

Horowhenua District Plan

Proposed Plan Change 4 – Tara-Ika Growth Area

Summary of Submissions (Ordered by Submission Point)

Summary of Submissions Notified 26th February 2021

1. Introduction

This document, Summary of Submissions, summarises the decisions requested for each submission received on Proposed Plan Change 4. Where no decision has been specifically requested, Council Officers have, where possible, inferred the decision requested from the text of the submission.

It is noted that the spelling of the growth area's name has been changed from "Taraika" to "Tara-Ika". This is based on updated advice from the Muaūpoko Tribal Authority. From this point forward, all documentation will "Tara-Ika" except where the original spelling was the topic of a submission.

Proposed Plan Change 4 was publicly notified on 16 November 2020 with the period for submissions closing on 1 February 2021.

A total of 40 submissions were received in relation to the proposed change, and this document provides a summary of those submissions in accordance with Clause 7 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).

It also includes the names and addresses of submitters so that they may be served a copy of any further submissions relating to their submission.

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

- **Horowhenua District Council office:** 126 Oxford Street. Hours: 8.00am to 5.00pm on Monday to Friday.
- **Te Takeretanga o Kura-hau-pō:** 10 Bath Street, Levin. Hours: 9.00am to 5.30pm on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday, 10.00am to 9.00pm on Wednesday, 10.00am to 4.00pm on Saturday and 1.00pm to 4.00pm on Sunday.
- **Te Awahou Nieuwe Stroom:** 92 Main Street, Foxton. Hours: 09.00am to 5.00pm Monday to Friday, 10.00am to 4.00pm Saturday and Sunday.
- **Shannon Library:** Plimmer Terrace. Hours: 10.00am to 12 noon, 1.00pm to 5.00pm Monday to Friday, 10.00am to 12 noon Saturday.

The full submissions can also be viewed or downloaded from Council's website: www.horowhenua.govt.nz/PPC4

2. Further Submissions

Further submissions must be in accordance with Clause 8 of Schedule 1 of the RMA. They can only support (in whole or in part) or oppose (in whole or in part) the submissions received on the proposed change, including any associated reasons. In supporting or opposing a submission only those matters raised in the original submission may be commented on.

The following persons may make a further submission in support of, or in opposition to, submissions already received:

- Any person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest; and
- Any person that has an interest in the proposed plan change greater than the interest that the general public has; and
- Horowhenua District Council itself.

Any further submission should be made using Form 6 of the Resource Management (Forms, Fees, Procedures) Regulations 2003 or closely follow this format. Failure to include all necessary information or to complete the form correctly may prevent the further submission from being considered. Further Submission forms (Form 6) can be obtained from the Council Service Centres and Public Libraries or found on Council's website: www.horowhenua.govt.nz/PPC4

Further submissions will need to be supplied to Horowhenua District Council by **4:00pm** on **Monday 15 March 2021**.

Further submissions can either be:

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

Posted to: Strategic Planning, Horowhenua District Council, Private Bag 4002, Levin 5540

Faxed to: (06) 366 0983

Emailed to: districtplan@horowhenua.govt.nz

Filled in online at: www.horowhenua.govt.nz/PPC4

Important: Any person making a further submission on Proposed Plan Change 4 is required under Clause 8A of Schedule 1 of the RMA to send a copy of it to the person who made the original submission. The copy must be sent to the original submitter within five (5) working days of submitting the further submission to Horowhenua District Council.

Section 5 of this document includes the address for service of each person or organisation that has made a submission on Proposed Plan Change 4.

3. Process from here

Once the Further Submission period has closed (15 March 2021), a hearing date will be set and a Planning Report identifying and summarising all the submissions received will be produced. The Planning Report will provide an impartial assessment of the merits of these submissions, including whether the matters raised are valid considerations under the RMA. It will also contain any recommended amendments to the Plan Change to address matters raised by submitters.

Before a formal Council hearing is held, a pre-hearing meeting may be held to help clarify, mediate or facilitate a resolution on any matters raised in 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. Submitters 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 formal notice of the decision on the Plan Change, including the reasons behind the decision reached. The decision will also be publicly notified.

Any submitter who is not satisfied with the decision has the further opportunity, under Clause 14 of Schedule 1 of the RMA, to lodge an appeal with the Environment Court.

4. Additional Information

For more information please contact Lauren Baddock via:

Phone on 06 366 0999

Email at districtplan@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 4. Each submission has also been assigned a unique reference number (e.g. 04/01).

The purpose of this table is to help any person who makes a further submission to meet their legal obligation to supply a copy of their further submission to the person who made the original submission. The copy must be sent to the original submitter within five (5) working days of submitting the further submission to Horowhenua District Council.

Sub. No.	Submitter Name	Address for service	Wish to be heard
04/01	Sue-Ann Russell	sueann100@hotmail.com	Yes
04/02	Hayden & Prudence Stewart	hj.pa.stewart@gmail.com	No
04/03	James Cameron	32 McKenzie Street Levin 5510	No
04/04	Simon Austin	austinlevin@xtra.co.nz	Yes
04/05	Erin Nijhuis	thursy@hotmail.com	Yes
04/06	Elisabeth Leighfield	eleigh053@gmail.com	No
04/07	Geoff Kane	kanevale@xtra.co.nz	Yes
04/08	Ann Thomas	ann.thomas@xtra.co.nz	Yes
04/09	Phillipa & Pasanka Wickremasinghe	phillipabw@gmail.com	Yes
04/10	Helen Brown & Kevin MacPherson	helenolivebrown@gmail.com	Yes
04/11	John Brown & Jeny Brown	farmerjohnbrown65@gmail.com	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter Name	Address for service	Wish to be heard
04/12	Gwyneth Schibli	wgschibli@gmail.com	Yes
04/13	Gwyneth Schibli	wgschibli@gmail.com	Yes
04/14	Gwyneth Schibli	wgschibli@gmail.com	Yes
04/15	Gwyneth Schibli	wgschibli@gmail.com	Yes
04/16	Carol & Rob Bloomfield	carol@mrsb.co.nz	No
04/17	Ministry of Education	alice.falloon@beca.co.nz	Yes
04/18	Jennings Family Trust	sam@jennings.co.nz	Yes
04/19	Michael Harland	1 Linley Place Levin 5510	No
04/20	Julia Burgess	tony.burgess9@me.com	No
04/21	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	aimee.brown2@beca.com	Yes
04/22	Gill Morgan	gillibnz@yahoo.co.nz	Unclear
04/23	Kevin Daly	kevindaly124s@gmail.com	Yes
04/24	Haddon Preston	paul@landlink.co.nz	Yes
04/25	Horowhenua District Council	milcahx@horowhenua.govt.nz	Yes
04/26	Horowhenua District Residents and Ratepayers Association	leoneb@extra.co.nz	Yes
04/27	Brendan McDonnell	bmcbuilders@actrix.co.nz	Yes
04/28	Electra	dylan.andrews@electra.co.nz	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter Name	Address for service	Wish to be heard
04/29	Rangeview Villas Body Corporate	john.welch@aubreys.co.nz	Yes
04/30	Horizons Regional Council	penelope.tucker@horizons.govt.nz	Yes
04/31	Incite (on behalf of a range of Redwood Grove properties)	tom@incite.co.nz	Yes
04/32	Leith Consulting	monique@leithconsulting.co.nz	Yes
04/33	Truebridge Associates	roger@truebridge.co.nz	Yes
04/34	WKNZTA	consentsandapprovals@nzta.govt.nz	Yes
04/35	MTA	ceo@muaupoko.iwi.nz	Yes
04/36	Catriona McKay	catriona.mckaynz@gmail.com	No
04/37	Margaret Day	maggie.day@hotmail.com	No
04/38	Prouse Trust Partnership	karen.stephen@xtra.co.nz	Yes
04/39	Charles Rudd	242 Hokio Beach Road RD 1 Levin 5571	Yes
04/40	Vivienne Bold	vivienneg@gmail.com	Yes

6. Summary of Decisions Requested

The below table summarises the decisions requested or inferred by submitters to Proposed Plan Change 4. This is to enable people to establish whether a submission might be of interest to them. The summary is not a substitute for inspecting the original submission itself, and it is recommended that this is done once you have identified any submissions of particular interest.

In addition to the reference numbers assigned to the submissions received (i.e. 04/03 being Plan Change 4, Submission Number 3), a unique numeric identifier (i.e. 04/03.1) has also been applied to the specific points/matters raised in each submission in order to provide greater specificity and extra clarity. This unique identifier(s) should be specifically referenced in any further submission you may wish to make relating to an original submission.

The submissions below have been organised according to the issue or provision. An alternative document is also available that contains the submissions summarised in numerical order.

Where it has been specified or is clear that the submission is either in support of, or opposition, to the proposed change this has also been identified in the summary table below. The term 'In-part' has generally been applied in the table to submissions that provide qualified support or opposition to a proposed provision, subject to incorporating further suggested changes. 'Neutral' has been used where the submitter has specifically identified they are neutral and 'Not specified' has been used where the submitter has not indicated whether they support or oppose and it is not clear.

Where specific wording changes have been requested to Proposed Plan Change 1 by submitters these have been shown in the summary table as follows:

- *Italics underlined text* = New text to be included
- ~~Strikethrough text~~ = Text to be delete

Submission Number	Submission Point	Submitter Name	Issue	Provision	Support/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
04/34	04/34.05	WKNZTA	Amenity		Support in part	WKNZTA seek a number of transport related 'amenity' improvements, including traffic calming to reduce	Range of transport related amenity improvements.

						traffic speed, reduced speed limits, cycle lanes, place making, prioritisation of pedestrians at traffic lights and improving co-ordination between water, transport, and landscape systems.	
04/25	04/25.11	Horowhenua District Council	Arapaepae Road Special Treatment Overlay		Support in part	Introduce a policy to clarify the purpose of the Arapaepae Road Special Treatment Overlay and associated rules.	Introduce a policy to clarify the purpose of the Arapaepae Road Special Treatment Overlay and associated rules.
04/04	04/04.03	Simon Austin	Bulk and location		Oppose	States 2m front yard setback is not good urban design.	Increase front yard setback.
04/25	04/25.03	Horowhenua District Council	Bulk and location		Support in part	Given the plan change encourages an increase in building density, there may be some instances where buildings that exceed the maximum permitted height may be appropriate. The proposed plan change does not currently have any direction on this matter. The introduction of a policy relating to this matter would assist with implementation.	Introduce a policy guiding how proposals for a height breach should be determined.
04/32	04/32.03	Leith Consulting	Bulk and location	15A.6.2.4	Support in part	The submitter seeks clarification on how the building setback from front boundary standard applies to	Impose a standard requiring structures housing vehicles to be

						a structure housing a vehicle, seeking that in cases where a vehicle takes direct entry to a structure from the road, a 5m setback should apply with the 2m setback applying to living areas.	setback 5m from the road boundary.
04/26	04/26.09	Horowhenua District Residents and Ratepayers Association	Car Parking		Unclear	The submitter questions whether sufficient space has been allocated for carparking around the commercial zone.	Unclear.
04/25	04/25.10	Horowhenua District Council	Carparking		Support in part	That 15A.8.2.2(b)(i) and 15A.8.2.3(b)(ii) be reworded for clarification purposes to be consistent with the requirements of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development. It should be clear that car parking is not required (with the exception of disabled parking) but that if on site car park that car parking is not required (with the exception of disabled parking) but that if on site car park is provided then it should be to the rear of the building(s).	Reword provision to be clear that the standard only applies where the applicant chooses to provide carparking.
04/26	04/26.04	Horowhenua District Residents and	Climate Change		Unclear	The submitter questions what measures are proposed within the proposed plan change to	Unclear.

		Ratepayers Association				manage effects arising from climate change. The submitter also seeks modelled hydrological changes to the water table across the District and proposed measures to mitigate risk of damage to infrastructure.	
04/06	04/06.05	Elisabeth Leighfield	Commercial Zone		Oppose	Opposes the generality of activities proposed to be able to establish in commercial zone.	Prohibit liquor stores in Tara-Ika.
04/25	04/25.13	Horowhenua District Council	Commercial Zone		Support in part	Currently it could be difficult to determine what qualifies as a serviced based commercial activity.	Include examples of "service based" commercial activities" to Policy 6A.5.2 to improve clarity.
04/25	04/25.14	Horowhenua District Council	Commercial Zone		Support in part	Improve the clarity of the provisions through the proposed wording changes.	Make the following additions (shown in <i>underline italics</i>) to 15A.1.2 (a) to improve clarity - <i>Commercial Activities</i> (excluding entertainment activities) <i>occupying a maximum floor area</i> of up to 250m ² , Retail <i>Activities occupying a maximum floor area of</i> up to 250m ² .
04/25	04/25.15	Horowhenua District Council	Commercial Zone		Support in part	Improve the clarity of the provisions through the proposed wording changes.	<i>Maximum</i> floor area limits.

04/33	04/33.09	Truebridge Associates	Commercial Zone	15A.3.3	Oppose	The submitter opposes restricted discretionary activity status for commercial buildings on the basis that there are standards to follow.	Change activity status to permitted.
04/33	04/33.12	Truebridge Associates	Commercial Zone	15A.4.3(b)	Unclear	The submitter notes the word "not" is missing from the second line.	Add "do <u>not</u> comply" to 15A.4.3(b).
04/33	04/33.23	Truebridge Associates	Commercial Zone		Oppose	Linked to the submitter's request that subdivision should be a controlled activity, the submitter requests that several 'matters of discretion' for subdivision be shifted to 'matters of control' and that a number of other 'matters of discretion' be removed entirely.	Shift 15A.8.1.2(a) Matters of Discretion - (v), (vi), (vii), (ix), (x), (xiii), (xiv) to matters of control and remove (iii), (iv),(xi), (xii) entirely.
04/34	04/34.12	WKNZTA	Commercial Zone		Oppose	WKNZTA seek that commercial activities adjoining or taking access from a State Highway should be a non-complying activity.	Commercial activities adjoining or taking access from a State Highway should be a non-complying activity.
04/19	04/19.05	Michael Harland	Consultation process		Oppose	Considers the consultation process a 'rubber stamping' exercise and not genuine due to ground breaking ceremony attended by the Prime Minister.	Reject Plan Change in its entirety.

04/22	04/22.01	Gill Morgan	Consultation process		Oppose	Submission states that consultation process was not inclusive enough.	More specific consultation undertaken with landowners who did not participate in the Master Plan process.
04/39	04/39.02	Charles Rudd	Consultation process		Oppose	The submitter states that consultation with iwi has been insufficient on the basis that it has been with the Muaūpoko Tribal Authority only. The submitter states that consulting with iwi authorities only is not in accordance with Treaty of Waitangi requirements. The submitter also states that the timeframe for consultation on draft master plan (Aug-Sep 2020) was insufficient as it did not allow for public speaking rights at a Council meeting.	Engage with the people of Ngai Tara/Muaūpoko tribe.
04/24	04/24.02	Haddon Preston	Cultural Sites		Oppose	Protection of cultural sites (e.g. Maunu Wahine and Waihau Waterhole) is referenced as a key design principle in the Master Plan but there is no associated policy or rule in the Proposed Plan Change.	Introduce policy which requires these specific sites to be protected.

04/35	04/35.02	MTA	Cultural Sites		Neutral	The submission details that there are a number of sites of historic and cultural significance to Muaūpoko, including Waiopahu Reserve and Maunu Wāhine. Waiopahu Reserve contains native bush and is the habitat of the endangered native carnivorous snail, <i>Powelliphanta traversi</i> . Muaūpoko has kaitiaki obligations over these and other species.	Appropriate protection of cultural sites, native species, and habitats.
04/26	04/26.05	Horowhenua District Residents and Ratepayers Association	Development Contributions		Unclear	The submitter questions whether development contributions will be reintroduced before the Proposed Plan Change is adopted.	Unclear.
04/34	04/34.08	WKNZTA	Development Staging		Oppose	WKNZTA seek that the development area be staged to align with the WKNZTA Safe Networks Programme and the O2NL programme, with the ability to decline subdivisions where the state highway does not have the capacity for additional vehicle movements.	Stage the development around the WKNZTA Safe Networks Programme and introduce the ability to decline subdivisions when there is insufficient capacity in the state highway network.

04/33	04/33.10	Truebridge Associates	Discretionary Activities	15A.4	Oppose	The submitter states there are no activities listed under the Discretionary Activity heading.	Add Discretionary Activities.
04/30	04/30.08	Horizons Regional Council	Domestic Onsite Waste Water Disposal		Support	The submitter supports Rule 15A.8.4.1(b) Condition (i), in particular the requirement for lots not serviced by reticulated waste water to be at least 5,000m2 as this is consistent with One Plan requirement. The submitter also supports the restricted discretionary activity status.	None.
04/17	04/17.01	Ministry of Education	Education facilities	Objective 6A.1	Support in part	Supports intent of policy, but seeks that reference to 'social infrastructure' be included to cover education facilities.	Include 'social infrastructure' to Objective 6A.1.
04/17	04/17.02	Ministry of Education	Education facilities	Policy 6A.1.4	Support	Supports policy reference to education facilities.	Retain as proposed.
04/17	04/17.03	Ministry of Education	Education facilities	Policy 6A.1.5	Support	Supports reference to walking and cycling, given children in Tara-Ika may walk or cycle to school.	Retain as proposed.
04/17	04/17.04	Ministry of Education	Education facilities	Policy 6A.6.3	Support in part	Supports intent of policy in enabling education, however states that wording about limits on the scale of education activities is unclear and creates uncertainty.	Remove reference to 'limits on scale' and consider introducing education activities as a permitted activity with limits on scale, noting that the Ministry will

							likely rely on the designation process.
04/17	04/17.05	Ministry of Education	Education facilities		Support in part	Further refinement of the rule framework to enable education facilities.	Further refinement of the rule framework to enable education facilities.
04/30	04/30.10	Horizons Regional Council	Energy Efficiency		Oppose	One Plan Objective 3-2: Energy and Policy 3-7 seek to encourage renewable energy and energy efficient developing, including through housing and subdivision design and layout. The submitter does not consider PPC4 gives effect to this objective and policy and seeks changes to the wording of objectives, policies, and rules to encourage energy efficient design. Additions shown in <i>italics underline</i> .	Objective 6A.1 To achieve an integrated, <i>efficient</i> , and connected development...; <i>encouraging subdivision and development design to enable energy efficiency and reduced energy consumption</i> Insert a new policy 6A.1.6 <i>Require subdivision layout that will enable buildings to utilise energy efficiency and conservation measures.</i> Amend Rule 15A.8.1.2 Subdivision (a) Matters of Discretion (iii) The design and layout of the subdivision, including the size, shape and position of any lot, as well as the future land use and development of each lot. In addition, connectivity and linkages (both within and beyond the subdivision), <i>energy efficiency and</i>

							<u>conservation, and access to solar energy.</u>
04/38	04/38.10	Prouse Trust Partnership	Existing uses	15A.1.1.1	Oppose	The submitters seeks provision for existing activities (e.g. farming) to be made under 'Permitted Activities'.	Add 'existing activities' under 15A.1.1.1 Permitted Activities.
04/25	04/25.12	Horowhenua District Council	Fencing		Support in part	Correct the second bullet point of standard 15A.6.2.6(c), fencing in relation to 'other boundaries', to say the maximum height of the fence when it meets the road shall be 1.2m (not 1m), to be consistent with standard 15A.6.2.(a), front road boundary.	Correct the second bullet point of standard 15A.6.2.6(c), fencing in relation to 'other boundaries', to say the maximum height of the fence when it meets the road shall be 1.2m (not 1m), to be consistent with standard 1A.6.2.(a), front road boundary.
04/33	04/33.16	Truebridge Associates	Fencing	15A.6.2.6	Oppose	The submitter states that fence paling height of 1.2m in uneconomic and wasteful.	None specified.
04/36	04/36.03	Catriona McKay	Fencing		Support in part	The submission notes a future arterial road along the southern boundary of the submitter's property. Currently this boundary is planted with large pine trees and a farm style fence. This submitter notes that this is unlikely to be consistent with the urban streetscape envisioned for the area and	Council to remove the existing pine trees and erect a suitable fence, and install appropriate planting.

						seeks specific consideration be given to introducing new fencing and planting types to this area that better reflect the intended outcome.	
04/03	04/03.01	James Peter Cameron	General		Support in part	Supports plan change, but seeks inclusion of a bird corridor.	Include requirement for planting of native trees to establish native bird and butterfly habitats and pathways.
04/07	04/07.01	Geoff Kane	General		Support	Supports plan change, so long as Land Use Capability (LUC) 1 & 2 soils are not subdivided.	Protection of LUC 1 and 2 soils.
04/19	04/19.01	Michael Harland	General		Oppose	Oppose Plan Change in its entirety, as the land should be used for food production given nature of the land and distance from Lake Horowhenua.	Reject Plan Change in its entirety.
04/24	04/24.03	Haddon Preston	General	Objective 6A.1	Oppose	Notes that solar access is an important component of good urban design.	Seeks inclusion of "achieves good solar access to buildings" to Objective 6A.1.
04/26	04/26.06	Horowhenua District Residents and Ratepayers Association	General		Unclear	The submission questions what steps are being taken to ensure the proposed plan change content (e.g. structure plan, rules, objectives, and policies are followed).	Unclear.

04/27	04/27.01	Brendan McDonnell	General		Support	Supports the plan change.	Changes to the specific provisions as detailed in following submission points.
04/30	04/30.01	Horizons Regional Council	General		Support in part	The submitter generally supports plan changes that provide for growth by giving effect to a growth strategy or master plan. This approach is considered, in general, to give effect to One Plan Objective 3-3 and Policy 3-4.	None
04/31	04/31.05	Incite (on behalf of a range of Redwood Grove properties)	General		Neutral	The submitter requests that the Plan Change hearing be heard solely by qualified and experienced independent commissioners.	None.
04/33	04/33.01	Truebridge Associates	General	Issue 6A.1	Support in part	The submitter notes a typo in the second line of the first paragraph.	Correct typo.
04/33	04/33.02	Truebridge Associates	General	Issue Discussion Paragraph 3	Support in part	The submitter notes the word "a" is missing from the third line of paragraph three.	Correct typo.
04/33	04/33.03	Truebridge Associates	General	Explanation and Principal Reasons	Support in part	The submitter states that it is important that not only Māori Culture is recognised and that a collaborative approach is taken to recognise current owners as well, achieving a balance of all cultures in the	Expand the explanation and principal reason to include reference to a range of cultures.

						naming of streets and reserves.	
04/33	04/33.04	Truebridge Associates	General	Methods for Issues and Objectives	Oppose	The submitter states that statement at the top of page 10 is incorrect as they believe it is inconsistent with the activity status of subdivision.	Linked to submission point 04/33.08.
04/33	04/33.05	Truebridge Associates	General	Methods for Issues and Objectives	Unclear	The submitter states that bullet point 4 on page 10 of Chapter 6A needs to be clear that infrastructure as required for the particular proposal as its share of the overall requirements for the greater area.	Clarify intent of bullet point 4 on page 10 of Chapter 6A.
04/33	04/33.06	Truebridge Associates	General	Methods for Issues and Objectives	Unclear	The submitter states that the heading 'other' on page 10, needs to include reference to developers.	The submitter states that the heading 'other' on page 10, needs to include reference to developers.
04/34	04/34.01	WKNZTA	General		Support in part	WKNZTA is generally supportive of the intent to provide additional housing, but has some concerns about the level of information provided and the provisions currently proposed to protect existing SH57 and proposed O2NL.	None.
04/35	04/35.01	MTA	General		Neutral	The submission sets out Muaūpoko rohe and historic association with the land and	Refer to other submission points.

						establishes a clear link between Muaūpoko wellbeing and the whenua (land), maunga (mountain), lakes and waterways in the area.	
04/36	04/36.01	Catriona McKay	General		Support	The submitter notes general support for the proposed plan change and the emphasis on enhancing connections within and across the area, the mix of housing density, inclusion of walking and cycling tracks, and ensuring quality development.	None.
04/38	04/38.01	Prouse Trust Partnership	General	Objective 6A.1, Policy 6A.1.2	Support	The submitter supports objectives and policies that seek to enhance cultural, heritage and ecological values. Specifically, the submitter supports the use of the name Tara-Ika.	None.
04/38	04/38.02	Prouse Trust Partnership	Heritage		Support in part	The submitter seeks further protection of heritage values associated with the Prouse Homestead and surrounds by avoiding/minimising impacts from stormwater management (e.g. wetlands) and roading connections.	Refer to other submission points.
04/27	04/27.07	Brendan McDonnell	High Voltage Transmission Lines		Support in part	Consider the location of high voltage transmission lines in	No change requested.

					regard to heath and visual impact.		
04/28	04/28.01	Electra	High Voltage Transmission Lines		Support in part	The submitter supports plan changes that support good urban design, but is concerned the proposed plan change does not provide sufficient protection for the existing power lines.	Work with Council to ensure safe and beneficial outcome.
04/26	04/26.07	Horowhenua District Residents and Ratepayers Association	Housing Construction		Unclear	The submitter questions whether there is sufficient resources available to build 400 houses a year and, if not, what Council's responsibility on this matter is.	Unclear.
04/30	04/30.11	Horizons Regional Council	Indigenous Biodiversity		Oppose	The submitter states that there are two areas of threatened habitats in Tara-Ika. One of these is designated as Waiopahu Reserve on Structure Plan 013. However, the other is near to the Open Space area within the Arapaepae Road Special Effects Overlay but does not appear to be identified or protected. Land disturbance and vegetation clearance of these areas is a Non-Complying Activity in the One Plan.	Appropriately identify the indigenous vegetation area in the north-west on Structure Plan 013.

04/39	04/39.04	Charles Rudd	Information		Oppose	The submitter states that the plan change has insufficient information about matters such as land ownership, Gladstone Green development business owners/shareholders, and Council conflicts of interest.	Unclear.
04/06	04/09.03	Elisabeth Leighfield	Infrastructure		Oppose	Insufficient information to understand Council's ability to supply reticulated services in a sustainable, reliable manner and the associated costs.	More information on three waters proposal.
04/13	04/13.01	Gwyneth Schibli	Infrastructure		Support in part	Seeks that planning is done on the basis of the population doubling over the next 20 years. Raises concerns about water availability in Ōhau River to support this growth. Supports requirement for rainwater tanks and suggests investigating alternate water sources, such as known bores.	Abandon the wetland approach to managing stormwater and instead require use of sumps for house lots and north/south swales.
04/19	04/19.03	Michael Harland	Infrastructure		Oppose	Oppose due to insufficient water supply to meet current needs.	Reject Plan Change in its entirety.
04/21	04/21.01	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Infrastructure		Support in part	Notes that all properties (both reticulated and non-reticulated) need suitable firefighting water supplies.	Introduce provisions requiring subdivisions to ensure 'firefighting water supply', and for buildings to have a firefighting supply in

							accordance with the NZ Firefighting Code of Practice SNZ/PAS 4509:2008.
04/21	04/21.02	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Infrastructure		Support in part	Supports the proposed road carriageway widths, as these are suitable for fire trucks to access properties.	Retain as proposed.
04/21	04/21.03	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Infrastructure		Support in part	Supports approach to managing risk from natural hazards.	Retain as proposed.
04/21	04/21.04	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Infrastructure		Support in part	Supports development of a stormwater management solution capable of dealing with firefighting flows.	Ensure stormwater solution is capable of managing stormwater without causing adverse effects on the receiving environment.
04/24	04/24.07	Haddon Preston	Infrastructure		Oppose	The cost of providing infrastructure to the extent shown on the Structure Plan has a disproportionate effect on smaller landowners and requires them to construct infrastructure over and above what is required for their development. Clarification sought regarding the timing of development funding and how this will be linked with the timing of infrastructure construction.	Ensure developer only has to pay for the infrastructure needed for their own development.

04/26	04/26.03	Horowhenua District Residents and Ratepayers Association	Infrastructure		Unclear	The submitter questions whether infrastructure has sufficient capacity to cope with additional loading from Tara-Ika and the financial impacts of installing and maintaining new infrastructure in Tara-Ika.	Unclear.
04/31	04/31.03	Incite (on behalf of a range of Redwood Grove properties)	Infrastructure		Oppose	The submitter is concerned that the proposed infrastructure (including roading, three waters infrastructure, power, telecommunications, and gas) needed to service Tara-Ika will have a negative impact on the current amenity they enjoy.	Unclear.
04/31	04/31.04	Incite (on behalf of a range of Redwood Grove properties)	Infrastructure		Oppose	The submitter is concerned that the proposed rezoning will have a financial impact on Redwood Grove properties, through an increase in rates, given Council does not charge financial or development contributions.	None.
04/33	04/33.22	Truebridge Associates	Infrastructure		Oppose	The submitter states the provision relating to infrastructure requirements for subdivision (e.g. 15A.8.1.2(b)(ii) should be amended for all zones to reflect the costs of providing	Amend 15A.8.1.2(b)(ii) and corresponding provisions for other zones to provide for offsetting of infrastructure costs.

						infrastructure beyond what is required for the individual development (e.g. for future proofing) should be offset.	
04/38	04/38.06	Prouse Trust Partnership	Infrastructure	Policy 6A.2.3 and Provisions 15A.8.1.2(a)(xiii) and 15A.8.1.2(b)(ii)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the requirement that developers must construct and vest all infrastructure shown on their property as this may require them to construct infrastructure over and above what is required for their development or result in land being acquired without compensation.	Address growth funding to ensure costs are distributed fairly.
04/39	04/39.01	Charles Rudd	Infrastructure		Oppose	The submitter raises concerns over infrastructure planning and resulting environmental outcomes, including the impact of stormwater on Lake Horowhenua, potential for sewerage overflow, and water restrictions.	Unclear.
04/40	04/40.01	Vivienne Gwennyth Bold	Infrastructure		Oppose	The submitter opposes additional contaminants entering the Lake, the Pot, or the Sea. The submitter seeks further information about infrastructure works referred to in the Finance, Audit, and Risk agenda paper dated 27th January 2021 and seeks soil	Sufficient water and waste planning ahead of housing construction.

						testing at Pakipaki Dunes, Hokio, and the Pot.	
04/40	04/40.02	Vivienne Gwenyth Bold	Infrastructure		Oppose	The submitter seeks sufficient water and waste planning, including a new regional landfill, before new houses are built.	Sufficient water and waste planning ahead of housing construction.
04/26	04/26.01	Horowhenua District Residents and Ratepayers Association	Infrastructure		Unclear	The submitter questions whether hydrology maps and the location of water courses were considered to developing the Plans for Tara-lka, what steps will be taken to prevent adverse effects on water, and what steps were taken to engage with all those affected by water entering Lake Horowhenua.	Unclear.
04/40	04/40.04	Vivienne Gwenyth Bold	Infrastructure funding		Oppose	The submitter opposes ratepayers funding growth.	Seeks for development contributions to cover cost of growth.
04/25	04/25.09	Horowhenua District Council	Integral Garage		Support in part	Matters of discretion (i) and (ii) of 15A.8.1.4(a) are quite similar and could be combined	Combine matters 15A.8.1.4(i) and 15A.8.1.4(iii) into one
04/33	04/33.15	Truebridge Associates	Integral Garage	15A.6.2.3	Unclear	The submitter states that the rule requiring integral garages to be either recessed back from the main pedestrian entrance by 1m or account for no more than 50% of the front	Review design guide before including such as provision.

						façade of the dwelling is a design guide issue.	
04/35	04/35.04	MTA	Kaitiakitanga		Neutral	The submission notes that Muaūpoko have an obligation to care for, protect, and enhance the natural environment. The submissions notes concerns about the potential impact of water takes and stormwater and waste water discharges on waterways.	Ensure protection of native species and habitats and good environmental outcomes for waterways.
04/05	04/05.01	Erin Nijhuis	Liverpool Street extension		Neutral	Insufficient information to understand the impact of O2NL and the proposed Liverpool Street extension on the submitter's property.	Provide further information about the detailed design of O2NL and the proposed Liverpool Street extension (and associated process - e.g. PWA).
04/26	04/26.02	Horowhenua District Residents and Ratepayers Association	Liverpool Street extension		Unclear	The submitter questions whether there is a proposal for a roundabout at the intersection of Arapaepae Road and the termed 'Liverpool Street extension' and, if not, why not.	Unclear.
04/29	04/29.01	Rangeview Villas Body Corporate	Liverpool Street extension		Oppose	The submitter refers to the proposed roading connection with Arapaepae Road directly opposite Liverpool Street, Levin and the concept of this being connected in the future.	Remove reference to a Liverpool Street extension in all planning documents.

						The submitter opposes this on the basis that it will cause disruption, reduced values, and safety issues for Rangeview Villas residents and that this connection is not required.	
04/24	04/24.01	Haddon Preston	Master Plan		Oppose	The 'street network' terminology contained within the Master Plan document is inconsistent with that used on the Structure Plan.	Address inconsistency.
04/25	04/25.02	Horowhenua District Council	Medium Density Residential Provisions		Support in part	The medium density residential area should be extended as per the image provided in the submission. This area is well suited for medium density development because it is located near open space, the commercial zone, and active transport routes.	Rezone area indicated to medium density.
04/39	04/39.03	Charles Rudd	Naming of Tara-Ika		Oppose	The submitter opposes the use of the name "Taraika". The submitter does not believe that MTA have the right to gift this name and states that the spelling originally put forward is incorrect.	Engage with the people of Ngai Tara/Muaūpoko tribe.

04/40	04/40.05	Vivienne Gwennyth Bold	Naming of Tara-Ika		Oppose	The submitter opposes the use of the name "Taraika", stating it does not actually recognise Māori heritage. The submitter states that consultation on this was insufficient, as only MTA were consulted.	Unclear.
04/30	04/30.07	Horizons Regional Council	Natural Hazards		Support in part	The submitter states there is no modelled flood data for this area, which does not mean there is no history of flooding - just that there is no data. The submitter supports the inclusion of Rule 15A.8.3.1 Subdivision (a) Matter of Discretion (ix) avoidance and mitigation of natural hazards but requests reference to the 2008 Horizons hazards report be deleted, for consistency with other provisions within the proposed 15A chapter.	Delete reference to the 2008 Horizons hazards report in 15A.8.3.1(a)(xi).
04/04	04/04.02	Simon Austin	O2NL		Oppose	Location of development means O2NL will bisect Levin.	Unclear - submission states that the development should not mean O2NL expressway bisects Levin.
04/19	04/19.02	Michael Harland	O2NL		Oppose	Oppose due to the potential impact of O2NL. Tara-Ika will mean Levin still straddles a State Highway, resulting in	Reject Plan Change in its entirety.

						effects such as noise, light, and air pollution.	
04/22	04/22.05	Gill Morgan	O2NL		Oppose	Insufficient integration evidenced between O2NL and Tara-Ika.	Show evidence of consultation and consideration of how O2NL and Tara-Ika will integrate with each other.
04/34	04/34.02	WKNZTA	O2NL		Neutral	WKNZTA note that O2NL passes through Tara-Ika but that the design is not sufficiently advanced to determine the final form and required mitigation. WKNZTA seek development within 100m either side of the indicative corridor be either 'downzoned' to Low Density Residential (as opposed to the proposed standard density) or be staged to occur after O2NL. WKNZTA also seek ongoing collaboration with Council on this matter.	Change the zoning of the land on either side of the indicative O2NL corridor to low density residential, or stage the zoning so that development in this area happens after O2NL decisions are made.
04/38	04/38.08	Prouse Trust Partnership	O2NL		Oppose	The submitters raises concerns that O2NL and Tara-Ika are progressing at different speeds, resulting in issues such as showing O2NL accurately on the Structure Plan and progressing joint	None specified.

						stormwater management options.	
04/30	04/30.12	Horizons Regional Council	One Plan Requirements		Support in part	The submitter states that there are several waterways flowing through Tara-Ika which have Domestic Food Production Value under the One Plan. Many activities associated with subdivision (e.g. land disturbance, vegetation clearance etc.) will trigger resource consent under the One Plan where these activities occur in or adjacent to such streams and in or adjacent to threatened habitats.	Include general wording near the beginning of Chapter 15A advising plan users of One Plan requirements.
04/16	04/16.03	Carol & Rob Bloomfield	Open Spaces		Support in part	Open space needs to be designed so as not to impact on views to ranges (e.g. from large planting).	Protect views of ranges when designing reserves.
04/24	04/24.06	Haddon Preston	Open Spaces		Oppose	Zoning parks and reserves as 'open space' does not allow sufficient flexibility and should not occur until the reserve has been vested, to allow the zone boundaries to be accurately determined.	Rezone open space areas to residential.
04/33	04/33.24	Truebridge Associates	Open Spaces	15A.8.3.1	Oppose	Oppose matter of discretion (iii).	Remove matter of discretion 15A.8.3.1(a)(iii).

04/34	04/34.04	WKNZTA	Open Spaces		Support in part	WKZNTA seeks provision for open space and the north-south, east-west corridors be strengthened.	Unclear.
04/33	04/33.07	Truebridge Associates	Permitted Activities	15A.1	Unclear	The submitter states that paragraph 3 of page 1 needs to be amended to refer to 'existing areas' rather than 'existing zones'.	Amend paragraph 3 of page 1 of chapter 15A To refer to 'existing areas' rather than 'existing zones'.
04/04	04/04.01	Simon Austin	Plan Change extent		Oppose	Opposes plan change on basis that it does not include land north of Queen Street.	Include land north of Queen Street.
04/24	04/24.04	Haddon Preston	Planning Maps		Oppose	Notes inconsistency in zoning terminology between planning maps (Low Density Residential) and structure plan (Low Density Area).	Address inconsistency.
04/06	04/06.02	Elisabeth Leighfield	Rainwater Tanks		Support	Supports requirements for rainwater tank, but seeks requirements for tanks to be increased.	Retain requirement for rainwater tanks and require larger lots (e.g. Greenbelt Residential) to have onsite water supply.
04/25	04/25.04	Horowhenua District Council	Rainwater Tanks		Support in part	Rainwater tanks are a requirement in the residential zone. However, it is not clear how this requirement will apply to multiple joined dwellings.	Include an advice note clarifying how these requirements should apply to multiple joined dwellings.
04/25	04/25.05	Horowhenua District Council	Rainwater Tanks		Support in part	The current provision which sets out the requirements for	Addition of wording specifying that tanks are

						rainwater tanks could be clarified by the addition of wording specifying that the tanks are required to be designed and installed in accordance with the requirement.	required to be designed and installed in accordance with the requirement.
04/30	04/30.04	Horizons Regional Council	Rainwater Tanks		Support in part	The submitter supports the requirement for rainwater tanks on residential properties, but requests non-complying activity status where these are not provided.	Introduce a non-complying activity status for residential activities that do not provide an onsite rainwater tank.
04/32	04/32.02	Leith Consulting	Rainwater Tanks	15A.6.2.1	Support in part	The submitter supports the requirement for rainwater tanks, however seeks further flexibility on the size, shape, and nature of the tanks to assist with the tanks integrating with the built environment. For example, the specified tank size should be a minimum size rather than prescribed, with consideration given to other factors such as larger tanks connected to toilet flushing and outdoor taps, clarification of bulk and location requirements, explicit standards prohibiting non-potable water uses connecting to the town water	Review rainwater tank provision in line with the submitter's suggestions.

						supply, and further safe guards to protect against cross contamination.	
04/33	04/33.14	Truebridge Associates	Rainwater Tanks	15A.6.2.1	Unclear	The submitter states that the detailed requirements for rainwater tanks should be in the Engineering Standards, not within the Tara-Ika chapter.	Relocate rainwater tank provisions to engineering standards chapter of the Plan.
04/38	04/38.11	Prouse Trust Partnership	Rates		Neutral	The submitter is concerned that rezoning the land to residential could make rates unaffordable during the time between rezoning and development occurring.	Provide rates relief.
04/08	04/08.01	Ann Thomas	Residential zoning types		Support in part	Provide reticulated waste water to Greenbelt Residential Area so additional development can occur	Allow additional density in Greenbelt Residential areas
04/09	04/09.01	Phillipa & Pasanka Wickremasinghe	Residential zoning types		Support in part	Make better use of land by allowing greater housing density in certain areas. This reduces pressure on productive land and allows more housing to be built, addressing housing shortage.	Up-zone Greenbelt Residential and Low Density Residential to Standard Residential
04/10	04/10.01	Helen Olive Brown & Kevin Shane MacPherson	Residential zoning types		Support in part	Make better use of land by allowing greater housing density in certain areas. This reduces pressure on productive land and allows	Up-zone Greenbelt Residential and Low Density Residential to Standard Residential

						more housing to be built, Improving alignment with National Policy Statement for Urban Development (NPS-UD) and Proposed National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land (PNPS-HPL) and future proofs against future growth	
04/11	04/11.01	John William Brown & Jeny Doreen Brown	Residential zoning types		Support in part	Make better use of land by allowing greater housing density in certain areas. This reduces pressure on productive land and allows more housing to be built, Improving alignment with NPS-UD and PNPS-HPL. Allows more efficient/cost-effective infrastructure and provides improved economic viability.	Up-zone submitter's land to Standard Residential.
04/14	04/14.01	Gwyneth Schibli	Residential zoning types		Support in part	Notes pressure on land availability from population growth. Important role for Horowhenua as a food producer. Need to contain growth and maximise land usage, to avoid sprawl. Already have too many lifestyle blocks.	Up-zone Greenbelt Residential and Low Density Residential to Standard Residential.
04/16	04/16.01	Carol & Rob Bloomfield	Residential zoning types		Support in part	Zoning should be consistent for entire properties.	Change zoning on submitter's property to be

							consistent across whole property.
04/18	04/18.03	Jennings Family Trust	Residential zoning types		Oppose	Oppose the residential zoning between SH57 and the O2NL corridor - medium density, green space, or commercial would be more suitable.	Change zoning to medium density, commercial zoning, or green space.
04/18	04/18.04	Jennings Family Trust	Residential zoning types		Oppose	Opposes the zoning in the southwest corner. This should be medium or standard density.	Change zoning to medium or standard density.
04/18	04/18.05	Jennings Family Trust	Residential zoning types		Oppose	Oppose the low density residential zoning at Tararua Road, near SH57.	Change zoning to medium density or mixed use zoning.
04/20	04/20.01	Julia Burgess	Residential zoning types		Oppose	Opposes current low density zoning, supports a change to standard density zoning.	Change low density zoning to standard density.
04/22	04/22.02	Gill Morgan	Residential zoning types		Oppose	Extent of low density and greenbelt residential land is wasteful and does not cater for the needs of those in most need of housing.	Up-zone Greenbelt Residential and Low Density Residential to Standard Residential.
04/23	04/23.01	Kevin Daly	Residential zoning types		Support in part	Extent of low density is a waste of land. Standard density would be a more efficient use of land, would better mirror the proposed development pattern to the east, provide for more housing near key	Up-zone Low Density Residential to Standard Residential.

						infrastructure (e.g. collector road and cycle route) and improve the economic viability of constructing said key infrastructure.	
04/24	04/24.05	Haddon Preston	Residential zoning types		Oppose	Extension of medium density area on either side of the primary north south connector road would better align with the proposed policy framework.	Increase extent of medium density overlay.
04/25	04/25.01	Horowhenua District Council	Residential zoning types		Support in part	The extent of low density residential zoning on the Tararua Road side of the Plan Change area needs to be reviewed in light of new information about the likely location of an O2NL interchange at Tararua Road and in light of policy direction from the National Policy Statement - Urban Development.	Up-zone to standard density.
04/27	04/27.05	Brendan McDonnell	Residential zoning types		Support in part	Change the low density zoning on the Tararua Road side of the submitter's property.	Change the low density zoning on the Tararua Road side of the submitter's property.
04/31	04/31.01	Incite (on behalf of a range of Redwood Grove properties)	Residential zoning types		Oppose	The submitter states that the proposed 'standard residential' zoning for Redwood Grove does not	Change rezoning of Redwood Grove properties and properties adjoining

						align with Objective 6A.4 of the Plan Change and that this zoning should be changed to low density, in line with earlier versions of the Master Plan, to better give effect to this objective.	Redwood Grove to low density residential.
04/37	04/37.01	Margaret Day	Residential zoning types		Oppose	The submitter opposes having higher density housing types in a low density area, citing concerns about an increase in crime.	Build low density housing by the O2NL corridor.
04/38	04/38.05	Prouse Trust Partnership	Residential zoning types	Structure Plan 013 and Planning Map 30	Oppose	The submitter seeks a standard residential zoning on their property (instead of low density residential) to enable better flexibility and more efficient use of land and consistency with remainder of growth area.	Change zoning to standard residential.
04/27	04/27.06	Brendan McDonnell	Retirement Village		Support in part	The submitter would like to make provision for a retirement village.	Enable retirement villages.
04/34	04/34.06	WKNZTA	Reverse Sensitivity		Support in part	WKNZTA support the inclusion of indoor noise design standards in line with their guidance material, for properties near to the existing state highway. However, WKNZTA seek additional provisions to control noise	Either change the zoning of land between Arapaepae Road and the O2NL corridor be zoned low density residential, while the land covered by the 300m indicative O2NL corridor and the land 100m either

						effects, including reduced density or no build zones where current SH57 and 100m either side of the 300m wide indicative O2NL corridor.	side be either zoned low density residential or have no development rights. WKNZTA propose they could reconsider the 'no development' area through the O2NL Notice of Requirement Process.
04/34	04/34.09	WKNZTA	Revocation		Neutral	WKNZTA notes that SH57 is likely to be revoked once O2NL is open but that this work is yet to begin. The submitter requests consideration of how development between SH57 and O2NL occurs to ensure connectivity and integration, given the revocation project is yet to start.	That conversations about revocation occur to ensure integrated roading design
04/27	04/27.02	Brendan McDonnell	Road Naming		Support in part	Seek to be involved in conversations about street naming, alongside Council, iwi and the community. In particular for some street names to reflect the submitter's Irish heritage.	Involvement in street naming process.
04/38	04/38.04	Prouse Trust Partnership	Roading		Oppose	The submitter seeks flexibility in where local roads are provided to allow for better lot yield and development viability.	Allow flexibility in location of local roads.

04/40	04/40.03	Vivienne Gwentyth Bold	Roading		Oppose	The submitter opposes unsafe roundabouts that can't be used by trucks.	Unclear.
04/23	04/23.02	Kevin Daly	Roading		Support	Support no restrictions on vehicle crossings into secondary collector roads.	Retain as proposed.
04/16	04/16.02	Carol & Rob Bloomfield	Roading		Support in part	Roads and cycleways should follow ownership boundaries.	Relocate roads and cycleways to follow ownership boundaries.
04/31	04/31.07	Incite (on behalf of a range of Redwood Grove properties)	Screening		Oppose	The submitter seeks a screening provision along the boundaries of some Redwood Grove properties (refer to attached map) to protect the amenity of Redwood Grove residents and provide privacy for adjoining neighbours. This ranges from 2.1m fence on some properties, a 6m wide and 3-5m native plant screen, to no screening requirement.	Introduce a screening provision as a matter of discretion for subdivision as follows: 15A.8.1.2 Subdivision (a) Matters of Discretion (xxi) <u>Any subdivision within the Redwood Grove Buffer is to provide screening on the common boundary with any property on Redwood Grove as per the direction detailed on Planning Map 30</u> (refer to amended map provided by submitter). <u>In order to satisfy this matter of discretion, the application for subdivision must include details of any landscaping or fencing as per the direction detailed on Planning Map 30 and must specify mechanisms</u>

							<i>for ongoing maintenance and legal protection of any necessary screening.</i>
04/34	04/34.11	WKNZTA	Signs		Oppose	WKNZTA are concerned about the impact that signage on or near the State Highway could have on traffic safety.	Include standards requiring WKNZTA signage standards to be complied with and specify that digital sign boards visible from the state highway should be a non-complying activity.
04/33	04/33.17	Truebridge Associates	Signs	15A.6.3.1(b)	Unclear	The submitter specifies there is a typo in the standard.	Correct typo.
04/33	04/33.18	Truebridge Associates	Signs	15A.6.3.1(b)	Oppose	The submitter states that the provision relating to 'inside display window' signs is very hard to interpret and should not be required.	Remove 'inside display window' rule.
04/33	04/33.19	Truebridge Associates	Signs	15A.8.1.1(b)(i)	Unclear	The submitter notes a typo in the word "designed".	Correct typo.
04/19	04/19.04	Michael Harland	Social impacts		Oppose	Oppose due to lack of health services. Adding more residents is unfair to those who already live here.	Reject Plan Change in its entirety.
04/26	04/26.08	Horowhenua District Residents and Ratepayers Association	Social impacts		Unclear	The submitter questions the social impacts of mixed density development.	Provide an assessment of the social impacts arising from mixed density development.

04/35	04/35.08	MTA	Spelling of Tara-Ika		Neutral	The name "Taraika" should be spelt 'Tara-Ika' in the plan change documents.	Change spelling to 'Tara-Ika'.
04/34	04/34.03	WKNZTA	State Highway 57		Neutral	WKNZTA note that Tara-Ika will increase traffic onto existing SH57, the associated east/west intersections, and the wider roading network which need further assessment and potentially upgrading.	Further information about potential roading impacts to enable upgrade planning.
04/01	04/01.01	Sue-Ann Russell	Stormwater		Oppose	Opposed to the plan change due to limited information on stormwater treatment and potential impact on Lake Horowhenua.	More information on three waters proposal.
04/07	04/07.02	Geoff Kane	Stormwater		Support	Supports plan change so long as stormwater is managed to avoid additional runoff into Koputaroa Stream or under the new expressway into existing drains.	Effective stormwater management.
04/15	04/15.01	Gwyneth Schibli	Stormwater		Oppose	Water runs through the submitter's property west of Arapaepae Road during heavy rain. The proposed wetlands will not be sufficient for denser housing. Need specifically designed sumps and swales. Oppose to use of wetlands.	Replace wetland proposal with sumps and swales.

04/19	04/19.06	Michael Harland	Stormwater		Oppose	The submitter states the proposal will continue to pollute Lake Horowhenua.	Reject Plan Change in its entirety.
04/30	04/30.02	Horizons Regional Council	Stormwater	Objective 6A.3, Policies 6A.3.1 & 6A.3.3, Objective 6A.6, Rule 15A.6.2.1, Policy 6A.6.2 Rulee 15A.8.1.2	Support in part	The submitter notes that Lake Horowhenua is a threatened habitat under the One Plan and that discharge of stormwater is a non-complying activity. The Koputaroa catchment has known flood carrying capacity issues and the submitter holds indicative ponding information which suggests there may be areas in Taraika that experience surface ponding during heavy rain. The submitter supports objectives, policies, and rules relating to managing the quantity and quality of stormwater, specifically provisions Objective 6A.3, Policies 6A.3.1 & 6A.3.3, Objective 6A.6, Rule 15A.6.2.1 (rainwater tanks) and requirements to comply with Chapter 24 of the District Plan. However the submitter requests some changes to the wording of Policy 6A.6.2 and provision 15A.8.1.2 so that they more clearly give effect	Policy 6A.6.2 Ensure public parks are of a size, shape and type that enables functional <u>and</u> recreational uses by requiring all subdivision and development to comply with Structure Plan 013. Provision 15A.8.1.2(a) Matters of Discretion for Subdivision (vi) provision of land for publically accessible open space and recreation that is appropriately located and of a practicable size and shape <u>to support management of stormwater during heavy rain events</u> in accordance with Structure Plan 013.

						to related Objective 6A.6. Requested additions shown in <i><u>italics underlined.</u></i>	
04/30	04/30.03	Horizons Regional Council	Stormwater		Support in part	The submitter notes that the Three Waters Infrastructure Plan supporting PPC4 states that large private carparks and commercial roofs over 500m2 need to provide their own water quality treatment, but that there is no explicit provision requiring this in the proposed plan change.	Include an explicit provision relating to stormwater management on large private carparks and commercial roofs over 500m2.
04/34	04/34.10	WKNZTA	Stormwater		Support in part	WKNZTA support the requirement for onsite stormwater detention and emphasise the importance of good stormwater design to avoid runoff entering the state highway network.	Continue discussions for an integrated stormwater management solution.
04/38	04/38.07	Prouse Trust Partnership	Stormwater	Objectives 6A.3 & 6A.6, Policy 6A.3.1	Oppose	The submitter opposes the three waters plan (appendix 6 to s32 report) on the basis that it discusses a wetland on the submitter's property as a means of dealing with stormwater from both the development area and O2NL but does not provide clarity on how intended outcomes	Remove wetland from submitter's property.

						will be managed across parties.	
04/06	04/06.04	Elisabeth Leighfield	Strategic Cycleways		Support in part	Supports the concept that vehicles should not cross strategic cycleways, but opposes use of rear access lanes due to CPTED concerns.	Include advice on how to design rear access lanes in accordance with CPTED principles and differentiate between local roads and laneways.
04/09	04/09.02	Phillipa & Pasanka Wickremasinghe	Strategic Cycleways		Support in part	Strategic cycleway is a great initiative for health and low emission transport, but should be relocated to the collector road, as this would likely allow it to be built earlier.	Relocate Strategic Cycleway to Collector Road
04/11	04/11.02	John William Brown & Jeny Doreen Brown	Strategic Cycleways		Support in part	Supports use of strategic cycleways, but suggests relocating to collector road.	Relocate Strategic Cycleway to Collector Road.
04/12	04/12.01	Gwyneth Schibli	Strategic Cycleways		Support in part	Supports use of cycleways, but seeks that they are constructed in a timely manner and not reliant on development occurring. Modifications to route suggested so that it follows fixed roads (North/South and East/West) and eliminate 'dog leg' near Waiopehu Reserve.	Modify location to follow fixed north/south and east/west roads. Smooth dog leg near Waiopehu Reserve.
04/22	04/22.03	Gill Morgan	Strategic Cycleways		Oppose	Cycle network is disconnected and does not provide	Improve cycle connectivity to Levin.

						sufficient connections into Levin.	
04/24	04/24.09	Haddon Preston	Strategic Cycleways		Oppose	Remove the rule requiring access via rear access lanes for properties fronting strategic cycleways and amend associated policy to allow more flexibility for creative design.	Remove the rule requiring access via rear access lanes for properties fronting strategic cycleways and amend associated policy to allow more flexibility for creative design.
04/32	04/32.01	Leith Consulting	Strategic Cycleways	15A.6.1.1	Oppose	The submitter considers that further assessment into the feasibility of requiring properties fronting Strategic Cycleways to be accessed via rear access lane only. The submitter states that this could deter development and/or result in a number a resource consents being sought to depart from this standard which could collectively adversely impact on the integrity of the Structure Plan. The submitter also notes there could be other means of achieving a safe cycling environment.	Further consideration of the feasibility of the existing provision and exploration of alternatives.
04/33	04/33.13	Truebridge Associates	Strategic Cycleways	15A.5 & 15A.5.1.1	Oppose	The submitter opposes the non-complying activity status for vehicle crossings in Strategic Cycleways. The submitter states that there	Provide for crossings in strategic cycleways as a controlled activity when

						are a number of cycle and walkways with site access over them elsewhere in the District and that this activity status will slow or stop development in affected areas.	accompanied by a traffic assessment.
04/02	04/02.01	Hayden & Prudence Stewart	Structure Plan		Oppose in part	Seeks removal of the local road shown on Structure Plan alongside 180 Gladstone Road (submitter's property) as they do not intend to sell and do not wish to have a road on their property.	Remove local road on submitter's property.
04/06	04/06.01	Elisabeth Leighfield	Structure Plan		Oppose	Oppose road connections onto Gladstone Road and road through centre of development due to traffic concerns.	Remove road connections onto Gladstone Road and introduce additional measures to encourage recreational activities on Gladstone Road, as a means of traffic calming.
04/18	04/18.01	Jennings Family Trust	Structure Plan		Oppose	Oppose the location of the arterial road running from Queen Street E to the centre of Tara-Ika due to proximity to Redwood Grove.	Move road further east.
04/18	04/18.02	Jennings Family Trust	Structure Plan		Oppose	Oppose the location of the greenspace and education site, these should be located to create a buffer between Redwood Grove.	Introduce a greenspace buffer around Redwood Grove, or require low volume roading connectivity to the rear of

							eastern Redwood Grove to provide for future connectivity/subdivision.
04/31	04/31.02	Incite (on behalf of a range of Redwood Grove properties)	Structure Plan		Oppose	The submitter opposes the local roads which connect Redwood Grove into the rest of Tara-Ika. This is on the basis that the Redwood Grove properties are subject to a private covenant which prevents this from happening. The submitter also opposes the current position of the arterial and collector roads east and west of Redwood Grove, submitting that they will have an adverse impact on the amenity of the existing properties.	Remove the local roads connecting Redwood Grove and Tara-Ika and shift the arterial and collector roads east and west of Redwood Grove, so they are at least 100m away.
04/36	04/36.02	Catriona McKay	Structure Plan		Support in part	The submitter seeks a cycle/walking connection from Pohutukawa Drive into the development area be reintroduced, or alternatively direct pedestrian access from the submitter's property onto the proposed arterial road along the rear (southern) boundary of the submitters property.	A cycle/walking connection from Pohutukawa Drive into the development area shown on Structure Plan 013 or provision for direct pedestrian access from the submitter's property to the new arterial road specified.

04/38	04/38.03	Prouse Trust Partnership	Structure Plan	Structure Plan 013	Oppose	The submitter seeks for the road connecting their property to Redwood Grove be removed given Redwood Grove is already established and that the collector road located on the submitter's property be changed to a local road to reduce impact on the heritage setting of the Prouse Homestead.	Remove Redwood Grove connection and 'downgrade' collector road running north-south through submitter's property to a local road.
04/24	04/24.08	Haddon Preston	Subdivision		Oppose	Restricted Discretionary Activity status for subdivision is too restrictive and contrary to the NPS-UD.	Make subdivision a permitted or controlled activity, subject to conditions.
04/25	04/25.06	Horowhenua District Council	Subdivision		Support in part	The s32 report references a non-notification provision for all complying subdivisions. This provision appears in the commercial, open space, and greenbelt residential zone, but not the residential zone. This appears to be an error.	Introduce a non-notification provision for complying residential subdivision.
04/25	04/25.07	Horowhenua District Council	Subdivision		Support in part	Currently Table 15A-3 only requires a concept plan for medium density standalone dwellings. However, it appears that this should also apply to attached units.	Amend Table 15A-3 Standards Applying to Subdivision and Residential Dwelling Units to include a "*": reference for Medium Density Attached Units: 150m2.

04/25	04/25.08	Horowhenua District Council	Subdivision		Support in part	At present the requirement for "Those matters described in Sections 108 and 220 of the RMA" to be considered as a matter of discretion only applies in some zones. It is noted this requirement appears in the remainder of the Horowhenua District Plan. This should be addressed for consistency.	Include "Those matters described in Sections 108 and 220 of the RMA" as a matter of discretion for restricted discretionary subdivision in all zones.
04/27	04/27.03	Brendan McDonnell	Subdivision		Support in part	Subdivision should be a controlled activity rather than discretionary activity.	Change activity status of complying subdivision to controlled.
04/27	04/27.04	Brendan McDonnell	Subdivision		Support in part	The matters of discretion for subdivision are too restrictive and will add additional cost and delay, including the design and layout of subdivision, the timing and staging of works, and minimising the use of cul-de-sacs.	Simplify the matters of discretion.
04/31	04/31.06	Incite (on behalf of a range of Redwood Grove properties)	Subdivision		Oppose	The submitter requests that in addition to Redwood Grove and adjoining properties being zoned Low Density Residential instead of Standard Residential as proposed, they also be subject to a 'buffer' changing the	Change the minimum site area of Redwood Grove and adjoining properties to 2,000m2.

						minimum site size for these properties to 2,000m2.	
04/32	04/32.04	Leith Consulting	Subdivision	15A.8.1.2(a) & 15A.8.1.2(b)	Support in part	The submitter suggests that the conditions and matters of discretion for subdivision be given further consideration in regard to how they enable and facilitate medium density development. In particular, the submitter suggests that medium density should be design-led rather than allotment size led. The submitter suggests reducing the number of conditions and matters of discretion and replacing these with a robust design guide focusing on positive urban design outcomes.	Review medium density provisions, with a view of introducing a design-led rather than condition-led approach.
04/33	04/33.08	Truebridge Associates	Subdivision	15A.3.1(a)	Oppose	The submitter seeks that subdivision of land in all zones be a controlled activity, rather than restricted discretionary to give certainty to developers.	Make subdivision a controlled activity, subject to conditions.
04/33	04/33.11	Truebridge Associates	Subdivision	15A.4.2	Oppose	Consequential change to 15A.4.2 - the submitter states that subdivisions that do not comply with the "controlled" activity conditions (rather than restricted discretionary	Consequential change to 04/33.08.

						activity conditions) should be a discretionary activity.	
04/33	04/33.20	Truebridge Associates	Subdivision	15A.8.1.2(a)	Oppose	Linked to the submitter's request that subdivision should be a controlled activity, the submitter requests that several 'matters of discretion' for subdivision be shifted to 'matters of control' and that a number of other 'matters of discretion' be removed entirely.	Shift 15A.8.1.2(a) Matters of Discretion - (i), (vi), (x), (xii), (xiii), (xv), (xix), (xx) to matters of control and remove all remaining matters of discretion.
04/33	04/33.21	Truebridge Associates	Subdivision	15A.8.1.2(b)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the requirement for a building siting plan to be submitted for medium density subdivision on the basis the requirement is unclear and too restrictive.	Amend requirement to just require a potential building option.
04/38	04/38.09	Prouse Trust Partnership	Subdivision		Oppose	The submitter opposes limits on rear sections and the infrastructure requirements specified in the matters of discretion as referenced in submission point 04/38.06.	Do not restrict rear sections, address infrastructure concerns.
04/35	04/35.06	MTA	Tau utu utu		Neutral	The submission notes the opportunity to create a positive legacy, including new jobs, planting, housing (including affordable housing), and cultural expression.	Prioritisation of Muaūpoko members in new jobs, use of planting to enhance and restore waterways, specific provisions in the Plan Change to require provision of housing for people on

							low-moderate incomes, and take specific steps to connect cultural and spiritual history.
04/35	04/35.07	MTA	Tino rangatiratanga		Neutral	The submission notes the Tara-Ika project is occurring alongside the Ōtaki to North Levin highway project, which is the most significant developments to occur in the region since the railway arrived in the 1870s. The gifting of the name 'Tara' recognises this significant impact and needs to be cherished and respected. This includes Muaūpoko stories, ancestors, and association with the whenua of Tara-Ika being intentionally and consciously recognised through development stages and processes such as design, and the naming of public parks and streets. The spiritual pathway from wāhi tapu in the Tararua Range to Taitoko need to be protected from the built environment to avoid interrupting the connections and view path from the maunga to Punahau and onwards to the moana.	Recognises Muaūpoko to the design and naming of public parks and streets, implement Plan provisions to protect the connections/viewshafts between the Tararua Ranges, Taitoko/Levin, Punahau (Lake Horowhenua) and the sea.

04/34	04/34.07	WKNZTA	Traffic impacts		Oppose	WKNZTA note that the development will accommodate a significant number of people, increasing the amount of traffic needing to cross SH57 but this has not been subject to an Integrated Traffic Assessment.	Prepare an integrated traffic assessment to inform future assessment of large scale subdivision and development that results from the plan change and respond accordingly (for example, consider introducing development thresholds).
04/30	04/30.05	Horizons Regional Council	Transport		Support in part	The submitter supports inclusion of objectives, policies, and rules that seek to achieve connectivity, safety, and transport choice. Specifically the submitter supports Objective 6A.1, Policy 6A.1.1, and Rule 15A.6.1.1. The submitter supports medium density development in the centre of Tara-Ika as this supports connectivity and active and public transport options. The submitter notes a lack of provision for public transport in the proposed plan provisions. The submitter requests some changes to the wording of proposed plan change policies and provisions to improve clarity and make specific reference to public	Objective 6A.4 Achieve a high amenity, <u>connected</u> , walkable environment. Policy 6A.4.2 Enable and encourage a range of housing types and section sizes in Tara-Ika to meet the variety of needs and preferences in our community, while ensuring a high level of residential amenity <u>and connectivity</u> . 15A.8.1.2 Subdivision (a) Matters of Discretion (viii) The provision of any new roads, cycleways, provision of linkages to existing roads, access over or under railway lines, the diversion or alteration of any existing roads, the provision of access, passing bays, car parking and manoeuvring

						transport. Additions shown in <i><u>italics underlined.</u></i>	areas, <i><u>bus stops and tuning areas,</u></i> and any necessary easements.
04/30	04/30.06	Horizons Regional Council	Transport		Support in part	The submitter states that consideration should be given to how public and school bus services will enter and exit Tara-Ika from Arapaepae Road and that consideration needs to be given to how safe crossing locations will be provided for pedestrians and cyclists, particularly before and during construction of O2NL.	Consideration for how buses, pedestrians, and cyclists will enter and exit the development from Arapaepae Road.
04/35	04/35.03	MTA	Treaty of Waitangi		Neutral	The submission details Crown breaches of the Treaty of Waitangi and the impact that this had on Muaūpoko people.	Refer to other submission points.
04/30	04/30.09	Horizons Regional Council	Versatile Soils		Support	The submitter notes that the proposed plan change area is largely covered by Class 3 soils, with a small patch of Class 2 soils in the rural residential subdivision and reserve. Subject to this being the cases, One Plan Objective 3-4 and Policy 3-5 would be unlikely to apply	None.

04/22	04/22.04	Gill Morgan	Waiopehu Reserve		Oppose	Submission questions what protection is proposed for Waiopehu Reserve.	Advise appropriate protections for Waiopehu Reserve.
04/35	04/35.05	MTA	Whakapapa		Neutral	The submission notes that the Tara-Ika growth area is located within an area that Muaūpoko have been in for over 1000 years and therefore is likely to contain artefacts, sites of archaeological significance or possibly Tangata koiwi that could be uncovered during construction.	Earthworks and other construction must be subject to robust cultural monitoring protocols and accidental discovery processes agreed with Muaūpoko.

Further Submissions must be received by Horowhenua District Council before 4:00pm Monday 15 March 2021.