Residential Zone	2.3	In addition to the proposed policies for the Residential Zone, the RVA considers that 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.	Seeks that a new Policy is included in the Policies of the Residential Zone section, as follows: <u>2.3.X Changing communities</u> <u>To provide for the diverse and changing residential needs of communities and 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>		That the point of submission is rejected This request relating to the Residential Zone is not related to the focus of PC26, which is to implement the MDRS.
73.33	Support	Section 2 – Residential Zone	2.3	A policy regarding the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites should be included in the District Plan.	Seeks that a new Policy is included in the Policies of the Residential Zone section that recognises the intensification opportunities provided for by larger sites: <u>2.3.X Larger sites</u>		That the point of submission is rejected This request relating to the Residential Zone is not related to the focus of PC26, which is to implement the MDRS.

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
					<u>Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within the Residential Zone by providing for more efficient use of those sites.</u>		
73.34	Support	Section 2 – Residential Zone	2.3	A policy to provide for and acknowledge the following should be integrated into the District Plan: - The diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the particular needs and characteristics of older persons; and - The functional and operational needs of retirement villages.	Seeks that a new Policy is included in the Policies of the Residential Zone section, as follows: <u>2.3.X Provision of housing for an ageing population</u> 1. Provide for a diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the particular needs and characteristics of older persons in residential areas, such as retirement villages. 2. Recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, including that they: a. May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services; b. Have a unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.		That the point of submission is rejected This request relating to the Residential Zone is not related to the focus of PC26, which is to implement the MDRS.
73.35	Support	Section 2 – Residential Zone	2.3	It would be appropriate to enable the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments.	Seeks that a new Policy is included in the Policies of the Residential Zone section, as follows: <u>2.3.X Role of density standards</u> Enable the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments.		That the point of submission is rejected This request relating to the Residential Zone is not related to the focus of PC26, which is to implement the MDRS.
76.7	Support	Section 2 – Residential Zone	2A.4.2.10 and 2A.4.2.11	Supports Outdoor Living Space Rules 2A.4.2.10 and 2A.4.2.11.	Supports Outdoor Living Space Rules 2A.4.2.10 and 2A.4.2.11.		Support noted
76.8	Amend	Section 2 – Residential Zone		Supports outlook space standards, however, seeks clarification and/or amendment to reduce the minimum 4m depth and 4m width where this could contradict with the minimum outdoor living area minimum 3m dimension that would likely cause issues of 1m encroachments over property boundaries for example.	Supports outlook space standards, however, seeks clarification and/or amendment to reduce the minimum 4m depth and 4m width where this could contradict with the minimum outdoor living area minimum 3m dimension.		That the point of submission is rejected The outlook space standards do not apply to the Residential Zone.
76.9	Amend	Section 2 – Residential Zone	2A.4.2.21	Supports Window to Street Rule 2A.4.2.21, however, I seek clarification and/or amendment to reduce the minimum 20% to 10% and/or include any upper-floor level glazing that overlooks the street to provide CPTED.	Supports window to street Rule 2A.4.2.21, however, seeks clarification and/or amendment to reduce the minimum 20% to 10% and/or include any upper-floor level glazing that overlooks the street to provide CPTED.	FS7 - support	That the point of submission is rejected The window to street rules do not apply to the Residential Zone.
76.10	Support	Section 2 – Residential Zone	2A.4.2.23 and 2A.4.2.24	Supports Landscape Area Rules 2A.4.2.23 and 2A.4.2.24.	Supports Landscape Area Rules 2A.4.2.23 and 2A.4.2.24.		Support noted
79.4	Amend	Section 2 – Residential Zone	Section 2	Amendments are sought to ensure consistency across the Kāinga Ora submission in relation to relocated building activities and papakāinga and marae developments.	Amendments are sought to ensure consistency across the Kāinga Ora submission in relation to relocated building activities and papakāinga and marae developments.		Amendment not supported This request relating to the Residential Zone is not related to the focus of PC26, which is to implement the MDRS.
79.76	Support in part	Section 2 - Residential Zone	Section 2- Residential Zones, 2.1 Introduction	Generally supports the proposed amendments to the existing 'residential zone' chapter and associated provisions as they generally reflect consequential changes required as a result of the Medium Density Residential Zone.	Include the provisions of Section 2.1 Introduction as notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission; consequential amendments will be required, in order to give effect to Kāinga Ora submission and the relief sought.		Amendment not supported This request relating to the Residential Zone is not related to the focus of PC26, which is to implement the MDRS.
79.79	Oppose	Section 2 - Residential Zone	Objective 2.3.1	Opposes the requirement to maintain and enhance existing character. This implies that both outcomes must be achieved at the same time. The character of a residential environment changes over time through development that reflects the planned outcomes of the zone, which will be inconsistent with objective 2.3.1 as proposed.	Amend Objective 2.3.1 as follows: Objective-Key Elements of residential character 2.3.1 To maintain and, <u>where appropriate</u> enhance the existing elements of the Residential Zone that give each town, village or settlement its own character, <u>in accordance the planned outcomes for the zone.</u>		That the point of submission is rejected This request relating to the Residential Zone is not related to the focus of PC26, which is to implement the MDRS.

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
79.80	Oppose	Section 2 - Residential Zone	Policy 2.3.2.1 Building Setback	Opposes the requirement to maintain predominant existing building setbacks within neighbourhoods, noting the MDRS requires yard setbacks that may differ to existing neighbourhood development and the residential environment will change over time. Seeks that policy 2.3.2.1 is amended to meet the requirements of the NPS-UD.	Amend Policy 2.3.2.1 as follows: Policy - Building setback: road boundary 2.3.2.1 All buildings shall be designed and setback from roads in a manner which: (a) <u>Achieves the planned urban environment of the zone.</u> Maintains the predominant building setback within the neighbourhood; ...	FS5 – support FS6 - support	That the point of submission is rejected This request relating to the Residential Zone is not related to the focus of PC26, which is to implement the MDRS.
79.81	Oppose in part	Section 2 - Residential Zone	Policy 2.3.2.4 Building Setback	Oppose the requirement for development to ensure that there is no loss in privacy, sunlight or daylight in adjoining properties, noting that maximising the development potential on a site will result in a particular level of loss in privacy, sunlight and/or daylight.	Amend Policy 2.3.2.4 as follows: 2.3.2.4 A reduced setback from a side boundary may be acceptable where it (a)... Provided that there is no loss a <u>reasonable standard</u> of privacy, sunlight or daylight on adjoining properties <u>is achieved</u> , and where sufficient area is maintained on site for outdoor living...	FS5 – support FS6 - support	That the point of submission is rejected This request relating to the Residential Zone is not related to the focus of PC26, which is to implement the MDRS.

4.9 Definitions (see s42a report - Topic 4.9 pgs 115 to 118)

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
38.2	Support	Definitions	Definition	Supports the definition of qualifying matter	Retain definition of qualifying matter		Support noted
47.31	Support in Part	Definitions	Definitions	It is paramount to Fire and Emergency that the infrastructure capacity assessment includes an assessment of the flows in relation to firefighting water supply and that flow be in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008 (SNZ PAS 4509:2008) to ensure the proposed development can be adequately serviced.	Add a new definition for infrastructure capacity assessment and include the requirement for a suitably qualified and experienced person to demonstrate that the proposed subdivision or development can be adequately serviced in accordance with SNZ PAS 4509:2008.	FS5 – oppose FS6 - oppose	Amendment supported The following definitions are recommended: Infrastructure Capacity Assessment means an assessment of the capacity of an existing water, wastewater, or stormwater network to determine if there is enough capacity for a proposed development, or to define the requirements for network upgrades that would need to be implemented for the development to be approved. The exact requirements for an Infrastructure Capacity Assessment should be discussed and agreed with WDC on a case-by-case basis. A Suitably Qualified and Experienced Person to prepare an Infrastructure Capacity Assessment means a Chartered Engineer (or equivalent) experienced in the planning and design of three waters networks who is competent to carry out the assessment of development impacts on three waters networks. It should be noted that Council may require the use of a nominated Consultant to carry out hydraulic modelling on behalf of Council for the purpose of a capacity assessment, but developers may wish to engage their own Engineer to assess on their own behalf.
49.16	Amend	Definitions	Definitions	Further clarity is required surrounding the definition of a suitable qualified and experienced person. As these will be included as part of the AEE, it is assumed these assessments will be assessed by the processing planner. It is considered that this could result in inconsistency of approach due to experience, qualifications, time etc.	Amend Definitions section to include a definition of a suitably qualified and experienced person. And any consequential amendments or alternative relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.		Amendment supported The following definitions are recommended: A Suitably Qualified and Experienced Person to prepare an Infrastructure Capacity Assessment means a Chartered Engineer (or equivalent) experienced in the planning and design of three waters networks who is competent to carry out the assessment of development impacts on three waters networks. It should be noted that Council may require the use of a nominated Consultant to carry out hydraulic modelling on behalf of Council for the purpose of a capacity assessment, but developers may wish to engage their own Engineer to assess on their own behalf.
55.1	Oppose	Definitions	Part Definitions	Request an additional definition of 'Community corrections activity' consistent with the NPS must standard definition. Intensification and population growth in urban areas create more demand for these type of facilities.	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>	FS8 - support	That the point of submission is rejected The Waipa Plan is yet to be aligned with the National Planning Standards.

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
55.4	Support	Definitions	All	The Operative District Plan currently includes definitions for "residential activity" and "dwelling" which PC26 has not proposed to amend. This collective package of definitions appropriately covers residential activities with support that Ara Poutama provides in the community.	Retain the existing definitions related to "residential activity" and "dwelling".		Support noted
55.6	Support	Definitions	All	The Operative District Plan currently includes definitions for "residential activity" and "dwelling" which PC26 has not proposed to amend. This collective package of definitions appropriately covers residential activities with support that Ara Poutama provides in the community. The proposed changes to the Residential Zone Section, together with the retention of the existing "residential activity" and "dwelling" definitions (and associated provisions elsewhere in the Operative District Plan) will enable Ara Poutama to implement residential activities with support, subject to an appropriate regulatory framework, within the Waipā District.	Retain all provisions throughout the Operative District Plan and PC26 sections relating to "residential activities" and "dwellings".	FS8 - support	Support noted
63.14	Amend	Definitions	Definitions	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.	Add a new definition to Part B: Definitions as follows: <u>Transport Network / Transportation Network</u> Means all public rail, public roads, public pedestrian and cycling facilities, public transport, and associated public infrastructure. It includes: train stations; bus stops; bus shelters; and park and ride areas serving train stations.	FS3 – support FS8 - oppose	Amendment supported This term is used extensively in the ODP and in PC26 and the proposed definition is considered consistent with other examples.
79.1	Amend	Definitions	Definitions	Amendments are sought to Part B-Definitions to include a definition of Papakāinga.	Amendments are sought to Part B-Definitions to include a definition of Papakāinga.		Amendment not supported As 'papakāinga development' is already defined in the Plan it is not considered that a separate definition for 'papakāinga' would add any value.
79.51	Support in part	Definitions	2.1 Definitions	Supports the definitions which are in accordance with the Resource Management 'Enabling Housing Supply' Amendment Act ('Housing Supply Act').	Retain the proposed definition for 'Intensification Planning Instrument' as notified.		Support noted
79.52	Support in part	Definitions	2.1 Definitions	Supports the definitions which are in accordance with the Resource Management 'Enabling Housing Supply' Amendment Act ('Housing Supply Act').	Retain the proposed definition for 'Intensification Streamlined Planning Process' as notified.		Support noted
79.53	Support in part	Definitions	2.1 Definitions	Supports the definitions which are in accordance with the Resource Management 'Enabling Housing Supply' Amendment Act ('Housing Supply Act').	Retain the proposed definition for 'Medium Density Residential Standards' as notified.		Support noted
79.54	Support in part	Definitions	2.1 Definitions	Supports the definitions which are in accordance with the Resource Management 'Enabling Housing Supply' Amendment Act ('Housing Supply Act').	Retain the proposed definition for 'Qualifying Matter' as notified.		Support noted
79.55	Support in part	Definitions	2.1 Definitions	Supports the definitions which are in accordance with the Resource Management 'Enabling Housing Supply' Amendment Act ('Housing Supply Act').	Retain the proposed definition for 'Relevant Residential Zone' as notified.		Support noted
79.56	Support in part	Definitions	2.1 Definitions	Supports the definitions which are in accordance with the Resource Management 'Enabling Housing Supply' Amendment Act ('Housing Supply Act').	Retain the proposed definition for 'Te Ture Whaimana' as notified.		Support noted
79.57	Support in part	Definitions	2.1 Definitions	Supports the definitions which are in accordance with the Resource Management 'Enabling Housing Supply' Amendment Act ('Housing Supply Act'). Kāinga Ora seeks deletion of "Compact Housing" to give effect to the relief sought in the Kāinga Ora submission.	Delete the definition for 'Compact Housing'		Amendment supported Part of the Compact Housing provisions were retained in error and are recommended to be deleted.

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
79.58	Support in part	Definitions	2.1 Definitions	Supports the definitions which are in accordance with the Resource Management 'Enabling Housing Supply' Amendment Act ('Housing Supply Act'). Kāinga Ora seeks deletion of 'Fortified Site' to give effect to the relief sought in the Kāinga Ora submission.	Delete the definition for 'Fortified site'.		That the point of submission is rejected Fortified Site rules have not been changed by PC26. They remain a Prohibited Activity in the Residential Zone.
79.59	Support in part	Definitions	2.1 Definitions	Supports the definitions which are in accordance with the Resource Management 'Enabling Housing Supply' Amendment Act ('Housing Supply Act'). Kāinga Ora seeks a definition for Papakāinga included into the District Plan.	Insert a definition for Papakāinga which is absent within the District Plan, as follows: <u>Papakāinga:</u> <u>A development by tangata whenua established to be occupied by tangata whenua for residential activities and ancillary social, cultural, economic, conservation and/or recreation activities to support the cultural, environmental, and economic wellbeing of tangata whenua.</u>		That the point of submission is rejected As 'papakāinga development' is already defined in the Plan it is not considered that a separate definition for 'papakāinga' would add any value.
79.236	Oppose	Definitions	Definitions	Opposes the identification of fortified sites as a prohibited activity.	Opposes the identification of fortified sites as a separate activity, including the associated definition.		That the point of submission is rejected Fortified Site rules have not been changed by PC26. They remain a Prohibited Activity in the Residential Zone.

4.10 Design Guidance (see s42a report - Topic 4.10 pgs 118 to 119)

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Sub	Response
28.2	Support in Part	Design guidance	All	The council should restrict the types of building allowed, to remove the 'sausage house' style or other non-desirable type of build.	The council should restrict the type of building allowed to remove types out of keeping with the existing character.		That the point of submission is rejected It is considered difficult to strengthen the design guidelines further as they apply to the MDRZ without restricting development in the MDRZ.
29.2	Support in Part	Design guidance	All	New developments should keep with the existing character of the region.	The council should restrict the types of building allowed, to remove the 'sausage house' style or other non-desirable type of build.		That the point of submission is rejected It is considered difficult to strengthen the design guidelines further as they apply to the MDRZ without restricting development in the MDRZ.
61.1	Support in Part	Design guidance	All	The proposed plan change has not placed any emphasis on good urban design. In high density residential situations, good urban design is key in creating spaces that people are proud to live, work and play in that have good interface with the streetscape and surrounding land uses as well as connections for walking and cycling. This will go a long way in addressing concerns around character and amenity that come with building at a higher density.	Introduce criteria relating to good urban design. This criteria should include graphic illustrations and strong guidance within the District Plan that illustrates the desired outcomes when undertaking medium to high density residential development. Greenfield subdivisions and new dwellings should also be included in these criteria, so a consistent approach is taken towards development.		That the point of submission is rejected It is considered difficult to strengthen the design guidelines further as they apply to the MDRZ without restricting development in the MDRZ.
70.44	Oppose	Design guidance	2A.1.8	Opposes the reference to "design outcomes" and need for development within areas subject to structure plans to be undertaken in general accordance with the requirements of structure plans. The submitter considers these outcomes/ requirements are inconsistent with the intent of the Enabling Housing Act and NPSUD as they inappropriately and unnecessarily restrict development	Delete Section 2A.1.8 or any other relief that addresses the submitter's concerns.		That the point of submission is rejected It is considered that structure planning remains a valid approach for carrying out Council's functions under sections 30 and 31 of the RMA.
70.79	Oppose in Part	Design guidance	2A.3.7	Opposes the reference to "urban design principles" as it is unclear what these encompass and may be inconsistent with the MDRS.	Amend Objective 2A.3.7 to delete any reference to urban design principles.		That the point of submission is rejected This requests a fundamental change to the way design guidelines are contained and referenced in the Plan that appears to go beyond what PC26 has proposed in relation to design guidelines which is limited to the addition of the MDRZ and amendments to DG1.
79.22	Oppose	Design guidance	Various	Seeks that references to Design Guides are deleted across the plan and provisions are updated to reflect design outcomes sought, external design guides are referenced as a guidance note, or guidance is streamlined and simplified. Kāinga Ora seeks the design guides are guidance that is provided outside of the Plan and can be updated on best practice without the need to undertake a Schedule 1 of the RMA process	Seeks that any design guide are removed out of the District Plan and provisions are updated to reflect design outcomes sought.	FS5 – support FS6 – support	That the point of submission is rejected This requests a fundamental change to the way design guidelines are contained and referenced in the Plan that appears to go beyond what PC26 has proposed in

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Sub	Response
				every time it needs to be updated. Kāinga Ora seeks any design guides are removed out of the District Plan.			relation to design guidelines which is limited to the addition of the MDRZ and amendments to DG1.
79.47	Oppose	Design guidance	Appendices DG1 to DG8 Design Guidelines	Design Guides or design guidelines in the Plan act as de facto rules to be complied with and any policy or rule that would require development to comply with such design guidelines are opposed. Kāinga Ora alternatively seeks and supports design guidelines sitting outside the Plan as guidance regarding best practice design outcomes (they should be treated as a non-statutory tool).	Design Guides and design guidelines be removed from within the District Plan; be treated as non-statutory tool, outside of the District Plan; and all references to the Design Guides and design guidelines be deleted.		That the point of submission is rejected This requests a fundamental change to the way design guidelines are contained and referenced in the Plan that appears to go beyond what PC26 has proposed in relation to design guidelines which is limited to the addition of the MDRZ and amendments to DG1.
79.48	Support in part	Design guidance	Appendices DG1 to DG8 Design Guidelines	If there is content of a Design Guide or design guideline that Council wants in the Plan, Kāinga Ora seeks that these are relocated within a specific rule, matter of discretion or assessment criterion. Where particular design outcomes are to be achieved, these should be specified in matters of discretion or assessment.	Where particular design outcomes are to be achieved, these should be specifically stated in matters of discretion or assessment.	FS5 - oppose FS6 - oppose	That the point of submission is rejected This requests a fundamental change to the way design guidelines are contained and referenced in the Plan that appears to go beyond what PC26 has proposed in relation to design guidelines which is limited to the addition of the MDRZ and amendments to DG1.
79.49	Support in part	Design guidance	Appendices DG1 to DG8 Design Guidelines	Design Guides or design guidelines in the Plan act as de facto rules to be complied with and any policy or rule that would require development to comply with such design guidelines are opposed.	If the Council does not provide the relief sought, in deleting the Design Guides and design guidelines and references to such guidelines in the District Plan, Kāinga Ora seeks that the design guidelines are amended, simplified and written in a manner that is easy to follow. The outcomes sought in the guidelines should read as desired requirements with sufficient flexibility to provide for a design that fits and works on site, rather than rules that a consent holder must follow and adhere to. Otherwise, it is considered that there is no flexibility and scope to create a design that fits with specific site characteristics and desired built form development.		That the point of submission is rejected This requests a fundamental change to the way design guidelines are contained and referenced in the Plan that appears to go beyond what PC26 has proposed in relation to design guidelines which is limited to the addition of the MDRZ and amendments to DG1.
79.50	Support in part	Design guidance	Appendices DG1 to DG8 Design Guidelines	Design Guides or design guidelines in the Plan act as de facto rules to be complied with and any policy or rule that would require development to comply with such design guidelines are opposed.	The submitter seeks the opportunity to review the Design guidelines in Appendices DG1 to DG8 if they are to remain a statutory document.		The design guidelines are not proposed to be amended.

4.11 Formatting (see s42a report - Topic 4.14 pgs 121 to 122)

Sub point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Sub	Response
30.35	Support in Part	Formatting	1.1.39	The provision uses "currently" to refer to current town plans. We recommend the provision instead use dates, i.e., "as of September 2022" to ensure that in the future the plan is read in the appropriate context.	Amend provision as follows: " <u>As of September 2022, there are currently</u> town plans..." or wording to the same effect.		Amendment supported
30.37	Support in Part	Formatting	21.1.2A.1(a)	Incorrect spelling of "affects".	Amend "effects" to "affects".		Amendment supported
30.38	Support in Part	Formatting	21.1.2A.3 (a)(i)	Use consistent spelling for words like "optimise".	Amend spelling of 'optimized'.		Amendment supported
32.16	Amend	Formatting	All	Given the complexity of the Act and the limited timeframes available to Council it may be necessary to make further amendments to ensure that the rule numbering and internal cross referencing is correct and to ensure that the wording and format of new provisions is consistent with the District Plan.	Such further amendments to PC26 that are necessary to ensure accurate and workable numbering and cross referencing and to retain consistency with existing provisions.		Amendment supported

32.17	Amend	Formatting	2A.4.1.3(b)	Rule 2A.4.1.3(b) needs to be clarified so both the activity and the matters for discretion are clear and to ensure consistency with subsequent rules.	Amend Rule 2A.4.1.3(b) as follows: Four or more dwellings per site outside of the Infrastructure Constraint Qualifying Matter Overlay. Activities that fail to comply with this rule will require a resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity with discretion being restricted over. Discretion will be restricted to the following matters:		Amendment supported
32.18	Amend	Formatting	2A.4.1.3(c)	Rule 2A.4.1.3(c) needs clarifying so both the activity and the matters for discretion are clear, and to ensure consistent with subsequent rules.	Amend Rule 2A.4.1.3(c) as follows: Three or more dwellings per site within the Infrastructure Constraint Qualifying Matter Overlay. Activities that fail to comply with this rule will require a resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity with discretion being restricted over. Discretion will be restricted to the following matters:		Amendment supported
32.19	Amend	Formatting	2A.4.2.5	Rule 2A.4.2.5 refers to a standard without stating the applicable rule number. Citing the applicable rule number will assist in clear and certain interpretation of the rules.	Amend Rule 2A.4.2.5 as follows: This standard Rule 2A.4.2.4 does not apply.		Amendment supported
32.20	Amend	Formatting	2A.4.2.6	A cross-reference to the rule number referred to in Rule 2A.4.2.6 will assist in clear and certain interpretation of the rules	Amend Rule 2A.4.2.6 as follows: The minimum building setback depth listed above stated in Rule 2A.4.2.4 is modified in the following locations: ...		Amendment supported
32.21	Amend	Formatting	15.5.1.1	Subparagraphs (e) and (f) of Rule 18.5.1.1 should be renumbered to be subparagraphs of Rule 18.5.1.1(d)	Renumber 18.5.1.1(e) to 18.5.1.1(d)(i) and renumber 18.5.1.1(f) to 18.5.1.1(d)(ii).		Amendment supported
32.22	Amend	Formatting	18.5.2.10 18.5.2.16	PC26 deleted some words from Rule 18.5.2.10 and 18.5.2.16 but retained wording that makes the Rule unclear. Deleting the word 'that' from the first sentence of these Rules will clarify the intent.	Amend Rule 18.5.2.10 and Rule 18.5.2.16 as follows: "The maximum amount of Financial Contribution that taken for connection to...".		Amendment supported
65.11	Amend	Formatting	2A.4.2.25-30, .55, .57-59	Rules 2A.4.2.25-30, .55, .57-59 should go at the end of the rules for the zone, as they are all solely site-specific. Otherwise, zone-wide standards can get lost/missed.	Amend order of rules so that those listed (2A.4.2.25-30, .55, .57-59) are last within Section 2A.		Amendment supported
79.151	Support in part	Formatting	2A.2.13	There is inconsistent numbering for 2A.1.13.	There is inconsistent numbering for 2A.1.13.		Amendment supported

4.12 Other (see s42a report - Topic 4.11 pgs 119 to 120)

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
28.3	Support in Part	Other	All	The submission period should be extended to match Hamilton council in order to adequately take note of any helpful information.	The council should extend the submission period to match that of Hamilton City Council.		That the point of submission is rejected Submission period has passed.
29.3	Support in Part	Other	All	The submission period should be extended to match Hamilton council in order to adequately take note of any helpful information.	The council should extend the submission period.		That the point of submission is rejected Submission period has passed.

5 Rezoning

5.1 Rezoning – Deferred residential zones to ‘live’ MDRZ (see s42a report - Topic 5.1 pgs 122 to 123)

Sub Point	Position	Topic	Provisions	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Further Submissions	Response
70.125	Oppose	Planning Maps	Deferred Zones on Planning Maps	The submitter questions why the Waipā District Plan has retained several large areas of land zoned ‘Deferred Residential Zone’, ‘Deferred Medium Density Residential Zone’, and ‘Deferred Commercial Zone’. Given the housing crisis, and the Enabling Housing Act legislation that has been passed to address this crisis, the retention of these ‘deferred’ zones is questioned as this land could be made available now, as part of Plan Change 26, for residential and retirement village development to increase the supply of developable land.	Reconsider the retention of the deferred zones and rezone the land for immediate development as appropriate. The submitter also seeks that the deferred Residential Zoned Land is rezoned Medium Density Residential Zone.		That the point of submission is rejected This request to ‘live’ zone post-2035 growth cells, on the outskirts of Cambridge and Te Awamutu if enabled under PC26 would represent out of sequence development – that is unplanned. The request would be inconsistent with the NPS-UD, which Waipā along with its Future Proof partners has sought to respond to in the updated strategy, in confirming the preferred land use pattern across the sub-region and its associated processes to manage growth.
73.125	Oppose	Planning Maps	Deferred Zones on Planning Maps	The submitter questions why the Waipā District Plan has retained several large areas of land zoned ‘Deferred Residential Zone’, ‘Deferred Medium Density Residential Zone’, and ‘Deferred Commercial Zone’. Given the housing crisis, and the Enabling Housing Act legislation that has been passed to address this crisis, the retention of these ‘deferred’ zones is questioned as this land could be made available now, as part of Plan Change 26, for residential and retirement village development to increase the supply of developable land.	Reconsider the retention of the deferred zones and rezone the land for immediate development as appropriate. The submitter also seeks that the deferred Residential Zoned Land is rezoned Medium Density Residential Zone.		That the point of submission is rejected This request to ‘live’ zone post-2035 growth cells, on the outskirts of Cambridge and Te Awamutu if enabled under PC26 would represent out of sequence development – that is unplanned. The request would be inconsistent with the NPS-UD, which Waipā along with its Future Proof partners has sought to respond to in the updated strategy, in confirming the preferred land use pattern across the sub-region and its associated processes to manage growth.