

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Plan Change 21: Greenbelt Residential Zone & Urban Growth



Publicly Notified 26 March 2009



1. INTRODUCTION

This document, Summary of Submissions, summarises the decisions requested or inferred for each submission received on proposed Plan Change 21. Where no decision has been specifically requested, Council Officers have where possible, inferred the decision requested from the text of the submission.

Proposed Plan Change 21 was publicly notified on 10 January 2009 with the period for submissions for closing on 27 February 2009.

A total of 92 submissions were received in relation to proposed Plan Change 21 and this report provides a summary of those submissions, in accordance with Clause 7 of the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act 1991.

This report provides the names and addresses of submitters so that they may be served a copy of further submissions.

Copies of the full submissions can be inspected at the following locations during opening hours:
during opening hours:

- Horowhenua District Council – 126 Oxford Street, Levin
- Foxton Customer Service Centre – Main Street, Foxton
- Horowhenua Public Libraries – Levin, Foxton & Shannon
- Tokomaru Store – 2 Tokomaru Road, Tokomaru

The full submission can also be viewed or downloaded from the Council website www.horowhenua.govt.nz.

2. FURTHER SUBMISSIONS

Any person may make a Further Submission on proposed Plan Change 21, however, in accordance with Clause 8 of the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act 1991, Further Submissions may only support or oppose those submissions already made. In supporting or opposing a submission, a Further Submission may provide reasons for supporting or opposing, however, only issues that are related to those that have already been identified in a submission may be raised.

Any Further Submission should be made on Form 6 of the Resource Management (Forms, Fees, Procedures) Regs 2003 or closely follow this format. Failure to include all the necessary information or complete the form correctly may prevent the Further Submission from being able to be considered. Form 6 Further Submission forms can be obtained from the Council Service Centres and Public libraries listed earlier or downloaded from the Council website www.horowhenua.govt.nz.

Further Submissions must be in writing and be received by the Horowhenua District before **5:00 pm on Friday 27 April 2009**. Further Submissions can be

Delivered to: Horowhenua District Council,
126 Oxford Street, Levin

Posted to: Chief Executive, Horowhenua District
Council, Private Bag 4002, Levin 5540

Faxed to: (06) 366 0983

Emailed to: districtplan@horowhenua.govt.nz

Any person making a Further Submission on proposed Plan Change 21 is required by law to serve a copy of it to the person who made the original submission to which the Further Submission relates within five (5) working days of serving the Further Submission to the Horowhenua District Council.

Section 5 of this Report provides the address for service for each person or organisation that has made a submission on proposed Plan Change 20.

3. PROCESS FROM HERE

The current process of public notification and calling for submissions and further submissions is part of the statutory consultation process required to be undertaken for any plan change.

Once the Further Submission period has closed (27 April 2009), a Planning Report identifying and summarising all submissions will be produced. This Planning Report will provide an impartial assessment of the merits of the Submissions, including whether the issues are valid under the relevant legislation. The Planning Report may also contain any recommended amendment to the proposed Plan Changes to address matters raised by submitters.

Before a formal Council hearing is held, a Pre-hearing meeting may be held where Council Officer's consider that such a meeting would help clarify, mediate or facilitate a resolution on any matters raised in the submissions.

The Planning Report will be circulated to all submitters and further submitters in advance of the formal Council hearing.

At least 10 working days notice will be given of the hearing date.

Anyone can attend the Council hearing, however only those submitters who have indicated that they wish to be heard will have the opportunity to speak about the matters raised in their submission at the hearing, or they can nominate a representative or consultant to speak on their behalf.

The Hearings Committee will consider all relevant matters before making a recommendation to Council for a decision.

All submitters will receive notice of the decision on the Plan Change and the reasons for why the decision was made. The Council will also publicly notify the decision.

Any submitter who is not satisfied with the decision can lodge an appeal with the Environment Court.

4. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

The Council Planning staff are able to provide additional information on making a Further Submission or the Plan Change process. Additional information including the Plan Change documents, is available from the Council website (www.horowhenua.govt.nz).

5. SUBMITTERS

The following table provides the names and addresses for service of all those who made a submission in relation to proposed Plan Change 21. The purpose of this table is to enable any person who makes a Further Submission on Plan Change 21 to meet the requirements of the law and send a copy of their Further Submission to the person who made the original submission that they have made a Further Submission on, within 5 working days of submitting their Further Submission to the Horowhenua District Council.

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Address for Service	To be Heard
21/001	New Zealand Historic Places Trust/Pouhere Taonga	Rakesh Mistry Heritage Advisor-Planning New Zealand Historic Places Trust/Pouhere Taonga PO Box 19173 Wellington	Yes
21/002	Te Mauri O Rangitaane O Manawatu	Paul Horton Environmental Officer Te Mauri O Rangitaane O Manawatu PO Box 1341 Palmerston North	Yes
21/003	R. Patel & V. Muxlow	45 Friend Street Karori Wellington 6012	No
21/004	Reginald Fowles	32 East Road Shannon 4821	Yes
21/005	Sonia Horn	216 Park Avenue Waitarere Beach Levin 5510	No

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Address for Service	To be Heard
21/006	K. Stevenson	22 Drake Street Waikawa Beach RD 31 Levin 5573	No
21/007	William Morrison & Sheila Norton	133 Winara Avenue Waikanae 5036	No
21/008	Alan Stevenson	24 Drake Street Waikawa Beach RD 31 Levin 5573	No
21/009	Beverley Harris	6 Wairiri Street Ohau RD 20 Levin 5570	Yes
21/010	James & Lynn Wethey	15a Waru Street Khandallah Wellington 6035	No
21/011	Steve & Maree Grant	PO Box 29 Manakau 5541	No
21/012	Carol & Phil Wallington	7 Arthur Street Waikawa Beach RD 31 Levin 5573	No
21/013	Arthur Day	14 Sarah Street Waikawa Beach RD 31 Levin 5573	No
21/014	Bruce Jenkins	69a Chamberlain Road Karori Wellington	No
21/015	G & E Williams Consultants Ltd	RD 1 Otaki	Yes

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Address for Service	To be Heard
21/016	Mr Richard Walker	RD 31 Manakau Levin 5573	No
21/017	Mrs Irene Walker	RD 31 Waikawa Beach Levin 5573	No
21/018	Mr Alan Prentice	21 James Street Waikawa Beach RD 31 Levin 5573	Yes
21/019	Stephen Crombie	18 Espin Crescent Karori Wellington 6012	No
21/020	Mr John Hammond	RD 31 Manakau Levin 5573	No
21/021	Mr William Powell	654 Waikawa Beach Road RD 31 Levin 5573	No
21/022	San Souci Trust	Susan Ferguson & Desmond Coombes San Souci Trust C/- PDC Manakau Levin 5543	No
21/023	Craig & Fiona Wallace	PO Box 631 Levin 5540	Yes
21/024	Diana McGill & Adam Herlihy	228 Park Avenue Waitarere Beach Levin	No
21/025	Albert Burgess	31 Fairfield Road Levin 5510	No

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Address for Service	To be Heard
21/026	Walter Dalgliesh	6 Waipuna Grove RD 1 Levin 5571	Yes
21/027	Horowhenua District Council	David McCorkindale Horowhenua District Council Private Bag 4002 Levin 5540	Yes
21/028	Fish & Game New Zealand	PJ Teal Regional Manager Fish & Game New Zealand PO Box 1325 Palmerston North 4440	Yes
21/029	Matthew Walker	5 Shannon Street Mt Victoria Wellington	No
21/030	Lesley-Anne Walker	RD 31 Manakau Levin 5573	Yes
21/031	Cameron Walker	183 Buckley Road Melrose Wellington 6023	No
21/032	Mandy Cumming	362 Hokio Sand Road Levin 5571	No
21/033	Higgins Group Holdings Ltd	Richard Barton Environmental Manager Higgins Group Holdings Ltd Private Bag 11411, Manawatu Mail Centre Palmerston North 4442	Yes

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Address for Service	To be Heard
21/034	Waikawa Beach Ratepayers Association	Erica Wyatt Waikawa Beach Ratepayers Association 24 Manga-Pirau Street RD 31 Levin 5573	Yes
21/035	BJAZ Properties Ltd	BL & JM Murray BJAZ Properties Ltd 75 Seaview Road Paraparaumu	Yes
21/036	Patricia Berrett	24 Manga-Pirau Street RD 31 Levin 5573	Yes
21/037	David & Karen Smyth	13 Rolleston Street Mt Cook Wellington 6021	No
21/038	Kathleen Gilberd	12 Poutini Street Wanganui 4500	No
21/039	Mark Gilberd	PO Box 6025 Awapuni Palmerston North 4412	No
21/040	Alan & Belinda Hanlon	RD 31 Levin 5573	Yes
21/041	Francee Thompson	79 Shannon Street Mt Victoria Wellington 6011	No
21/042	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	Jenna Fincham, Burton Consultants Ltd PO Box 33 817 Takapuna North Shore City 0740 Auckland	Yes

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Address for Service	To be Heard
21/043	Frank Ave'Res	10 Manga-Pirau Street Waikawa Beach RD 31 Levin 5573	Yes
21/044	John Goldsmith	10 Manga Pirau Street Waikawa Beach Manakau Levin 5573	NS
21/045	Diana Mills	71 Kennedy Drive Levin 5510	Yes
21/046	Frank Williams	89 Miro Street Trenthan Upper Hutt 5018	No
21/047	Eyolepro-Ductions	Christopher Kilmister Eyolepro-Ductions 20 Meadowcourt Drive Papatoetoe Auckland 1705	No
21/048	Rosalie Kilmister	32 Puru Crescent Lyll Bay Wellington 6022	No
21/049	Tony Katsos	11 Puru Crescent Lyll Bay Wellington 6022	No
21/050	Margrita Averages	190 Bath Street Levin 5510	No
21/051	Lester Curley	Flat 2 37 Guthrie Street Waiwhetu	No
21/052	Murray Scott	Flat 4 766 Fergusson Drive Upper Hutt 5018	No

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Address for Service	To be Heard
21/053	Carolanna Anderton-Smith	F2 Seymour Flats 766 Fergusson Drive Upper Hutt 5018	No
21/054	Lakeview Farm Ltd	Peter Everton Lakeview Farm Ltd PO Box 1012 Levin 5540	Yes
21/055	Horowhenua District Council	Sue Graham Horowhenua District Council Private Bag 4002 Levin 5540	No
21/056	Valerie Walker	54 Raukawa Drive Mayfield Bethlehem Tauranga 3011	No
21/057	Trevor Walker	54 Raukawa Drive Bethlehem Tauranga 3011	No
21/058	P.M. Goodwin	Mike Mackiggan Landlink Ltd PO Box 370 Waikanae 6454	Yes
21/059	TGTC Ltd	Mike Mackiggan Landlink Ltd PO Box 370 Waikanae 6454	Yes
21/060	Impact Commercial Properties Ltd	Rodger Taylor Impact Commercial Properties Ltd 85 Main Street Foxton	Yes
21/061	George & Moira Bryce	PO Box 665 Levin 5540	Yes

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Address for Service	To be Heard
21/062	Russell & Barbara Woodley	PO Box 68 Levin 5540	Yes
21/063	David & Lorene Burdan	114 Kawiu Road Levin 5510	Yes
21/064	Tarrant Family Trust	Peter McKenzie Tarrant Family Trust 472 State Highway 1 Ohau RD 20 Levin 5570	Yes
21/065	Barry Smith	36 Manga-Pirau Street RD 31 Levin 5573	No
21/066	Horowhenua District Growers Association	George Sue Horowhenua District Growers Association PO Box 1113 Levin 5540	Yes
21/067	John Hewitson	4 Cathryn Street Waikawa Beach RD 31 Levin 5573	Yes
21/068	John Martin	48 Martins Road Manakau RD 31 Levin 5573	Yes
21/069	Peter Bolton	PO Box 434 Levin 5540	No
21/070	Marilyn Blenkhorn	81 Lindsay Road Levin 5510	Yes

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Address for Service	To be Heard
21/071	Truebridge Associates	Roger Truebridge Truebridge Associates 522 Queen Street Levin 5510	Yes
21/072	New Zealand Railways Corporation	Megan Fenney New Zealand Railways Corporation PO Box 593 Wellington 6011	Yes
21/073	Susette Playford	9 Ngati Huia Place Waitarere Levin 5510	Yes
21/074	Susanne Hanlon	7 Ngati Huia Place Waitarere Beach Levin 5510	Yes
21/075	Mr & Mrs Astwood	Lucy Cooper Lendrums PO Box 40 083 Upper Hutt 5140	Yes
21/076	Sidney & Jocelyn Thomas	90 Roslyn Road Levin 5510	Yes
21/077	Matt Hoggard	11A Churchill Street Kaikoura 7300	Yes
21/078	Judy Keall	1 Ihaka Hakuene Street Manakau RD 31 Levin 5573	Yes
21/079	Horticulture New Zealand	Chris Keenan Manager Resource Management and Environment Horticulture New Zealand PO Box 10232 Wellington	Yes

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Address for Service	To be Heard
21/080	MC ² Group Ltd	Mike Mackiggan Landlink Ltd PO Box 370 Waikanae 6454	Yes
21/081	Landlink Ltd	Mike Mackiggan Landlink Ltd PO Box 370 Waikanae 6454	Yes
21/082	Colyer Mair Assets Limited	Phil Hocquand Lowe Corporation Ltd PO Box 444 Hastings 4156	Yes
21/083	Horizons Regional Council	Greg Carlyon Horizons Regional Council Private Bag 11025 Manawatu Mail Centre Palmerston North 4442	Yes
21/084	Pritchard Group Ltd	Bryce Holmes Pritchard Group Ltd 20 Addington Road RD 1 Otaki	Yes
21/085	Graham Halstead/Maple Securities Ltd	Graham Halstead Maple Securities Ltd PO Box 28035 Wellington 6150	Yes
21/086	FRP Investments Ltd & FRP Agriculture Ltd	Paul Thomas Environmental Management Services PO Box 29024 Wellington	Yes

Submission Number	Submitter Name	Address for Service	To be Heard
21/087	Nathan Masters	9 Farnham Street Morningson Wellington	Yes
21/088	Woodhaven Gardens Ltd	John Clarke Woodhaven Gardens Ltd 44 Joblins Road RD 1 Levin 5571	No
21/089	Bill & Jenny Studd	23 Waru Street Khandallah Wellington 6035	No
21/090	LR & EJ Greer & GM & LM Purvis	857 Makerua Road RD 4 Palmerston North 4474	Yes
21/091	HW Richardson Group Ltd	Craig McKibbin Mitchell Partnerships PO Box 489 Dunedin	Yes
21/092	JW & JD Brown	Rhys Phillips/Alastair Seyb Cardno TCB PO Box 13142 Johnsonville Wellington 6440	Yes

NS = Not Specified

6. SUMMARY OF DECISIONS REQUESTED

Each decision requested as set out in this summary endeavours to identify the individual outcomes sought in the submission. This is to enable people to quickly ascertain whether any submission might be of interest to them. It is not a substitute for inspecting the submission itself where the matter may be of interest.

If, after inspecting the summary of decisions there are areas of interest, it is recommended that the full copies of the individual submissions are inspected.

Each submission has a unique number (i.e. 21/097), any Further Submission made must specify the number of the original submission that the Further Submission relates to. The unique submission number is also used to cross reference the address for service for all of the submitters contained in the following table.

The submissions are summarised in numerical order. Where it has been specified or is clear that the submission is either in support or opposition to the Plan Change this has been included in the table.

Submission No.	Submitter Name	Location/ Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
21/001	New Zealand Historic Places Trust <i>Pouhere Taonga</i>	Section 6A Objective 6A4.1 & Policy 6A4.2	Support	Supports Objective 6A4.1 and Policy 6A4.2 to achieve development that is efficient and takes place in a sustainable form with recommendations for further protection of historic sites and features. Some of the areas being rezoned for future residential development near the coastline rivers and lakes are associated with pre-European Maori settlement and early European settlement in the district. These areas contain a number of pre recorded archaeological sites and chances of encountering new sites are high. Supports the objective and policy initiatives.	That Section 6A be adopted including Objective 6A.4.1 and Policy 6A.4.2. That an archaeological assessment and cultural assessment of the areas of high likelihood of containing significant historical and archaeological sites be undertaken prior to confirming the structure plans to assess whether any of the areas being rezoned contain any significant historic heritage features that could be protected by the new structure plans.

Submission No.	Submitter Name	Location/ Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
21/001 Continued	New Zealand Historic Places Trust <i>Pouhere Taonga</i>	Rules 19A.2.22 & 19A.2.24	Support	Supports these performance standards in relation to the modification, demolition and alteration, modification of listed heritage features and sites of significance to Tangata Whenua with recommendations for further protection.	That Rules 19A.2.22 and 19A.2.24 be adopted and amended to require subdivision of a site containing a historic heritage resource to be a Discretionary Activity.
		Section 24A Assessment Criteria		Further specific criteria required for assessing the impact of subdivision criteria on historic heritage values in the Proposed Greenbelt Residential Zone	That new specific assessment criteria for assessing the impact of subdivision criteria on historic heritage values in accordance with the NZHPT SMHH Guidelines, in particular information sheet 20 are adopted, or alternatively adopt these guidelines as a non-regulatory method into the District Plan.
		Rules 14.4.1 (iii) & 15.4.1 (v)		These rules should be amended to refer to Historic Heritage as Proposed Plan Change 21 and the District Plan do not contain a definition of cultural features, whereas the RMA contains a comprehensive definition for historic heritage.	That Rule 14.4.1 (iii) and 15.4.1 (v) be amended to change "Cultural Heritage" to "Historic Heritage".
		Greenbelt Residential Subdivision Design Guide	Support	Supports the Design Guide as a useful tool in support of the objectives and policies of the District Plan to control the effects of subdivision on the rural environment. Specifically supports the protection and preservation of historic heritage values within a site to be subdivided but notes that there are no specific provisions in terms of guidelines in relation to this outcome.	That the "Horowhenua – Greenbelt Residential Subdivision Design Guide" be adopted with a section included on approaches to protect historic heritage features which could include; setting aside reserves, covenanting areas to protect historic heritage features or avoiding ground excavations by raising the natural ground level of building platforms to avoid impacting upon archaeological deposits. Other guidelines from NZHPT SMHH guidelines should also be included.
21/002	Tanenuiarangi o Manawatu Inc. (TMI)	Rule 19A.2.24		Recommending terminology adjustment	That the term "Maori" within Rule 19A.2.24 be changed to "iwi".

Submission No.	Submitter Name	Location/ Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
21/002 Continued	Tanenuiarangi o Manawatu Inc. (TMI)			<p>The need to reduce concerns that iwi may have with developments occurring near sites of significance or other areas of interest</p> <p>The need to reduce concerns that iwi may have with developments occurring near sites of significance or other areas of interest</p> <p>TMI feel that ongoing consultation needs to occur with each new development to outline and identify any significant impacts. Iwi will endeavour to notify Horowhenua District Council of sites prior to development.</p> <p>Use of archaeologists during the development in conjunction with an Accidental Archaeological Discovery Protocol to eradicate concerns that iwi may have with developments occurring near sites of significance or other areas of interest</p>	<p>That a discovery protocol for archaeological sites, activities and artefacts within this region is incorporated into the proposal. Any artefacts, or evidence of past human activity discovered through future developments related to the District Plan changes are to be protected in line with relevant legislation and the process of managing the site are undertaken in strict adherence to current legislation.</p> <p>That an Accidental Archaeological Discovery Protocol with TMI that has suitable measures that are consistent with iwi, current legislation and are formulated specifically for this plan is developed. Further consultation with the iwi authority will determine the contents of a protocol that are suitable for Rangitaane O Manawatu.</p> <p>Any development should not modify, remove or demolish any sites of significance to iwi, this means any site known or discovered during the development process.</p> <p>Provision for archaeologists (verified by the iwi authority) to be present during development on any areas sensitive to the iwi</p>

Submission No.	Submitter Name	Location/ Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
21/003	Rajesh Patel and Victoria Muxlow	Waitarere Beach – rezoning Map G	Oppose	Opposed to the re-zoning of this area of Waitarere Beach from Rural to Residential 2 as the submitter purchased their section with a view to retiring in this area with a level of privacy afforded by the neighbouring property being zoned Rural. This meant that the neighbouring property would not be permitted under the Rural rules to build a dwelling within 30 metres of the submitters dwelling. The submitter recently signed an approval form for this neighbour to subdivide their 5000m ² property down to a section of just over 2000m ² , secure in the knowledge that no dwelling could be built within 30 metres of their dwelling. If this area is re-zoned to Residential 2 this would mean that this neighbour would be permitted to build a dwelling 1.5 metres from their boundary and would result in a loss of privacy for the submitter.	That the current zone status of Rural for the top northern end of Waitarere Beach (area around Park Avenue) be retained
21/004	Reginald Fowles	Shannon – rezoning Map D	Oppose	Objects to the proposed rezoning of Rural land to Greenbelt Residential in Shannon on the grounds that the submitter purchased their home for the outlook it afforded. Submitter acknowledges Council's need to plan ahead to guide development but also acknowledges the right of the landowner to purchase land with a pleasing outlook having checked with Council for planned development without that outlook being put at risk by plan changes. Submitter feels their land would be devalued by the proposed re-zoning. Notes that the property owners	Inferred – that the current Rural zoning of this area is retained. Alternatively a minimum 15 year time buffer before any building could be imposed. This would give all concerned parties time to deal with the situation.

Submission No.	Submitter Name	Location/ Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
21/004 Continued	Reginald Fowles			along East Road are all in their sixties and would be more affected as they are nearing retirement age and are more settled in the area than younger people. Also notes that area to be rezoned is a flood prone area.	
21/005	Sonia Horn	Waitarere Beach – Rezoning Map G	Oppose	Opposed to the rezoning of this area of Waitarere Beach from Rural to Residential 2 as the submitter believes the rural character and associated land use should be retained. Submitter purchased the property for the rural lifestyle.	That the current Rural zone status for the land at the top northern end of Waitarere Beach (area around Park Avenue) be retained.
21/006	K. Stevenson	Waikawa Beach – Rezoning Map K	Oppose	Opposed to Plan Change 21 as it relates to rezoning two blocks of rural land, on the grounds that; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any further subdivision will irrevocably change the special nature of Waikawa Beach. • Any further subdivision will adversely affect Waikawa Beach's estuary and coastal environment, and associated wildlife breeding habitat. • The climate change issues and associated predicted rises in sea level have not been adequately addressed • North of Drake Street the river is prone to flooding. • Drake St. and Waikawa Beach Road were not designed for an increase in traffic. 	That the Rural land encompassing Waikawa Beach not be rezoned to Greenbelt Residential land.

Submission No.	Submitter Name	Location/ Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
21/007	William Morrison & Sheila Norton	Ohau – Rezoning Map I	Support	<p>Supports the rezoning of areas in Ohau to be rezoned Greenbelt Residential but wishes this area to be extended to incorporate the submitter's property and to provide services to this area on the grounds that;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • McLeavey Road currently contains many small lots and the provision of services to this area would be necessary to increase environmental enhancement. • The area to be rezoned Greenbelt Residential is only 500 metres from the submitters property between 170 and 198 McLeavey Road. 	That the rezoning of Rural land around Ohau be adopted and extended to include the McLeavey Road area inclusive of the small parcel of land between 170 and 198 McLeavey Road.
21/008	Alan Stevenson	Waikawa Beach – Rezoning Map K	Oppose	<p>Opposed to Plan Change 21 as it relates to rezoning two blocks of rural land, on the grounds that;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any further subdivision will irrevocably change the special nature of Waikawa Beach. • Any further subdivision will adversely affect Waikawa Beach's estuary and coastal environment, and associated wildlife breeding habitat. • The climate change issues and associated predicted rises in sea level have not been adequately addressed. • Waikawa contains unique surroundings and atmosphere which could be compromised by the proposal. • Waikawa Beach Road is not built for heavy construction traffic and was unsafe during the development of 	That the Rural land encompassing Waikawa Beach not be rezoned to Greenbelt Residential land.

Submission No.	Submitter Name	Location/ Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
21/008 Continued	Alan Stevenson			<p>Strathnaver.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The water table is continuing to lower in this area. • Population increase would put pressure on the coastal dune environment. • Increased population would increase vandalism in the area. • Could cause an increase in air pollution. • Could cause damage to tidal shellfish with increased beach traffic. 	
21/009	Beverley Harris	Ohau – Rezoning Map I	Support	<p>Seeks that the area to be rezoned Greenbelt Residential in Ohau be extended to include the submitter's property on Marsden Terrace which borders the area to be rezoned for the following reasons;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitter has plans for development. • There is no direct vehicular access to State Highway 1, wooden barriers are in place here. • Sealed formation of the road can be extended without adverse environmental affects on Ohau or the surrounding area. • Submitter's property remaining rural could cause future reverse sensitivity issues, e.g. chickens, piggery. • Rezoning this property would be consistent with the adjoining pattern and would complete it, this would be logical. 	That the submitter's property on Marsden Terrace, Ohau which adjoins the area to be rezoned Greenbelt Residential and included in the area to be rezoned Greenbelt Residential.
21/010	Saltburn Trust	Waikawa Beach – Rezoning Map K	Oppose	<p>Opposed to Plan Change 21 as it relates to rezoning two blocks of rural land, on the grounds that;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any further subdivision will irrevocably 	That the Rural land encompassing Waikawa Beach not be rezoned to Greenbelt Residential land.

Submission No.	Submitter Name	Location/ Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
21/010 Continued	Saltburn Trust			<p>change the special nature of Waikawa Beach.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any further subdivision will adversely affect Waikawa Beach's estuary and coastal environment, and associated wildlife breeding habitat. The climate change issues and associated predicted rises in sea level have not been adequately addressed. Within the current residential precinct of Waikawa Beach there still remain approximately 20 sections not yet developed, evidencing a lack of demand for more residential development at this time. 	
21/011	Steve & Maree Grant	Waikawa Beach – Rezoning Map K	Oppose	<p>Opposed to Plan Change 21 as it relates to rezoning two blocks of rural land, on the grounds that;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any further subdivision will irrevocably change the special nature of Waikawa Beach. Any further subdivision will adversely affect Waikawa Beach's estuary and coastal environment, and associated wildlife breeding habitat. The climate change issues and associated predicted rises in sea level have not been adequately addressed. 	That the Rural land encompassing Waikawa Beach not be rezoned to Greenbelt Residential land.
21/012	Carol & Phil Wallington	Waikawa Beach – Rezoning Map K	Oppose	<p>Opposed to Plan Change 21 as it relates to rezoning two blocks of rural land, on the grounds that;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any further subdivision will irrevocably change the special nature of Waikawa 	That the Rural land encompassing Waikawa Beach not be rezoned to Greenbelt Residential land.

Submission No.	Submitter Name	Location/ Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
21/012 Continued	Carol & Phil Wallington			<p>Beach.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any further subdivision will adversely affect Waikawa Beach's estuary and coastal environment, and associated wildlife breeding habitat. The climate change issues and associated predicted rises in sea level have not been adequately addressed. Potential loss of Rural amenity. 	
21/013	Arthur Day	Waikawa Beach – Rezoning Map K	Oppose	<p>Opposed to Plan Change 21 as it relates to rezoning two blocks of rural land, on the grounds that;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any further subdivision will irrevocably change the special nature of Waikawa Beach. Any further subdivision will adversely affect Waikawa Beach's estuary and coastal environment, and associated wildlife breeding habitat. The climate change issues and associated predicted rises in sea level have not been adequately addressed. Potential loss of Rural amenity. 	That the Rural land encompassing Waikawa Beach not be rezoned to Greenbelt Residential land.
21/014	Bruce Jenkins	Waikawa Beach – Rezoning Map K	Support	<p>Supports the proposal to rezone the area at the northern end of Drake and Arthur Streets and the land between James Street and Strathnaver in Waikawa Beach to Greenbelt Residential for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> These blocks would make an ideal extension to the existing Waikawa Beach area if they are rezoned Greenbelt Residential. 	That the Rural land encompassing Waikawa Beach be rezoned to Greenbelt Residential land as proposed.

Submission No.	Submitter Name	Location/ Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
21/014 Continued	Bruce Jenkins			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any future subdivision would be in keeping with the character of Waikawa Beach. If the rezoning does not occur the development potential at Waikawa Beach would severely restricted. 	
21/015	G & E Williams Consultants Ltd	Greenbelt Residential rezoning – objectives and policies	Support	Supports the Council initiative to identify 'Greenbelt Residential' areas around the towns and villages of the district. Supports the objectives and policies of the plan changes and thinks the proposed rules are a reasonable way of implementing these policies. Notes the difficulty in framing rules with inherent conflict between public planning and community requirements on one hand and private interests and property rights on the other. Expresses strong support for the objectives and policies as important statements with the rules being more specific measures to implement them.	Inferred – That Plan Change 21 be adopted.
		Greenbelt Residential Subdivision Design Guidelines	Support	Strongly supports the use of the design guidelines. These guidelines are very useful in explaining the intent of the plan changes, to inform developers (including individual property owners), and to obtain the desired community outcomes.	
21/016	Richard Walker	Waikawa Beach – Rezoning Map K	Support	Supports the proposed rezoning of areas around the Waikawa Beach settlement to Greenbelt Residential for the following reasons; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This would be an extension to the original settlement. 	That the Rural land north of Waikawa Beach be rezoned Low Density Residential and the land further north be rezoned Deferred Greenbelt Residential. That the land south of Waikawa Beach be rezoned Greenbelt Residential.

Submission No.	Submitter Name	Location/ Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
21/016 Continued	Richard Walker			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The land is capable of absorbing higher development. The land should be zoned Low Density Residential to be in keeping with the surrounding area. When services become available there would be no detrimental effect to the natural environment. <p>Also makes suggestions to extend the area to be rezoned;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The land further north should also be rezoned but deferred Greenbelt Residential. This land is also capable of absorbing development. Roads on Structure Plan could extend without environmental effect. River is the boundary to development. 	
21/017	Mrs Irene Walker	Waikawa Beach – Rezoning Map K	Oppose	<p>Opposes the rezoning of the area north of the settlement of Drake Street and Arthur Street at Waikawa Beach.</p> <p>Opposes the section sizes increasing from 2000m² to 5000m² as this would be in direct contrast to the existing and well established “old” part of Waikawa Beach.</p> <p>Notes that the Council had this land zoned Low Density Residential with sections 1000m² – 2000m² in 2007 and this should be retained.</p>	That the Rural land north of Waikawa Beach should not be rezoned Green Belt Residential but should be rezoned Low Density Residential.
21/018	Alan Prentice	Waikawa Beach – Rezoning Map K	Support	<p>Supports the proposed rezoning of areas to the north and south of Waikawa Beach to Greenbelt Residential.</p> <p>The availability of these areas would tend to</p>	That the Rural land north of Waikawa Beach be rezoned Greenbelt Residential and that this zoning be extended further north to the Waikawa River either now or Deferred.

Submission No.	Submitter Name	Location/ Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
20/018 Continued	Alan Prentice			<p>confine any future residential growth along the coastline. Such growth is vastly better than any growth to the east which could present difficulties with future infrastructure. Encouraging future growth in these areas would enhance the community spirit of current residents as future residents would be likely to become more community minded and mix with the current residents than if they were located elsewhere. From local knowledge both areas are conducive to development in that minimal earthworks would be required. This is important as most of the terrain is sand built up over many years.</p> <p>Also from local knowledge it would seem prudent to extend the proposed Greenbelt Residential area to the north of the existing settlement to be bounded by the Waikawa River either now or as a Deferred Zone. This could ease the design and provision of some of the infrastructure required e.g. roading and public reserves.</p> <p>The area to the south to be rezoned Greenbelt Residential is a logical extension in that it links the two residential areas which are presently isolated from each other.</p>	That the land south of Waikawa Beach be rezoned Greenbelt Residential.
21/019	Stephen Crombie	Waikawa Beach – Rezoning Map K	Oppose	<p>Opposed to Plan Change 21 as it relates to rezoning two blocks of rural land, on the grounds that;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any further subdivision will irrevocably change the special nature of Waikawa Beach. 	That the Rural land encompassing Waikawa Beach not be rezoned to Greenbelt Residential land.

Submission No.	Submitter Name	Location/ Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
21/019 Continued	Stephen Crombie			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any further subdivision will adversely affect Waikawa Beach's estuary and coastal environment, and associated wildlife breeding habitat. The climate change issues and associated predicted rises in sea level have not been adequately addressed. 	
21/020	John Hammond	Waikawa Beach – Rezoning Map K	Oppose	<p>Opposed to Plan Change 21 as it relates to rezoning two blocks of rural land, on the grounds that;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any further subdivision will irrevocably change the special nature of Waikawa Beach. Any further subdivision will adversely affect Waikawa Beach's estuary and coastal environment, and associated wildlife breeding habitat. The climate change issues and associated predicted rises in sea level have not been adequately addressed. No provision for open spaces and reserves is made in the proposed plan and submitter feels plan is incomplete. A long term view of Waikawa Beach should be taken by Council considering encouraging vitality in community life providing scope for other than residential construction (commercial and community activities). Focal point at Waikawa is the river, its banks and estuary. Council should look at developing access to the river banks on both sides up from the estuary to beyond 	That the Rural land encompassing Waikawa Beach not be rezoned to Greenbelt Residential land.

Submission No.	Submitter Name	Location/ Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
21/020 Continued	John Hammond			<p>the proposed residential developments north of the existing settlement although this would not be easy due to the terrain.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No evidence in Council's publications that it has weighed the benefits of Proposed Plan Change 21 with the costs of development. • The development charges introduced by Council on the land would not provide an adequate contribution to what is needed to develop the vitality of the area. 	
21/021	William Powell	Waikawa Beach – Rezoning Map K	Oppose	<p>Opposed to Plan Change 21 as it relates to rezoning two blocks of rural land, on the grounds that;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any further subdivision will irrevocably change the special nature of Waikawa Beach. • Any further subdivision will adversely affect Waikawa Beach's estuary and coastal environment, and associated wildlife breeding habitat. • The climate change issues and associated predicted rises in sea level have not been adequately addressed. 	That the Rural land encompassing Waikawa Beach not be rezoned to Greenbelt Residential land.
21/022	San Souci Trust	Waikawa Beach – Rezoning Map K	Oppose	<p>Opposed to Plan Change 21 as it relates to rezoning two Rural blocks of land for the following reasons; The Waikawa Beach Ratepayers Association made it clear to Council through the consultation period for the Development Plan that no further growth is wanted in the area. Demand for growth in the area is not seen to be apparent as there are a number</p>	That the proposed Greenbelt Residential land at Waikawa Beach not be rezoned and that no further subdivision be allowed in the Waikawa Beach area

Submission No.	Submitter Name	Location/ Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
21/022 Continued	San Souci Trust			<p>of sections still for sale at Strathnaver Glen, Waikawa Heights and Waikawa Beach. Council should not be encouraging further subdivision in this area as it is against Council's principles stated in the Development Plan.</p> <p>Waikawa Beach settlement has unique amenity values with character baches, limited development form and infrastructure which would be compromised by additional development. With a greater population at Waikawa Beach there will be greater demand for services and the uniqueness of the area would disappear. The qualities important to property owners at Waikawa include peace and quiet, isolation, safe streets, low crime and low population. How would further development "maintain the beach character" or improve these qualities? The Council needs to determine the capabilities of its infrastructure to cope with additional development before advocating these changes. Waikawa Beach Road is in a bad state of repair and prone to flooding, this would require major improvements. Council's duty should be to provide for existing ratepayers before encouraging more.</p> <p>The Strathnaver Glen development grew from the original 28 lots to approximately 90 lots, some barely 2000m², minimum required under the current District Plan. Two development proposals have been before</p>	

Submission No.	Submitter Name	Location/ Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
21/022 Continued	San Souci Trust			<p>Council recently at Waikawa. Independent consultants recommended Council to decline both of these.</p> <p>Possible impacts to groundwater and underground aquifers have not been addressed, these are very important with no reticulated water supply available. Global warming has not been given consideration. Concerned about Structure Plan 11 which shows a Greenbelt local road that will extend south from the end of Manga-Pirau Street through the proposed Greenbelt Residential land. This proposed road is currently the only vehicle access track to the beach, and during high tides is subject to some erosion. This is a dangerous area to put a road with global warming, rising sea levels, high tides and erosion to contend with.</p> <p>The southern end of Manga-Pirau Street is very congested currently and more vehicles would increase risks here. An access way to this land is already existing at the end of Sarah Street. The use of this access way would make more sense.</p> <p>It was agreed that the reserve land would join the reserves to the north and south, and extend to the west, guaranteeing legal vehicle access to the beach. The reserve shown on Structure Plan 11 is different to that shown on the Development Plan and neither show what was agreed by the WBRA. A Greenbelt Residential area was</p>	

Submission No.	Submitter Name	Location/ Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
21/022 Continued	San Souci Trust			<p>accepted as a trade off for guaranteed beach access but the WBRA are opposed to the rezoning of the land in its current form as shown.</p> <p>The proposed Greenbelt Residential land at the end of Drake/Arthur Streets was agreed to for the rezoning of a 5 acre (2 hectare) block. This has increased to 7.5 hectares in the Development Plan and Structure Plan 10.</p> <p>Waikawa Beach should be recognised as 'culturally important' and should be free from any threat of further development.</p>	
21/023	Craig & Fiona Wallace	Levin North – rezoning Map E	Oppose	<p>Opposed to Plan Change 21 as it relates to rezoning the Rural land around the Fairfield Road area to Residential 1 for the following reasons;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ponding and regular flooding of low lying properties, 43 – 49 Fairfield Road is apparent. Development would need to be avoided in this area. • The current rating reflects Council services provided i.e. No footpaths, little lighting, no stormwater/drainage, no rubbish collection, mowing, post etc. 	That the current Rural zoning be retained in the Fairfield Road area.

Submission No.	Submitter Name	Location/ Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
21/024	Diana McGill & Adam Herlihy	Waitarere Beach – rezoning Map G	Oppose	<p>Opposed to the rezoning of Waitarere Beach from Rural to Residential as;</p> <p>The submitter's property was purchased for the rural lifestyle it offered including accommodating livestock and the privacy of housing separation.</p> <p>Rezoning would increase development, which would increase traffic flows, the grass berm would be inadequate in its current form or use as a footpath.</p> <p>Traffic islands would potentially need moving to facilitate access, which would destroy the aesthetics of the area.</p> <p>Rates increase would be extreme with a dramatic increase of residents.</p> <p>Many of the original waterways in this area have re-surfaced and provide a habitat for wildlife.</p> <p>Development would pose a threat to the regenerating habitat in this area as the wetlands would need to be filled in.</p> <p>Destruction of this environmentally sensitive area would be required to facilitate medium housing.</p>	That the rural land encompassing Waitarere Beach not be rezoned as Residential land.
21/025	Albert Burgess	Levin North – rezoning Map E	Oppose	<p>Oppose the rezoning of the land bounded by Kennedy Drive north to Roslyn Road because this is the only area to be rezoned in Levin that is not deferred or limited Low Density. The area east of Fairfield Road is to be rezoned Limited Density and this would keep the semi rural nature of the road. Submitter wishes to see both sides of Fairfield Road rezoned limited density to</p>	That the Rural land on the western side of Fairfield Road not be rezoned Residential but to be rezoned Low Density Residential.

Submission No.	Submitter Name	Location/ Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
21/025 Continued	Albert Burgess			retain the rural aspect of the northern part of this road and not have the beauty of this area despoiled by infill housing.	
21/026	Walter Dalgliesh	Ohau Potential Future Link Road	Oppose	<p>Opposed to the Development Plan in that it has a "Potential future road link" between Western Heights Road and Waipuna Grove. Submitter discussed this with residents of Waipuna Grove and states that all are opposed to any future road link joining these two streets.</p> <p>Waipuna Grove is part of the Papaitonga Springs subdivision which is a private eco subdivision formed to protect Lake Papaitonga. It was formed in partnership with DOC to ensure long term protection and road specifications are part of this protection.</p>	That the "Potential future road link" between Waipuna Grove and Western Heights in Ohau be rescinded from the Development Plan.
21/027	Horowhenua District Council	Levin North – rezoning Map E Fairfield Road Special Residential Zone and Low Density Overlay	Support	<p>Supports Plan Change 21 but seeks to amend Map E so that the Low Density Overlay shown over the Fairfield Road Special Residential 1 Zone is uplifted. The decision on Plan Change 18 created the Fairfield Road Special Residential 1 Zone. Several rules specific to this zone were to be included as part of Section 14 of the Horowhenua district Plan as part of this decision. The appeal period for Plan Change 18 has since ended with no appeals lodged.</p> <p>Plan Change 21 is currently silent on the Fairfield Road Special Residential 1 zone and this could lead to a confusing situation where properties within this area are subject</p>	That the Low Density Area overlay be removed from be Fairfield Road Special Residential 1 Zone and that the minimum allotment size and shape factor that resulted from the Plan Change 18 decision remain enforce.

Submission No.	Submitter Name	Location/ Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
21/027 Continued	Horowhenua District Council			to two different minimum allotment sizes and shape factors. To avoid this situation the Low Density Overlay could be uplifted from this area which would remove the proposed rules specified for Low Density on table 14.1 of Proposed Plan Change 21. The rules that were part of the Plan Change 18 decision were specifically designed for these sites and it is more appropriate for the site-specific rules to remain enforce.	
21/028	Fish and Game New Zealand	Plan Change 21	Oppose	Opposed to Plan Change 21 in that it does not specifically identify Significant Natural Areas. These should be included in a classification list.	That Plan Change 21 includes a Significant Natural Areas classification list.
21/029	Mathew Walker	Waikawa Beach – Rezoning Map K	Support	Supports the rezoning of Rural land to Greenbelt Residential at Waikawa Beach with suggested changes. Wishes the proposed Greenbelt Residential area to be rezoned Low Density Residential and for the submitter's land further north to be rezoned Deferred Greenbelt Residential for the following reasons; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The existing properties are mainly smaller sections. • The land is rough and not good farm land, and would be better for other uses. • The land is elevated and would make good building platforms. • It seems wrong to leave a small block of farmland in the middle of residential properties. • Both areas north of Waikawa are capable of absorbing further 	That the Rural land to be rezoned Greenbelt Residential north of Waikawa Beach is rezoned Low Density Residential and that the submitter's land further north be rezoned Deferred Greenbelt Residential.

Submission No.	Submitter Name	Location/ Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
21/029 Continued	Mathew Walker			<p>development, roads could be easily extended with no adverse environmental effects.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notes that although the WBRA are likely to object to this as they only represent 1/3 of the properties at Waikawa Beach. If development of this land takes place it can go no further than the river as this is the natural boundary of the land. 	
21/030	Lesley-Anne Walker	Waikawa Beach – Rezoning Map K	Support	<p>Supports the rezoning at the northern end of Arthur and Drake Streets at Waikawa Beach from Rural to Greenbelt Residential for the following reasons;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The rezoning of land north of Waikawa Beach for subdivision in the future would be a natural extension to the existing settlement. In 2007 Council thought this land should be rezoned Low Density Residential for which it would still be suitable, but Greenbelt Residential is an acceptable option especially if the lot sizes can be a minimum of 2000m². This would be a Greenbelt zone adjacent to an already established high density area which is totally in keeping with what is envisaged by the Council's growth plan. If and when services become available, being so close to a high density area, there should be no detrimental effects to the natural environment when these services were continued. 	That Plan Change 21 as it applies to rezoning Rural land to Greenbelt Residential at Waikawa Beach be adopted and amended to decrease the lot sizes to 2000m ² or Low Density Residential and that the area north of this be rezoned Deferred Greenbelt Residential.

Submission No.	Submitter Name	Location/ Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
21/030 Continued	Lesley-Anne Walker			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The land in question is well and truly capable of absorbing further development. Land further north of the proposed Greenbelt zone should be zoned Deferred Greenbelt Residential as the Council would not be required to service the area for some years. The area of land north of the submitter's land is capable of absorbing further development in years to come. The roads on Council's Structure Plan 10 could easily be extended without any adverse environmental effects – any roading could be done in keeping with the “lay of the land”. When development in this area takes place there would be a Council Reserve along the rivers edge so the public could enjoy the area which they cannot do currently access. Any further development north of this area would be impossible as the Waikawa River acts as a natural boundary. 	
21/031	Cameron Walker	Waikawa Beach – Rezoning Map K	Support	Supports the rezoning of rural land to Greenbelt Residential at Waikawa Beach with suggested changes. Seeks that the proposed Greenbelt Residential area be rezoned Low Density Residential and for the submitter's land further north to be rezoned Deferred Greenbelt Residential for the following reasons;	That the Rural land to be rezoned Greenbelt Residential north of Waikawa Beach is rezoned Low Density Residential and that the submitter's land further north be rezoned Deferred Greenbelt Residential.

Submission No.	Submitter Name	Location/ Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
21/031 Continued	Cameron Walker			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rezoning this area would be an extension to the original township. • The land is capable of absorbing further development; roads could be easily extended with no adverse environmental effects. • The land closer to the settlement should be rezoned Low Density Residential and the submitter's land Deferred Greenbelt Residential with larger section sizes as it is more suitable for this. • If development of this land takes place it can go no further than the river as this is the natural boundary of the land. 	
21/032	Mandy Cumming	Waikawa Beach – Rezoning Map K	Support	Supports the proposed rezoning of Rural land to Greenbelt Residential at Waikawa Beach for the following reasons; The northern end is just an extension of the existing high density properties and it would have no impact on the environment as it stands now.	That Plan Change 21 where it applies to rezoning rural land at Waikawa Beach to Greenbelt Residential be adopted.
21/033	Higgins Group Holding Ltd	Section 6A	Support	Supports the proposed Section 6A which sets out issues and objectives for the Greenbelt Residential Environment. Notes the fundamental importance of aggregates to the maintenance, growth and development of New Zealand. Highlights the negative connotations attached to the industry and problems with reverse sensitivity when subdivision takes place near existing operations. Supports the implementation of the Greenbelt Residential Zone as it will	That the area identified in Proposed Plan Change 21 be rezoned to “Greenbelt Residential” as proposed and that proposed Section 6A is adopted.

Submission No.	Submitter Name	Location/ Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
21/033 Continued	Higgins Group Holding Ltd			consolidate rural-residential subdivision into discernable areas, enabling future land users to avoid such areas when establishing new industrial type activities in the Rural zone. The proposed Greenbelt Residential zone is not adjacent to the primary Industrial zone in Levin and is therefore not likely to adversely affect existing activities within that zone.	
		Issue 6A.3	Support	Supports the addition of Issue 6A.3 to the Plan which is " <i>The recognition of reverse sensitivity effects between activities within the Greenbelt Residential Zone and at the interface with the rural and urban areas</i> " and supports that associated objectives, policies and methods are included in Amendments 1 and 2 and two for managing this issue.	Inferred: That Issue 6A.3 and the associated objectives and policies and methods be adopted.
		Industrial rezoning (Development Plan Area 11)	Support	Existing (operative) Planning Map 25 shows the extent of the Levin Industrial Zone along Tararua Road ending just after Roe Street. Planning Map 25 included in the notified Proposed Plan Change 21 documents shows the Industrial Zone to incorporate a larger area. It appears that the Industrial Zone proposed incorporates "Area 11" which was identified in the Horowhenua Development Plan (June 2008) as "Proposed Industrial". Higgins supports the extension of the Industrial Zone to include this area but notes that "Area 12" which was also identified in the Development Plan for proposed Industrial zoning has not been	That the extension of the Industrial Zone along the northern side of Tararua Road as shown on Planning Map no. 25 included in Proposed Plan Change 21 occur as proposed.

Submission No.	Submitter Name	Location/ Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
21/033 Continued	Higgins Group Holding Ltd			incorporated. It appears that there has been no discussion in the notified documents as to why only Area 11 has been rezoned from Rural to Industrial.	
		Industrial rezoning (Development Plan Area 12)	Oppose	Opposes that Area 12 identified in the Development Plan has not been incorporated and considers that the Industrial Zone should be amended in accord with the Development Plan to provide for existing Industrial activities in this area. This would provide certainty to land users in this area that effects and amenity values associated with Industrial Activities should be expected. It would also provide certainty as to the siting of new Industrial Activities.	That Area 12, identified in the Development Plan, be rezoned from Rural to Industrial.
21/034	Waikawa Beach Ratepayers Association	Waikawa Beach – Rezoning Structure Plan 10	Oppose	Opposed to Structure Plan 10 in that it proposes to rezone Rural land to Greenbelt Residential at a larger scale than that which was agreed to by WBRA and Council. WBRA was involved in submissions and discussions with Council concerning the Development Plan. A strong message from the community was received that no further development was welcome at Waikawa Beach. The proposed plan changes are not what the Association agreed to and consequently they object to the proposal. The proposed land to be rezoned Greenbelt Residential is larger than that agreed to by WBRA. The Association suggested that 5 acres (2 hectares) of Greenbelt Residential	That Structure Plan 10 be adjusted to be in line with what was agreed with Council during consultation for the Development Plan.

Submission No.	Submitter Name	Location/ Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
21/034 Continued	Waikawa Beach Ratepayers Association			<p>land would have a minor impact on Waikawa and would help achieve the Council's goals. The 7.5 hectares that has been proposed to be rezoned Greenbelt Residential was never agreed to and options 4 and 5 were removed from the original draft Development Plan.</p> <p>The Association is pleased to see the inclusion of Reserve land fronting the river to allow public access should this area ever be developed.</p>	
		Structure Plan 11	Oppose	<p>Opposed to Structure Plan 11 in that it shows the inclusion of a local road continuing on from the southern end of Manga-Pirau Street. A road would require much repair and upkeep and be a waste of ratepayer's money. The designated reserve land is less than what was agreed to at meetings with Council. This was to have included the area directly to the seaward side of the end of Manga-Pirau Street, continuing on the Reserves that currently exist.</p> <p>The proposed pedestrian connection from the Reserve land to Reay Mackay Grove is through private property as is the greenbelt local road from Strathnaver Drive south. Have these been discussed with the landowners?</p> <p>The Association is disturbed to see that alterations to the Development Plan agreed to with Council have been changed with no further consultation.</p>	That Structure Plan 11 be adjusted to be in line with what was agreed with Council during consultation for the Development Plan.

Submission No.	Submitter Name	Location/ Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
21/035	BJAZ Properties Ltd	<p>Foxton – Rezoning of Industrial land in Hetta Street & Norbiton Road Map B Structure Plan 2</p> <p>Issue 6A3 Objective 6A.3.1 19A.2.1 19A.2.3 19A.2.6 19A.2.8-19A.2.10 Section 32 Analysis</p>	Oppose	<p>Opposes Plan Change 21 as it relates to a proposed rezoning to Greenbelt Residential from the area currently zoned industrial at Hetta Street and Norbiton Road in Foxton for the following reasons:</p> <p>BJAZ properties Ltd owns 3196m² of land in Hetta Street which is zoned industrial having buildings on it totalling 1200m². Approx 75% of the industrial land in this area has current industrial activities being carried out on it. There is currently high demand for industrial premises in Foxton with the submitter's buildings fully tenanted and enquiries coming in. Real Estate agents have advised of a shortage of Industrial zoned land in Foxton. It therefore does not make sense to rezone an area which is in short supply. Amendment 5 section 6 says "assist business and employment opportunities by providing new locations for growth". Currently industrial businesses located in this area provide employment opportunities in the Foxton area. Changing the zoning would diminish employment and be contrary to the wording in the Development Plan. There would be a significant loss in income to the district.</p> <p>The rezoning is likely to create sensitivity issues with surrounding property owners having an expectation that industrial activities are not going to take place here in the future, however they can continue under existing use rights. This will be a constant</p>	That the Industrial land in the Hetta Street, Norbiton Road area proposed to be rezoned to Greenbelt Residential remains zoned as Industrial.

Submission No.	Submitter Name	Location/ Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
21/035 Continued	BJAZ Properties Ltd			<p>source of complaints. Many of the issues and permitted activity standards included in the Plan Change conflict with the existing industrial uses on site.</p> <p>With the proposed zoning change, the addition of other structures, signage or changes in use in this area would require resource consent that may not be approved. This imposes significant cost and uncertainty on the current owners.</p> <p>The section 32 report places emphasis on the Development Plan saying that "it was an integral part in the preparing proposed plan change 21". This suggests that the consultation on the Development Plan can be relied on to justify the plan change. The submitter believes the consultation was neither significant nor meaningful.</p> <p>The section 32 report, Plan text and Planning Map Amendments have not uncovered any specific reference as to the reasons for the changes to the zoning. This is a significant omission in the section 32 analysis.</p> <p>It is considered that this proposal is a significant down zoning and will result in a significant long term financial loss to the submitter's business and a significant economic loss to the industrial landowners. The structure plan doesn't rely on rezoning this industrial land therefore the Greenbelt zone would not be compromised by the land in question remaining Industrial.</p>	

Submission No.	Submitter Name	Location/ Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
21/036	Patricia Berrett	Waikawa Beach - Rezoning Map K	Oppose	<p>Opposed to Plan Change 21 as it relates to rezoning two blocks of rural land, on the grounds that;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any further subdivision will irrevocably change the special nature of Waikawa Beach. Any further subdivision will adversely affect Waikawa Beach's estuary and coastal environment, and associated wildlife breeding habitat. The climate change issues and associated predicted rises in sea level have not been adequately addressed. 	That the rural land encompassing Waikawa Beach not be rezoned to Greenbelt Residential land.
21/037	David & Karen Smith	Waikawa Beach – Rezoning Map K	Oppose	<p>Oppose the rezoning of the land at the north end of Waikawa Beach to Greenbelt Residential. Rezoning would reduce the amenities that adjacent properties have at present in terms of open space next to their properties, increased traffic and risks to present groundwater supplies. Opposed to further development around Waikawa Beach.</p>	Inferred: That the land at the north end of Waikawa remains zoned Rural.
		<p>Issue 6A.3 Policy 6A.2.8 Objective 6A.3.1 Policy 6A.4.2 Policy 6A.4.3 Rule 19A.2.3(b)</p> <p>Policy 6A.2.8</p>		<p>If Council does go ahead and rezone this area, then the policies need to be strengthened as there is insufficient recognition of the interface issues which arise across the boundary of the proposed Greenbelt and existing residential zones. Issue 6A.3 pays insufficient attention to reverse sensitivity effects.</p> <p>Policy 6A.2.8 has a narrow focus, it should take into account the rural amenities and</p>	<p>That the following provision be amended Issue 6A.3 Policy 6A.2.8 Objective 6A.3.1 Policy 6A.4.2 Policy 6A.4.3 Rule 19A.2.3(b)</p> <p>That Policy 6A.2.8 be amended. The concept of adequate space between neighbours should be</p>

Submission No.	Submitter Name	Location/ Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
21/037 Continued	David & Karen Smith			space existing in these localities.	a broader concept, including a provision for adequate open space, not just direct sunlight and shade effects.
		Objective 6A.3.1		Objective 6A.3.1 is too vague and although it refers to setback rules it provides no guidance on what the setback should be.	That Objective 6A.3.1 be amended so that the existing situation be recognised and that any new building in the adjacent Greenbelt zone be a specific distance (15 metres?) away from residential/greenbelt boundary.
		Policy 6A.4.2 & Policy 6A.4.3		These policies require that attention be given to sustainable management and supply of physical resource and in particular water supply. This focus is on the availability of water to the new greenbelt properties and ignores the potential effects on supply or quality of water to existing adjacent properties.	That Policies 6A.4.2 and 6A.4.3 give full consideration to cross-zone boundary effects on resource sustainability, and requirements that any application for subdivision include a proper assessment by experts of the effects of the proposal on supply and quality of water for existing users in neighbouring zones, and for prior consultation with those owners.
		Rule 19A.2.3(b)		Rule 19A.2.3(b) states that buildings on Greenbelt residential properties should be 3 metres from the boundary with the adjacent properties. This is inadequate given the high level objective of preserving space and semi rural character. Unnecessary for properties of 5000m2.	That Rule 19A.2.3(b) be amended so that the figure of 3 meters is increased to 15 metres.
21/038	Kathleen Gilberd	Waikawa Beach – Rezoning Map K	Support	Support Plan Change 21 particularly the development at the ends of Drake and Arthur Streets, as it would be an extension of the original settlement. The land looks as though it would be capable of being subdivided with little or no adverse effects on the surrounding area. The area north of the proposed development to where the river turns inland	That Plan Change 21 be adopted and amend plans to rezone additional land further north of the proposed Waikawa Greenbelt Residential zone to also be included as Greenbelt Residential.

Submission No.	Submitter Name	Location/ Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
21/038 Continued	Kathleen Gilberd			should also be rezoned Greenbelt Residential.	
21/039	Mark Gilberd	Waikawa Beach – Rezoning Map K	Support	Support Plan Change 21 as it relates to Waikawa Beach. Both areas are close to the existing settlement. The area could be subdivided with little or no adverse effects on the surrounding area. Low density residential should be considered as it is close to the high density alongside it.	That Plan Change 21 in regards to Waikawa Beach be adopted.
			Support	The land further north of the proposed rezoning would also be capable of absorbing further development. This land should be Greenbelt Residential or Deferred Greenbelt Residential. The proposed Structure Plan for Waikawa shows that the road could be extended without any adverse environmental effects. This would finish any further development in the older end of the Beach as the river acts as a boundary.	That the proposed Waikawa Greenbelt area be extended to include land further north up to the river or allow it to be rezoned Deferred Greenbelt Residential.
21/040	Alan & Belinda Hanlon	Manakau Rezoning Map J	Support	Support Plan Change 21 in that the submitter's property is included and would allow future subdivision. Opposed any suggestion of being included in the Manakau Downlands Domain. Oppose submitter's property being shown on the existing Planning Maps (Map 29) as containing Class 1 and 2 soils.	Adopt Rezoning of submitter's property (see submission). Delete any suggestion to include submitter's property in the Manakau Downlands. Delete land use capability 1 and 2 from submitter's property.
21/041	Francee Thompson	Waikawa Beach – Rezoning Map K	Support	Support rezoning of land at Waikawa Beach as Greenbelt Residential. The northern end should be low density residential rather Greenbelt Residential. Land is capable of absorbing higher development with no detriment to the environment.	That Waikawa Beach be rezoned as planned. That the land at the southern end be zoned Greenbelt Residential.

Submission No.	Submitter Name	Location/ Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
21/041 Continued	Francee Thompson			Land further north of proposed Greenbelt Residential area should be rezoned Deferred Greenbelt Residential. The roading on the structure plan can be easily continued. The land can absorb further development with not detriment to the environment. The river acts as a natural boundary.	That the land at the northern end be rezoned Low Density and then additional land to the north up to the river be rezoned Greenbelt Residential.
21/042	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Map F		Plan Change 21 does not propose to introduce any provisions within the new Greenbelt Residential zone, either in respect of buildings or subdivisions, to seek to ensure that the National Grid is sufficiently protected. This is of particular concern as the Mangahao-Paekakariki A transmission lines traverse an area of land in the proposed Levin South Greenbelt residential area. Subdivision represents the most appropriate opportunity to ensure adequate and safe separation distances are provided for.	That the objectives, policies, rules and assessment criteria be amended to appropriately recognise and provide for an adequate level of protection for the National Grid from third party subdivision activities and building/development. Incorporate appropriate provisions for development near high voltage transmission lines into the Greenbelt Residential Subdivision Design Guide.
		Section 6A		Transpower seeks that the Plan Change be amended to ensure that <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ongoing operation and management of the National Grid is provided for; • The National Grid is sufficiently protected from any adverse effects; • Reverse Sensitivity issues are avoided; and • Public safety and health around high voltage transmission lines is 	That a new issue, objective and policy be included in Section 6A. New Issue "Encroachment of development and activities, including rural residential and related development and activities, on existing infrastructure/network utilities" New Objective "To ensure that subdivision and land development does not compromise the ongoing operation, maintenance, upgrading and

Submission No.	Submitter Name	Location/ Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
21/042 Continued	Transpower New Zealand Limited			maintained.	development of the National Grid" New Policy "To avoid, remedy or mitigate any actual or potential adverse effects of subdivision and land use development/activities on the National Grid".
		Rule 19A.2		Transpower seeks that a provision is included in the Plan Change requiring Transpower be notified as an affected party on subdivision resource consent application that are likely to affect a transmission corridor. Unless a 32 metre rule is adopted for both subdivision and land use activities in all zones, transmission corridors will not be protected from encroaching development/activities.	That Rule 19A.2 (permitted Activity Conditions) be amended to include an additional sub-section as follows: 19A.2.29 High Voltage Transmission Lines (a) No buildings or structures shall be located closer than 32 metres either side of the centre line of any high voltage transmission line. (b) All land use activities, including the construction of new buildings/structures, earthworks the operation of mobile plant shall comply with the New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safe Distances (NZECP 34:2001) (c) All new trees/vegetation planted in the vicinity of any transmission line are limited to those which at a mature height will not encroach upon the relevant growth limit zone [or notice zone] for the line, as defined in the Electricity (Hazards from Trees) Regulations 2003.
		Rule 19A.5			That Rule 19A.5 (limited Discretionary Activities) be amended to include two new bullet points as follows: (e) In the case of any subdivision within 32

Submission No.	Submitter Name	Location/ Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
21/042 Continued	Transpower New Zealand Limited				metres of the centreline of transmission lines, matters over which Council will exercise its discretion shall also include the following: Measures necessary to protect existing high voltage transmission lines and people health and safety. (f) In the case of buildings and structures within 12-32 metres of the centre line of transmission lines, matters over which Council will exercise its discretion shall also include the following: Measures necessary to protect existing high voltage transmission lines and people's health and safety. Notification: For the purpose of notification/non-notification, Transpower New Zealand Limited will be identified as a potentially affect party in respect of Rules 19.5.1(e) and (f).
		Rule 19A.8			That Rule 19A.8 be amended to include a new bullet point as follows: (c) Any building and/or structure within 12 metres either side of the centre line of a high voltage transmission line.
		Section 24A			That Section 24A be amended to include a new assessment criterion for the assessment of Limited Discretionary Activities, with respect to subdivisions within 32 metres and/or buildings and structures within 12-32 metres of the centreline of a transmission line.

Submission No.	Submitter Name	Location/ Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
21/042 Continued	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Greenbelt Residential Subdivision Design Guide			That the Greenbelt Residential Subdivision Design Guide be amended to change the heading (pg 11) from "Services" to "Infrastructure" and make "Services" the first heading. Insert new section after Services headed High Voltage Transmission Lines as per submission detail. That Plan Change 21 be amended with any additions, deletions or consequential amendments made necessary as a result of the matters raised in this submission and any other such relief to give effect to this submission.
21/043	Frank Ave'Res	Waikawa Beach – Rezoning Map K	Oppose	<p>Opposed to Plan Change 21 as it relates to rezoning two blocks of rural land, on the grounds that;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any further subdivision will irrevocably change the special nature of Waikawa Beach. • Any further subdivision will adversely affect Waikawa Beach's estuary and coastal environment, and associated wildlife breeding habitat. • The climate change issues and associated predicted rises in sea level have not been adequately addressed. <p>The proposed rezoning at Waikawa Beach will exasperate many of the current problems and lead to more people, more machines on the beach, more traffic and more dogs. The increase in residents is likely to lead to the need for a convenience</p>	That the Rural land encompassing Waikawa Beach not be rezoned to Greenbelt Residential land.

Submission No.	Submitter Name	Location/ Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
21/043 Continued	Frank Ave'Res			<p>store which in turn will lead to more rubbish. Waikawa should be afforded the same sanctuary status as Pauahatanui inlet. Provision of reticulated sewage and water would only be necessary due to the increase in population. The desire to carve up land where there is little natural population growth or settlement can therefore only be driven by speculation and investment. The only real reason for the Council to permit ongoing subdivision is simply financial. Councils do know, or at least can be reasonably expected to know the probability of rising sea levels and the likely severe impact within the next generation or two. Horowhenua District Council (HDC) has no excuse for ignoring the growing evidence. Will the HDC be found to have been negligent in permitting ongoing subdivision, as currently proposed under the District Plan?</p>	
21/044	John Goldsmith	Waikawa Beach – Rezoning Map K	Oppose	<p>Opposed to Plan Change 21 as it relates to rezoning two blocks of rural land, on the grounds that;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any further subdivision will irrevocably change the special nature of Waikawa Beach. • Any further subdivision will adversely affect Waikawa Beach's estuary and coastal environment, and associated wildlife breeding habitat. • The climate change issues and associated predicted rises in sea level 	That the Rural land encompassing Waikawa Beach not be rezoned to Greenbelt Residential land.

Submission No.	Submitter Name	Location/ Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
21/045	Diana Mills	Levin North – Rezoning Map E Structure Plan 5	Oppose	<p>have not been adequately addressed.</p> <p>Oppose Rural land be rezoned Residential 1. The soils are very fertile and free draining suitable for a wide range of farming uses. There is more than adequate land already rezoned for residential uses in the Levin area. Rezoning would lead to a surge in rates. The landowners would not want to subdivide to make the land available for future housing. Low number of sales and houses for the Okarito Avenue subdivision. Council services would not be able to cope with additional subdivision development. The proposed rezoning would prevent existing owners from changing their current farming practices to new ones due to reverse sensitivity issues and existing use rights only applying to the activities currently undertaken.</p>	<p>That the proposed Residential 1 rezoning be deleted from Plan Change 21 on all land except the Okarito Avenue subdivision. That Structure Plan 5 be amended so that the proposed roading and shopping centre on the submitter's land is deleted from this Plan.</p>
21/046	Frank Williams	Waikawa Beach – Rezoning Map K	Oppose	<p>Opposed to Plan Change 21 as it relates to rezoning two blocks of rural land, on the grounds that;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any further subdivision will irrevocably change the special nature of Waikawa Beach. • Any further subdivision will adversely affect Waikawa Beach's estuary and coastal environment, and associated wildlife breeding habitat. • The climate change issues and associated predicted rises in sea level have not been adequately addressed. 	<p>That the Rural land encompassing Waikawa Beach not be rezoned to Greenbelt Residential land.</p>

Submission No.	Submitter Name	Location/ Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
21/047	Chris Kilmister	Waikawa Beach – Rezoning Map K	Oppose	<p>Opposed to Plan Change 21 as it relates to rezoning two blocks of rural land, on the grounds that;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any further subdivision will irrevocably change the special nature of Waikawa Beach. Any further subdivision will adversely affect Waikawa Beach's estuary and coastal environment, and associated wildlife breeding habitat. The climate change issues and associated predicted rises in sea level have not been adequately addressed. 	That the Rural land encompassing Waikawa Beach not be rezoned to Greenbelt Residential land.
21/048	Rosalie Kilmister	Waikawa Beach – Rezoning Map K	Oppose	<p>Opposed to Plan Change 21 as it relates to rezoning two blocks of rural land, on the grounds that;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any further subdivision will irrevocably change the special nature of Waikawa Beach. Any further subdivision will adversely affect Waikawa Beach's estuary and coastal environment, and associated wildlife breeding habitat. The climate change issues and associated predicted rises in sea level have not been adequately addressed. 	That the Rural land encompassing Waikawa Beach not be rezoned to Greenbelt Residential land.
21/049	Tony Katsos	Waikawa Beach – Rezoning Map K	Oppose	<p>Opposed to Plan Change 21 as it relates to rezoning two blocks of rural land, on the grounds that;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any further subdivision will irrevocably change the special nature of Waikawa Beach. Any further subdivision will adversely 	That the Rural land encompassing Waikawa Beach not be rezoned to Greenbelt Residential land.

Submission No.	Submitter Name	Location/ Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
21/049 Continued	Tony Katsos			<p>affect Waikawa Beach's estuary and coastal environment, and associated wildlife breeding habitat.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The climate change issues and associated predicted rises in sea level have not been adequately addressed. 	
21/050	Margarite Averages	Waikawa Beach – Rezoning Map K	Oppose	<p>Opposed to Plan Change 21 as it relates to rezoning two blocks of rural land, on the grounds that;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any further subdivision will irrevocably change the special nature of Waikawa Beach. Any further subdivision will adversely affect Waikawa Beach's estuary and coastal environment, and associated wildlife breeding habitat. The climate change issues and associated predicted rises in sea level have not been adequately addressed. 	That the Rural land encompassing Waikawa Beach not be rezoned to Greenbelt Residential land.
21/051	Lester Curley	Waikawa Beach – Rezoning Map K	Oppose	<p>Opposed to Plan Change 21 as it relates to rezoning two blocks of rural land, on the grounds that;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any further subdivision will irrevocably change the special nature of Waikawa Beach. Any further subdivision will adversely affect Waikawa Beach's estuary and coastal environment, and associated wildlife breeding habitat. The climate change issues and associated predicted rises in sea level have not been adequately addressed. 	That the Rural land encompassing Waikawa Beach not be rezoned to Greenbelt Residential land.

Submission No.	Submitter Name	Location/ Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
21/052	Murray Scott	Waikawa Beach - Rezoning	Oppose	<p>Opposed to Plan Change 21 as it relates to rezoning two blocks of rural land, on the grounds that;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any further subdivision will irrevocably change the special nature of Waikawa Beach. • Any further subdivision will adversely affect Waikawa Beach's estuary and coastal environment, and associated wildlife breeding habitat. • The climate change issues and associated predicted rises in sea level have not been adequately addressed. 	That the Rural land encompassing Waikawa Beach not be rezoned to Greenbelt Residential land.
21/053	Carolanna Anderton-Smith	Waikawa Beach - Rezoning	Oppose	<p>Opposed to Plan Change 21 as it relates to rezoning two blocks of rural land, on the grounds that;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any further subdivision will irrevocably change the special nature of Waikawa Beach. • Any further subdivision will adversely affect Waikawa Beach's estuary and coastal environment, and associated wildlife breeding habitat. • The climate change issues and associated predicted rises in sea level have not been adequately addressed. 	That the Rural land encompassing Waikawa Beach not be rezoned to Greenbelt Residential land.
21/054	Lakeview Farm Ltd			Rural multiple-owned Maori land titles included in the urban growth plan such as at Hokio Beach township need to be exempt from Development Contributions and other Council charges. This may help growth in areas like Hokio Beach as the owners of multiple owned lots often have limited	That rural multiple-owned Maori land titles included in the urban growth plan such as at Hokio Beach township need to be exempt from Development Contributions and other Council charges

Submission No.	Submitter Name	Location/ Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
21/054 Continued	Lakeview Farm Ltd			resources and do not want to sell their land to developers.	
21/055	Horowhenua District Council		Support	Support Plan Change 21 with amendments to ensure proper functioning of the Plan and maintain the amenity of the Greenbelt Residential Zone.	That Plan Change 21 be approved with amendments.
		Policy 6A.2.13		Amend Policy 6A.2.13	That Policy 6A.2.13 be amended to include restricting street lighting in streets in line with Design Guide.
		Rule 19A.4.2		Amend Rule 19A.4.2	That Rule 19A.4.2 be amended so that Relocated buildings should be Discretionary Activities with assessment based on the size and design of the building and the relationship to the neighbourhood character so that buildings are not relocated contrary to the predominant character of the neighbourhood (e.g. State house into a new housing area).
		Rule 19A.6(c)		Amend Rule 19A.6(c)	That Rule 19A.6(c) be amended to included a specified limit on earthworks e.g. 50m3 or all earthworks are Discretionary Activities
21/056	Valerie Walker	Waikawa Beach – Rezoning Map K	Support	Support the rezoning of land north of the Waikawa settlement but suggests it should be rezoned Low Density Residential. It would be a logical extension to Waikawa. The land north of the proposed Greenbelt area should be rezoned Deferred Greenbelt Residential. The land can absorb development with no adverse effects on the environment. The river acts as a natural boundary.	That the proposed Greenbelt Residential area north of Waikawa be rezoned Low Density Residential. That the proposed Greenbelt Residential area to the south be rezoned as planned That the land north of the proposed Greenbelt Residential area north of Waikawa be rezoned Deferred Greenbelt Residential.

Submission No.	Submitter Name	Location/ Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
21/057	Thomas Walker	Waikawa Beach – Rezoning Map K	Support	<p>Support the rezoning of land north of the Waikawa settlement but suggests it should be rezoned Low Density Residential. It would be a logical extension to Waikawa.</p> <p>The land north of the proposed Greenbelt area should be rezoned Deferred Greenbelt Residential. The land can absorb development with no adverse effects on the environment. The river acts as a natural boundary.</p>	<p>That the proposed Greenbelt Residential area north of Waikawa be rezoned Low Density Residential.</p> <p>That the proposed Greenbelt Residential area to the south be rezoned as planned</p> <p>That the land north of the proposed Greenbelt Residential area north of Waikawa be rezoned Deferred Greenbelt Residential.</p>
21/058	P.M. Goodwin	Levin South- Rezoning Map F	Oppose	<p>Oppose the arbitrary delineation of the Deferred Greenbelt Residential Zoning of the land on the western side of Gladstone Road. The Greenbelt Zone should extend up to the 100 metre contour. Relying on the land use capability overlay as the basis for what is productive land is unreliable. The land currently excluded is of limited productive potential.</p>	<p>That the Levin South Deferred Greenbelt Residential zone be amended so the eastern extension of that zone extends to be the edge of the Levin-Koputaroa domain to where it meets the Hill Country domain.</p>
21/059	TGTC Limited	Waitarere Beach – Rezoning Map G	Oppose	<p>Oppose the Residential 2 Deferred zoning of the land to the west of Forest Road, Waitarere Beach. The deferred zoning is contrary to previous written advice provided by the Council and the adopted Horowhenua Development Plan. The deferred status would result in the rural rules being applied in the interim leaving a “rural” zoned block sitting incongruously within a residential area. The deferred status will prevent the submitter from proceeding with a more appropriate subdivision than the one currently granted.</p>	<p>That standard Residential 2 zoning is re-instated as per the Adopted Development Plan.</p> <p>That the submitter should not be subject to financial hardship as a result of Council's unwarranted indecision and reversal of previous written advice.</p>

Submission No.	Submitter Name	Location/ Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
21/060	Rodger Taylor	Foxton – Rezoning Map B	Oppose	Oppose the rezoning of Industrial zoned land (Hetta Street, Foxton) to Greenbelt Residential. Industrial land in Foxton is in short supply. Further expansion of current activities on these Industrial sites would be require resource consent and would result in increased costs and delays. The existing uses have been operating for a number of years without a negative impact on the surrounding area.	That the Industrial zoned land in Hetta Street, Foxton proposed to be rezoned Greenbelt Residential remain zoned Industrial.
21/061	George & Moira Bryce	Ohau- Rezoning Map I	Oppose	Oppose Plan Change 21. The Horowhenua Development Plan showed the submitter's property to be rezoned Greenbelt Residential and now Plan Change 21 does not include the submitter's property within the land to be rezoned Greenbelt Residential. It would be advantageous to be able to subdivide the property into two at sometime in the future. There is no good reason for the change from the original Development Plan.	That the submitter's property be rezoned Greenbelt Residential.
21/062	Russell & Barbara Woodley	Ohau- Rezoning Map I	Oppose	Oppose Plan Change 21. The Horowhenua Development Plan showed the submitter's property to be rezoned Greenbelt Residential and now Plan Change 21 does not include the submitter's property within the land to be rezoned Greenbelt Residential. There is no good reason for the change from the original Development Plan.	That the submitter's property be rezoned Greenbelt Residential.

Submission No.	Submitter Name	Location/ Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
21/063	Lorene & David Burdan	Levin – Rezoning Map E	Oppose	<p>Oppose this Plan Change particularly the rezoning of the rural land north of Kawiu Road between Weraroa and Tiro Tiro Road intersections because of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The high productive quality of the soil for crop production • The pollution threat to the natural spring fed Patiki Stream and natural swamp • The threat to native figs, plants, water and swamp birds. 	<p>Not specified. Inferred: That the rural land north of Kawiu Road between Weraroa and Tiro Tiro Road intersections not be rezoned Residential.</p>
21/064	Tarrant Family Trust	Ohau – Rezoning Map I		<p>The area now planted in grapes should be considered as a buffer zone from traffic or State Highway 1. The low density zone be moved west to include and surround the QEII Totara Bush so a higher density level can be provided. The land is very well drained enabling easy drainage for high density sites.</p>	<p>That the Plan Change be amended to move the proposed Low density overlay west from the area which is now planted as vineyard.</p>
21/065	Barry Smith	Waikawa Beach – Rezoning Map K	Support	<p>Fully support Plan Change 21 as it relates to Waikawa Beach. The north end would be a natural extension to the existing development. The land further north should be rezoned Deferred Greenbelt Residential. Both areas are capable of absorbing further development. The river acts as a boundary.</p>	<p>That the land at Waikawa Beach be rezoned Greenbelt Residential as per the Plan Change and the area further north be rezoned Deferred Greenbelt Residential.</p>
21/066	Horowhenua District Growers Association			<p>Support the submission lodged by Horticulture New Zealand in its entirety for Plan Change 21</p>	<p>Not Specified Inferred: That the Council support the matters raised in the submission lodged by Horticulture New Zealand.</p>

Submission No.	Submitter Name	Location/ Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
21/067	John Hewitson	Waikawa Beach – Rezoning Map K		<p>The proposed Greenbelt area at the south of Manga-Pirua Street extends into the land promises as a Reserve thereby eliminating public access to the beach.</p> <p>The proposed Greenbelt Area at the north end extends will into the area designated by Horizons as a Flood Plain. The Horowhenua District Council gave an undertaking it would only be 2 hectares (5 acres). New properties will increase the water take and will increase the risk of salinisation of the aquifers. Earthworks required to create new building platforms will destroy the wetlands that exist now and result in the loss of feeding and breeding areas for wildlife.</p>	<p>That the proposed Greenbelt Residential area at the north end of Waikawa be reduced to 5 acres.</p> <p>That the number if new residential blocks should be kept to a minimum and the size of each block should be no smaller than 5000m2.</p> <p>That there must be no new lakes created.</p> <p>That any new residences be built on suitable existing sites.</p>
21/068	John Martin			<p>Should development be shifted away from highly productive land?</p> <p>What are the advantages of moving hosing development out and creating hamlets? If Council were not to supply water, sewage or rubbish disposal, it would force people into water collection and conservation and away from the naive belief that Council can and will supply limitless potable water for minimal cost.</p>	Not Specified
21/069	Peter Bolton	Levin North – Rezoning Map E	Oppose	Oppose existing Rural land being rezoned Residential 1 - Low Density Area (Levin North) as there are no services provided	That a sewer main be provided to the end of the road.
21/070	Marilyn Blenkhorn	Levin South – Rezoning Map F	Support	Strongly support the Greenbelt Residential zoning. The objectives can not be faulted. As the deferred zoning of Levin South (east) is the closest connection to Levin this should	Not specified: Inferred: That Plan Change 21 be adopted.

Submission No.	Submitter Name	Location/ Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
21/070 Continued	Marilyn Blenkhorn			be a priority. Could some areas within this be rezoned now? The Arapaepae area has water and power readily available, as funds build, infrastructure and development could then move further east. Levin South (east) meets the criteria of Issue 6A.4 however the proposed zonings in outlying areas don't meet this so well.	
21/071	Truebridge Associates		Oppose	Given the concerns which cover many different aspects of Plan Change 21 there is an overall concern that the proposed changes in their current form will have a negative impact on future development within the Horowhenua.	That changes be made in accordance with the submission
		Foxton Beach – Rezoning Map A		Does not appear to be a logical explanation as to why some titles have two or three proposed new zonings. This style of zoning leaves an awkward rural zoned buffer strip adjacent to Palmer Road. New zonings do not reflect the current land-uses or recently approved developments.	
		Levin – Rezoning Map F		An unusual zone boundary shape is shown between the rural and industrial land. There appears to be no explanation for this shape or why these titles are half industrial and half residential.	
		Ohau – Rezoning Map I		Ohau will contain 4 residential zonings and a central area that is zoned rural however it contains residential sized allotments. Is there a need for such complex zoning arrangement in Ohau? Recent subdivision approvals seem to be at odds with the	

Submission No.	Submitter Name	Location/ Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
21/071 Continued	Truebridge Associates			proposed zonings (e.g. Residential 3 land opposite Railway Terrace contains lifestyle sections)	
		Waikawa – Rezoning Map K		Appears to be a number of developments surrounding Waikawa that have already been developed in a rural residential style. Would they be better suited to another type of zoning?	
		Manakau – Rezoning Map J		Ketemaringi Way has already been developed into lifestyle sections so why not change the zoning to suit.	
		Waitarere Beach – Rezoning Map G		Properties on Kent Avenue down by the Waterfront have been developed residentially but still have a rural zoning. Why not rezone them Residential 2. Rural land to be zoned Greenbelt Residential also does not follow title boundaries or the recently approved Waitarere Rise development. Stage of this development has been completed is it not now more suitable to another zone?	
		Structure Plan		There does not appear to be any detail in the Plan Change about the requirements of Structure Plans. There needs to be flexibility in meeting the requirements of structure plans so that it won't result in a non-complying consent being required.	
		Deferred Zones		Deferred Greenbelt Residential zoning shown for Spring Street, Foxton however this area is also included in the Structure	

Submission No.	Submitter Name	Location/ Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
21/071 Continued	Truebridge Associates			<p>Plan 2. Does this mean the Greenbelt residential zoning will take effect immediately?</p> <p>Can individual landowners apply for a Plan Change to incorporate a Structure Plan for just their land or does it have to be for the whole piece of deferred zoned land?</p> <p>Are landowners able to be proactive in getting the deferred zones uplifted or are they reliant on Council initiating the change or upgrading the reticulated services?</p>	
21/072	New Zealand Railways Corporation	Explanation of Objective 6A.4.1 (Paragraph 2 pg 10) Rule 19A.4.1(ii) Section 24A.1.1(k)	Support	<p>NZRC generally supports the intent of Plan Change 21 particularly Paragraph 2 pg 10</p> <p>Supports the Council's stated intention to require subdividers to provide a reasonable contribution towards funding improvements or extensions to existing infrastructure.</p> <p>Rule 19A.4.1(ii)</p> <p>Supports the inclusion of the words "access over or under railway lines" in this provision.</p> <p>Section 24A.1.1(k)</p> <p>Supports the inclusion of the reference to "all rail networks" in this provision.</p> <p>NZRC requests amendments to the proposed plan change in order to better address the adverse effects that inappropriate subdivision or development could have on the railway network</p>	That Plan Change 21 be adopted particularly the following provisions Explanation of Objective 6A.4.1 - (Paragraph 2 pg 10) Rule 19A.4.1(ii) Section 24A.1.1(k)

Submission No.	Submitter Name	Location/ Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
21/072 Continued	New Zealand Railways Corporation	Rule 19A.2.3		Amend rule to reduce the potential for reverse sensitivity in relation to residential activities.	That Rule 19A.2.3 be amended by adding an additional criterion: "No dwelling shall be located closer than 15 metres from any railway boundary".
		Rule 19A.2.5		All level crossings have view lines – an area of land that must be kept clear of obstruction to allow an approaching or stopped vehicle to see in both directions along the railway line. Maintaining view lines is particularly important for level crossings.	That Rule 19A.2.5 be amended by adding the following statement at the end of this provision "Any person proposing to build within close proximity to a level crossing should contact the New Zealand Railways Corporation for calculation of the view lines for the crossing."
		Rule 19A.2.16		Oppose the creation of new lots that rely solely on a level crossing over a railway line for access.	That Rule 19A.2.16 be amended to read "All activities shall be provided with practicable vehicle access from a public road that is not obtained by crossing a railway line in accordance with the requirements as specified in Section 21".
21/073	Susette Playford	Waitarere Beach – Rezoning Map G	Oppose	Oppose the rezoning of Park Avenue from Rural to Residential 2. It will devalue the current resident's investments. The ambience of the area will diminish. There is already an abundance of properties in Waitarere to meet demands. Park Avenue is the only rural area close to the beach. Concerns that the current infrastructure (e.g. sewage) would be able to manage the increased density.	That the status quo should remain and the rural area of Park avenue should not be rezoned.
21/074	Susanne Hanlon	Waitarere Beach – Rezoning Map G	Oppose	Oppose rezoning the rural land in Park Avenue to Residential 2. The road is a rural road not a residential road with footpaths, curbing or channelling. To rezone would have many more sewage connections and	That the status quo should remain and the rural area of Park Avenue should not be rezoned.

Submission No.	Submitter Name	Location/ Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
21/074 Continued	Susanne Hanlon			the sewage system was not made to handle all the lots this would create. There is not a demand for more residential sections. The ambience of what was originally planned for would be gone forever.	
21/075	Mr & Mrs Astwood	Ohau – Potential Future Link Road Section 6A.1 (particularly the third paragraph) Policy 6A.4.4 (and the penultimate and final paragraphs of the explanatory text to this policy) Methods for Issue 6A.4 & Objective 6A.4.1 (4 th bullet point)	Oppose	The adopted Horowhenua Development identifies the potential future road link between Western Rise and Waipuna Grove. The potential link road is not included in the Structure Plans for the Ohau area. As Ohau is the only urban area identified in the Development Plan as a potential location for a future link road, it would appear that reference to linked road networks and significant upgrades and extensions to infrastructure within the Plan change can be directly related back to the Ohau Plan in the adopted Development Plan. Whilst Plan Change 21 does not specifically refer to the requirement for a potential future link road in Ohau to deliver the expected environmental outcomes of Plan Change 21, omitting to refer explicitly to the need or otherwise for such a link road it does nothing to allay landowners and resident fears in this respect. Given the potential that a future link road between Waipuna Grove and Western Rise would have significant implications on local landowners and residents, it is not fair or reasonable on the residents of Ohau, or the wider community that the Council remain silent or vague on the issue.	That the following provisions be amended to more accurately reflect the Council's intentions in respect of a potential future link road in the Ohau township area: Section 6A.1 (particularly the third paragraph) Policy 6A.4.4 (and the penultimate and final paragraphs of the explanatory text to this policy) Methods for Issue 6A.4 & Objective 6A.4.1 (4 th bullet point)

Submission No.	Submitter Name	Location/ Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
21/075 Continued	Mr & Mrs Astwood			<p>Oppose parts of Plan Change 21 as they do not accurately reflect the possible means by which the Council consider that the stated aims, objectives and potential methods of the adopted Development Plan can be delivered in a managed and planned way in the long term.</p> <p>Oppose parts of the Plan as they do not provide certainty for future decision making on urban growth.</p>	
21/076	Sidney & Jocelyn Thomas	Levin North – Rezoning Map E	Oppose	<p>Oppose rezoning Rural land to be zoned Residential 1 (specifically the area bound by Roslyn Road and Fairfield Road to behind the existing properties in Kennedy Drive. The soils are very fertile and free draining suitable for a wide range of farming uses. There is more than adequate land already rezoned for residential uses in the Levin area. Rezoning would lead to a surge in rates. The landowners would not want to subdivide to make the land available for future housing. Low number of sales and houses for the Okarito Avenue subdivision. Council services would not be able to cope with additional subdivision development. The proposed rezoning would prevent existing owners from changing their current farming practices to new ones due to reverse sensitivity issues and existing use rights only applying to the activities currently undertaken. It would force farming out of this area</p>	That the proposed Residential 1 zoning be deleted from all land except the recent subdivision off Kennedy Drive (Okarito Avenue)
		Rules 14.2.8,	Oppose	Oppose the rezoning and being subject to	Inferred: That the proposed rezoning of Rural

Submission No.	Submitter Name	Location/ Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
21/076 Continued	Sidney & Jocelyn Thomas	14.2.9, 14.2.12, 14.2.13, 14.2.18, 14.2.27, 14.1(c) Structure Plan 5	Oppose	the Residential 1 rules, particularly Rules 14.2.8, 14.2.9, 14.2.12, 14.2.13, 14.2.18, 14.2.27, 14.1(c) Oppose Structure Plan 5 as the roads are unrealistic and straddle the submitter's property. The proposed roads are vague especially as one is planned to join Roslyn Road through a deep gully.	land to Residential 1 should not proceed, except for the Okarito Avenue subdivision. Inferred: That Structure Plan 5 be deleted.
21/077	Matt Hoggard	Greenbelt Concept Policy 6A.2.2 Methods for Issues 6A.2 and Objectives 6A.2.1 (first bullet point) Policy 6A.4.4 Table 19A.1	Support	Greenbelt concept is supported as it allows for planned development to occur. The change to the district plan reflects the Horowhenua Development Plan, however it cannot carry significant weight as it is not subject to a statutory process. The Council should use the Resource Management Process to determine the development of the district. Public participation is a key principle of the Resource Management Act. Policy 6A.4.4 is unclear if it is intended to refer to all infrastructure including sewage and water. If this is the case, the policy is in conflict with Policy 6A.2.2. Policy 6A.4.4 should be amended to reflect adequate servicing as opposed to adequate infrastructure. The use of 5000m2 for unserviced areas is not substantiated. Effluent disposal systems can adequately operate on less than 5000m2. Effects should be addressed	That the Greenbelt concept be refined and retained. Retain Policy 6A.2.2 That the first bullet point under Methods for Issues 6A.2 and Objectives 6A.2.1 be amended to read "Plan maps will define the geographic extent of the Greenbelt Residential zone based on demographics, land forms, land types, ability to provide services, hazards, historic heritage and the extent of existing development". That Policy 6A.4.4 be amended to read "Ensure that staging of development in the Greenbelt Residential zone is efficient, consistent with existing infrastructure (where available) or able to be adequately serviced by onsite infrastructure and that development is otherwise deferred until the required level of service can be provided". That Table 19A.1 be amended Greenbelt residential unserviced to 2000m2 subject to ability to provide evidence of adequate effluent (waste water) disposal.

Submission No.	Submitter Name	Location/ Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
21/077 Continued	Matt Hoggard			rather than the creation of arbitrary rules.	Review Rule 15.4.1 to reflect that adequate sewage disposal is dependent on factors other than simply allotment size.
		Section 6		The District Plan should not rely on or be driven by other non-statutory documents which are subject to change as Councillors change. Placing a strong emphasis on the importance of the Horowhenua Development Plan threatens to undermine the Resource Management Act process. The section 32 analysis depends heavily on the importance of the Horowhenua Development Plan where as a fresh focus on the benefits and costs of policies, rules or other methods and the risk of acting or not acting as opposed to being driven by existing policy.	That Non-complying activities are replaced with Discretionary Activities. That the wording of Section 6 be amended to reflect that the Development Plans a subservient document to the District Plan and as such contains no legal weight. The current wording "The Development Plan details an implementation action list which will be progressively implemented, and includes actions such as changing the District Plan" should be reworded to read "The Development Plan has been formulated to assist in future planning direction as such it may be considered when seeking direction".
				Insufficient information on the effects of climate change and coastal processes to provide for long term planning. The Waikawa area is complex given the location of the Waikawa Stream and the coastal influences on this stream.	That Plan Change 21 recognise and include the effects of climate change.
		Policy 8.4a	Support	The effects of the recession may last between 3-4 years it is important to stimulate growth within the District	That Policy 8.4a be retained.
		Policy 8.4b	Oppose	Oppose Policy 8.4b as the landownership and availability of land are key factors in successful economic growth.	That Policy 8.4b be deleted.

Submission No.	Submitter Name	Location/ Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
21/077 Continued	Matt Hoggard	Waikawa Beach – Rezoning Map K Structure Plans 10 & 11		Zoning land will not in itself provide for development to proceed. The current zoning of Structure Plan 11 and proposed Greenbelt Residential areas at Waikawa are insufficient. Increasing the area to be rezoned Greenbelt residential would better reflect the current uses which are occurring within this area	That a realistic area of land be provided for expansion of the Waikawa Settlement including rezoning properties from Rural to Greenbelt Residential along Strathnaver Drive (between Sarah Street and Reay Mackay Grove).
21/078	Judy Keall	Manakau Map J	Support	Support the proposed greenbelt residential area in the Manakau district being restricted to the land south of Manakau Village and strongly support the removal or any Greenbelt Residential area to the north of the village. Opposed to any delay in implementing the plan change. Developers should not gain a window of opportunity to subdivide under the old rule before this plan change comes into effect.	Inferred: That Plan Change 21 in relation to Manakau be adopted in its current form. That Plan Change 21 be brought into effect as soon as possible so that people who already have built residences on the land to the south of Manakau do not get the opportunity to further subdivide that land before the Plan Change is implemented.
21/079	Horticulture New Zealand	Rule 19A.2.3(f) Section 24A.1.1(d)		Rule 19A.2.3 sets a building setback of 15 metres between dwellings and the rural zone. It is considered that this is insufficient and a 50 metre setback should be provided to ensure that the potential for conflict is reduced. The assessment criteria would be more explicit if it referred to rural production activities on adjoining rural zoned land.	That Rule 19A.2.3(f) be amended to 50 metres and Section 24A.1.1(d) be amended by adding “including rural production activities on adjoining rural zoned land”.
		Rule 19A.1	Support	Support that primary productive activities are included as a permitted activity in Greenbelt Residential zone.	That Primary Productive activities are retained in Rule 19A.1

Submission No.	Submitter Name	Location/ Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
21/080	MC ² Group Limited	Ohau – Rezoning Map I Greenbelt Residential Subdivision Design Guide	Neutral	<p>The zone boundaries are, in places inconsistent with the proposal, the section 32 analysis, the structure plans and the existing built environment, thereby leading to anomalies in the planning process in the future.</p> <p>The design guides for rural subdivision do not require a broad enough examination of the peripheral characteristics of the adjoining properties, thereby allowing ecological, cultural and physical connections to be enhanced.</p> <p>The Design Guides give little clue about how they achieve the desired outcomes when the built form is considered.</p> <p>There appears to be little incentive, through mechanisms such as a discretionary density bonus and the ability to transfer development rights, to go beyond the scope of traditional development and to achieve advances in design, planning, ecological restoration, community/affordable/workforce housing and other areas.</p>	That further information be provided and the opportunity to be involved in clarifying the matters raised.
21/081	Landlink Ltd	Ohau – Rezoning Map I Greenbelt Residential Subdivision Design Guide	Neutral	<p>The zone boundaries are, in places inconsistent with the proposal, the section 32 analysis, the structure plans and the existing built environment, thereby leading to anomalies in the planning process in the future.</p> <p>The design guides for rural subdivision do not require a broad enough examination of the peripheral characteristics of the adjoining properties, thereby allowing</p>	That further information be provided and the opportunity to be involved in clarifying the matters raised.

Submission No.	Submitter Name	Location/ Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
21/081 Continued	Landlink Ltd			ecological, cultural and physical connections to be enhanced. The Design Guides give little clue about how they achieve the desired outcomes when the built form is considered. There appears to be little incentive, through mechanisms such as a discretionary density bonus and the ability to transfer development rights, to go beyond the scope of traditional development and to achieve advances in design, planning, ecological restoration, community/affordable/workforce housing and other areas.	
21/082	Colyer Mair Assets Limited		Oppose	Oppose all provisions that would affect the ability of the submitter to carry out its existing business or would create reverse sensitivity issues.	That the plan change be amended to avoid adverse effects on the submitter's property and ability to undertake existing activities.
21/083	Horizons Regional Council	Objective 6A.2.1 and Policies 6A.2.2 and 6A.2.16	Support	Support Objective 6A.2.1 and Policies 6A.2.2 and 6A.2.16	That Objective 6A.2.1 and Policies 6A.2.2 and 6A.2.16 be retained
		Objective 6A.4.1 and Polices 6A.4.3 (1 st one) and 6A.4.4	Support	Support Objective 6A.4.1 and Polices 6A.4.3 (1 st one) and 6A.4.4	That Objective 6A.4.1 and Polices 6A.4.3 (1 st one) and 6A.4.4 be retained.
		Rules 19A.1(k), 19A.2.3(d) and (e), 19A.2.12, 13, 14 19A.2.21, 19A.4.1(iii)-(vii), 19A.4.1.A	Support	Support Rules 19A.1(k), 19A.2.3(d) and (e), 19A.2.12, 19A.2.13, 19A.2.14, 19A.2.21, 19A.4.1(iii)-(vii), 19A.4.1.A	That Rules 19A.1(k), 19A.2.3(d) and (e), 19A.2.12, 19A.2.13, 19A.2.14, 19A.2.21, 19A.4.1(iii)-(vii), 19A.4.1.A be retained.

Submission No.	Submitter Name	Location/ Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
21/083 Continued	Horizons Regional Council	Sections 24A.1.1 (e), (f), (g), (h), (j) and (k)	Support	Support Sections 24A.1.1 (e), (f), (g), (h), (j) and (k)	That Sections 24A.1.1 (e), (f), (g), (h), (j) and (k) be retained.
		Policy 8.4h	Support	Support Policy 8.4h	That Policy 8.4h be retained
		Rule 15.4.1	Oppose	Oppose the minimum lot sizes where reticulated sewage disposal is not available. The allotment sizes stated, where reticulated sewage disposal is not available are contrary to minimum property sizes prescribed under Rule 13-11 of the Proposed One Plan. Alternatively if this rule is not conformed to the Deferred zoning status could be applied.	That the minimum allotment (property) sizes be changed to conform to Rule 13-11 of the Proposed One Plan Or Adopt Amendment 30, Rule 15A.1 Residential 2, 3 and 4 (Deferred) Zones
21/084	Pritchard Group Limited	Plan Change 21 Section 32 Analysis	Oppose	Oppose Plan Change 21 as it does not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and is therefore inconsistent with Part II of the Resource Management Act (RMA) The section 32 Analysis is deficient for a plan change promoting such significant amendments. The Plan Change has not been considered appropriately under Section 74 of the RMA. Plan Changes 20 and 21 are inextricably linked and therefore both Plan Changes should not be documented and promoted separately.	That the status quo remains and the existing provisions of the Operative District Plan be maintained.
21/085	Graham Halstead/Maple Securities Ltd	Levin North – Rezoning Map E	Oppose	Oppose the rezoning of rural land to Residential 1. The soils are very fertile and free draining suitable for a wide range of farming uses.	That the proposed Residential 1 zoning of all land including the low density zoning on the eastern side of Fairfield Road be deleted, except for the recent new subdivision off Kennedy Drive

Submission No.	Submitter Name	Location/ Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
21/085 Continued	Graham Halstead/Maple Securities Ltd			There is more than adequate land already rezoned for residential uses in the Levin area. Rezoning would lead to a surge in rates. The landowners would not want to subdivide to make the land available for future housing. Low number of sales and houses for the Okarito Avenue subdivision. Council services would not be able to cope with additional subdivision development. The proposed rezoning would prevent existing owners from changing their current farming practices to new ones due to reverse sensitivity issues and existing use rights only applying to the activities currently undertaken. It would force farming out of this area	(Okarito Avenue).
		Structure Plan 5	Oppose	Oppose Structure Plan 5. Structure plans are not referred to in the Resource Management Act and there is no requirement for such a plan. Structure Plans are not defined in the Horowhenua District Plan. The proposed roads are unrealistic, in the wrong place and straddle approximately 8 properties held in different ownership. The proposed reserve on the submitter's land is unrealistic, as it would be too dangerous for a children's playground and too small for playing fields. It is up to the Council to purchase land and develop it, not the landowner. Creation of a large open space reserve on	That Structure Plan 5 be deleted, and that all proposed amendments referring to subdivisions having to comply with Structure Plans be deleted

Submission No.	Submitter Name	Location/ Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
21/085 Continued	Graham Halstead/Maple Securities Ltd			private land alongside SH1 must surely be beyond Council powers by means of a structure plan. The proposed intersection modifications are so vague that they should be deleted. The structure plan appears to have been created as a means of trying to avoid the statutory requirement for designating land. Will structure plans prevent further development such as new buildings being constructed along proposed road lines and reserves?	
21/086	FRP Investments Ltd & FRP Agriculture Ltd	Foxton Beach – Rezoning Map A		Amend the area to be rezoned Greenbelt Residential to include the submitter's land. The submitter's land is accessed from Palmer Road and adjoins the northern boundary of Foxton Beach township. The land is in the Rural zone and is relatively flat compared with other coastal sand country areas. The land is well suited to providing additional Residential Greenbelt land in the medium to longer term.	That the submitter's land be rezoned Greenbelt Residential. (See submission for map). That any other consequential changes be made to the Plan Change resulting from the incorporation of the zoning and structure plan amendment.
		Structure Plan 1		A Structure Plan will be developed for the submitter's land and made available in advance of Council consideration of this submission.	That Structure Plan 1 be amended to include a Structure Plan for the submitter's land.
21/087	Nathan Masters	Sections 6A, 6B, 14A, 15A, 19A, 24A, Schedule 7 Schedule 8, Changes to Sections 6, 14, 15, 21, 22, 25	Oppose	Oppose the Plan Change as the current system seems difficult and challenging enough to adhere to. By introducing further policy and steps it is going to discourage growth and development in the areas impacted.	That the Council abandons the introduction of the following parts of Plan Change 21 Sections 6A, 6B, 14A, 15A, 19A, 24A, Schedules 7 and 8, and abandons the proposed changes to Sections 6, 14, 15, 21, 22, 25

Submission No.	Submitter Name	Location/ Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
21/088	Woodhaven Gardens Limited			The aggregation of Greenbelt areas limits options for others to subdivide property, if owners are unable to utilise their land productively. If unable to use a resource like water to grow crops it is highly unlikely that the land could be sold for farming, leaving the only alternative as subdivision.	That Plan Change 21 be amended to the effect that where an owner in a Greenbelt area has applied for water resources and has been declined that right to water, (and thus making the land uneconomic for farming in the manner that the farmer and previous owners have farmed the land) that the owner is able to subdivide.
21/089	Bill & Jenny Studd	Waikawa Beach – Rezoning Map K	Oppose	Oppose the rezoning of the land at the north end of Waikawa Beach to Greenbelt Residential. Rezoning would reduce the amenities that adjacent properties have at present in terms of open space next to their properties, increased traffic and risks to present groundwater supplies. Opposed to further development around Waikawa Beach.	Inferred: That the land at the north end of Waikawa remain zoned Rural.
		Issue 6A.3 Policy 6A.2.8 Objective 6A.3.1 Policy 6A.4.2 Policy 6A.4.3 Rule 19A.2.3(b)		If Council does go ahead and rezone this area, then the policies need to be strengthened as there is insufficient recognition of the interface issues which arise across the boundary of the proposed Greenbelt and existing Residential zones. Issue 6A.3 pays insufficient attention to reverse sensitivity effects.	That the following provisions be amended Issue 6A.3 Policy 6A.2.8 Objective 6A.3.1 Policy 6A.4.2 Policy 6A.4.3 Rule 19A.2.3(b)
		Policy 6A.2.8		Policy 6A.2.8 has a narrow focus, it should take into account the rural amenities and space existing in these localities.	That Policy 6A.2.8 be amended. The concept of adequate space between neighbours should be a broader concept, including a provision for adequate open space, not just direct sunlight and shade effects.
		Objective 6A.3.1		Objective 6A.3.1 is too vague and although it refers to setback rules it provides no guidance on what the setback should be.	That Objective 6A.3.1 be amended so that the existing situation be recognised and that any new building in the adjacent Greenbelt zone be a

Submission No.	Submitter Name	Location/ Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
21/089 Continued	Bill & Jenny Studd	Policy 6A.4.2 & Policy 6A.4.3 Rule 19A.2.3(b)		<p>These policies require that attention be given to sustainable management and supply of physical resource and in particular water supply. This focus is on the availability of water to the new greenbelt properties and ignores the potential effects on supply or quality of water to existing adjacent properties.</p> <p>This rule states that buildings on Greenbelt Residential properties should be 3 metres from the boundary of the adjacent properties. This is inadequate given the high level objective of preserving space and semi-rural character. Unnecessary for properties of 5000m².</p>	<p>specific distance (15 metres?) away from residential/greenbelt boundary.</p> <p>That Policies 6A.4.2 and 6A.4.3 be given to cross-zone boundary effects on resource sustainability, and requirements that any application for subdivision include a proper assessment by experts of the effects of the proposal on supply and quality of water for existing users in neighbouring zones, and for prior consultation with those owners.</p> <p>That Rule 19A.2.3(b) be amended so that the figure of 3 meters is increased to 15 metres.</p>
21/090	Lesley & Robyn Greer, Graham Murray and Lorraine Purvis	Tokomaru – Rezoning Map C	Oppose	<p>Oppose the change in zoning from Rural to Greenbelt Residential for the proposed area north of Tokomaru. Oppose the further subdivision of these properties. Properties purchased on the understanding that they were zoned Rural. The likely increase in the number of small holdings in the area will be accompanied by an increase in reverse sensitivity complaints. No need to create a buffer between the existing urban area and the rural properties. A number of the properties in the proposed Greenbelt Residential area are already below 5000m².</p>	<p>That the proposal to replace the current Rural zoning with a Residential Greenbelt zoning for the area north of Tokomaru Village (the area bounded by SH 57 and Rewa Rewa Street) be withdrawn.</p>

Submission No.	Submitter Name	Location/ Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
21/091	HWRG Richardson Group Ltd	Ohau – Rezoning Map I	Oppose	The proximity of the proposed rezoning to the existing Allied Concrete plan has the potential to result in reverse sensitivity issues that could threaten the existence of this legally established business. Plan Change 21 needs to be amended in order to ensure that future residential activity is situated in an appropriate location with separation from existing activities that may adversely impact on the residential amenity anticipated in the Greenbelt Residential zone.	That the Greenbelt Residential Zone proposed to the south of Ohau be either removed from the Plan Change or significantly reduced in size to ensure that the legitimate and legally established Allied Concrete site is not placed in a position where its operations could be impaired due to reverse sensitivity complaints. That an appropriate buffer needs to be incorporated on the rezoned land to protect residents from potentially adverse effects and also to protect Allied Concrete from reverse sensitivity claims.
		Section 6A.1		Amend Section 6A.1 to make reference to providing form an appropriate interface with existing activities located in the Rural zone in order to limit reverse sensitivity issues. Rezoning land adjacent to the Allied Concrete site Greenbelt Residential and then leaving the planning of this area to a later stage provides uncertainty which can not be supported in terms of section 32 of the Resource Management Act.	That Section 6A.1 (2 nd paragraph) be amended to read as follows: “... provide an urban edge interface with rural areas that limits reverse sensitivity conflicts and provides for the protection of legally established activities in the Rural Zone”. Retain the first sentence of the third paragraph. Though only on the basis that the Greenbelt Residential Zone is amended as per this submission, or an appropriate assessment is undertaken with respect to providing adequate buffering in the Greenbelt Residential Zone and shown on the Structure Plan maps.
		Issue 6A.2	Support	Support the text (Issue 6A.2) included in the Plan Change.	That Issue 6A.2 as provided in the Plan Change be amended.
		Policy 6A.2.11	Neutral	No amendment sought to Policy 6A.2.11 but notes that it is unlikely to be achievable in the Greenbelt Residential Zone to the south of Ohau. Without the removal or modification of this particular zone as	

Submission No.	Submitter Name	Location/ Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
21/091 Continued	HWRG Richardson Group Ltd			requested in this submission Policy 6A.2.11 will not be achieved.	
		Section 6A.2 Explanation & Principle Reasons	Support	Support the text (Section 6A.2 Explanation & Principle Reasons) included in the Plan Change	That the following text (Sec 6A.2) be retained: "However, other activities, such as intensive farming and industrial activities may be incompatible with the character and amenity values of this zone
		Issue 6A.3	Support	Support the text (Issue 6A.3) included in the Plan Change	That the explanation associated with Issue 6A.3 as provided in the Plan Change be retained.
		Objective 6A.3.1 & associated policies	Support	Policy 6A.3.3 refers to the provision of buffers at the immediate interface between Rural and Greenbelt Residential Zone, which is what HWRG is seeking between the Allied Concrete site and the proposed Greenbelt Residential Zone to the south of Ohau. For the avoidance of doubt, Policy 6A.3.4 should be amended to include the Greenbelt Residential zone as this Policy should only refer to activity within that zone.	That Objective 6A.3.1 be retained and the associated policies 6A.3.3 and 6A.3.4 be amended to read Policy 6A.3.3 "Provide buffers at the immediate interface between Rural and Greenbelt Residential zones to mitigate residential dwellings from the adverse effects of activities in the Rural zone". Policy 6A.3.4 "Provide interface controls on primary production and other activities in the Greenbelt Residential Zone that may have adverse effects on adjoining activities".
		Section 6A.3 Explanation & Principal Reasons	Support	Support text (Section 6A.3 Explanation & Principal Reasons) included in Plan Change.	That the text of Section 6A.3 Explanation & Principal Reasons be retained as per the Plan Change.
		Structure Plans 8 & 9	Oppose	Oppose Structure Plans 8 and 9 as currently proposed. The Structure Plans need to be amended with the Greenbelt area removed or significantly reduced in area in order to	That the land zoned Greenbelt Residential on Structure Plans 8 & 9 be removed or significantly reduced.

Submission No.	Submitter Name	Location/ Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
21/091 Continued	HWRG Richardson Group Ltd			provide an appropriate separation distance between the Allied Concrete site and any future residential activity on land that was previously zoned Rural.	
21/092	J.W. & J.D. Brown	Levin South- Rezoning Map F	Support	Generally support Plan Change 21 as there is the need for Council to control where rural residential/greenbelt residential development occurs. It is more appropriate and sustainable to locate this type of development close to existing established urban areas. Random subdivision of this nature can lead to inefficient use of the rural land resource and reverse sensitivity issues with rural activities. The key concern is how this Plan Change affects the submitter's property.	That the changes and amendments detailed in the submission be incorporated into any decision made by HDC. That the submitters be involved in any decisions relating to the Levin South Greenbelt Residential Area, particularly any decisions regarding the Structure Plan for this area.
		Objective 6A.2.1 Explanation & Principal Reasons		Amend Objective 6A.2.1 Explanation & Principal Reasons (first sentence).	That Objective 6A.2.1 be amended to read Explanation & Principal Reasons (first sentence) to read: "The Plan acknowledges that the Greenbelt Residential Zone provides an area for people to reside, as well as other ancillary activities which are compatible with this residential character and amenity".
		Policy 6A.3.2		Amend Policy 6A.3.2	That Policy 6A.3.2 should be amended to read "Provide for land uses in the Greenbelt Residential Zone that have similar amenity expectations, and are managed through environmental standards as necessary to avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse effects".
		Objective 6A.3.1 Explanation &		Amend Objective 6A.3.1 Explanation & Principal Reasons	That Objective 6A.3.1 Explanation & Principal Reasons (first sentence)

Submission No.	Submitter Name	Location/ Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
21/09 Continued	J.W. & J.D. Brown	Principal Reasons			be amended to read "Providing for a wide range of activities within the zone increases the potential for conflict between activities".
		Rule 19.4.1			That Rule 19.4.1 be amended to read "(x) Compliance with any applicable Structure Plan in Schedule 8 (xi) Compliance with the Greenbelt Residential Design Guide in Schedule 7"
		Section 24A.1.5(b)			That Section 24A.1.5(b) should be amended to read "Whether the subdivision can be effectively and efficiently serviced by reticulated infrastructure. If reticulated infrastructure is not available or proposed, that the subdivision provides suitable on-site servicing which does not adversely affect the environment".
		Rule 19A.4.1A(ii)			That Rule 19A.4.1A(ii) be amended to read "Water Supply, Wastewater Disposal, and Other Services: All subdivisions shall comply with the requirements as specified set in Section 20".
		Section 6		Minor word changes required to make the plan change document easier to read and to prevent confusion regarding the intent of the provisions.	That Section 6 (bullet point 8) be amended to read "Avoiding fragmentation of urban growth areas to provide for integrated and efficient land use long term".
		Rule 19A.4.1(i)	Oppose	This provision blurs the distinction between subdivision and land use. It is not considered appropriate for Council to restrict future land uses or the location and orientation of buildings at subdivision stage,	That Rule 19A.4.1(i) be amended to read as follows: "(i) The Design and layout of the subdivision, including the size, shape and position of any lot."

Submission No.	Submitter Name	Location/ Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
21/092 Continued	J.W. & J.D. Brown			as these matters are controlled by the land use provisions of Plan Change 21.	
		Issue 6A.4 Explanation	Oppose	The proposed zone is clearly for rural-residential development and the public understand what rural-residential development is. Referring to this proposed zone as the Rural-Residential zone would prevent confusion.	That any references to the Greenbelt Residential zone should be changed to the Rural-Residential zone.
		Issue 6A.4 Objectives & Policies	Support	There is a need for the Greenbelt Residential Development to be coordinated. The big picture needs to be looked at in terms of roading and servicing infrastructure and ad-hoc developments which do not provide linkages to these services should be avoided.	That Issue 6A.4 and its associated objectives and policies be retained and adopted.
		Rule 19A.1(b)	Oppose	Clarification required to make it clear that only one dwelling is permitted.	That Rule 19A.1(b) be amended to read "One residential dwelling unit and one family flat".
		Rule 19A.4.1A(i)	Oppose	The conditions as written do not take into consideration the third party option for wastewater disposal which is the provision of private wastewater treatment plant(s) while Council's infrastructure is being planned and extended. Water could also be provided via a communal water supply. Provision of private communal treatment would allow some Greenbelt residential areas to be subdivided in to 2000m2 lots while the main infrastructure is planned and constructed.	That Rule 19A.4.1A(i) be amended so the notes read "Note1: Greenbelt Residential Serviced refers to the Greenbelt Residential Zone areas serviced by reticulated water and wastewater infrastructure". "Note 2: Greenbelt Residential Unserviced refers to the Greenbelt Residential Zone not serviced by reticulated water and wastewater infrastructure."

Submission No.	Submitter Name	Location/ Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
21/092 Continued	J.W. & J.D. Brown	Rule 19A.8(a)	Oppose	A strict interpretation of Rule 19A.8(a) as it is currently written could result in any development, which deviates slightly from the applicable structure plan becoming a non-complying activity. The rule should be amended to allow developers to submit applications which are generally in accordance with the structure plan as controlled or discretionary activities.	That Rule 19A.8(a) be amended to read "Any subdivision that is not generally in accordance with the requirements as specified in a Structure Plan in Schedule 8 is a non-complying activity."
		Section 6b.1	Oppose	Agree that a structure plan is required before land with the Greenbelt Residential Zone is developed, however as currently worded the second provision is a catch 22. The funding to upgrade these services will come from the financial contributions made by developments within the Greenbelt Residential Area. Without these contributions any upgrade of the reticulated infrastructure will need to be funded up front by HDC.	That 6b.1 be amended to read "Until such time that deferred status is uplifted, the rules of the Rural Zone shall apply within any Greenbelt Residential (Deferred) Zone. Greenbelt Residential (Deferred) Zone will cease to have effect and the Greenbelt Residential Zone provisions will apply when a District Plan Change is approved incorporating a Structure Plan for the area.

**Further Submissions must be received by the Horowhenua District Council
before 5:00pm 27th April 2009.**