

Horowhenua District Plan

Proposed Plan Change 5 – Waitārere Beach Growth Area

Summary of Submissions (Ordered by Submitter)

Summary of Submissions Notified 28th May 2021

1. Introduction

This document, Summary of Submissions, summarises the decisions requested for each submission received on Proposed Plan Change 5. 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 5 was publicly notified on 19 March 2021 with the period for submissions closing on 27 April 2021.

A total of 15 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:** 22 Harbour 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/PPC5

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/PPC5

Further submissions will need to be supplied to Horowhenua District Council by **4:00pm** on **Monday 14 June 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/PPC5

Important: Any person making a further submission on Proposed Plan Change 5 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 5.

3. Process from here

Once the Further Submission period has closed (14 June 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 Milcah Xkenjik 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 5. Each submission has also been assigned a unique reference number (e.g. 05/01).

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
05/01	Vivienne Bold	155 Moutere Road, RD1 Levin 5571	-
05/02	Charlotte Yates	crbyates@actriz.co.nz	No
05/03	Emma Jane Robinson	robinson.emmaj@gmail.com	No
05/04	Sharon Freebairn	sharonf@inspire.net.nz	No
05/05	Waitarere Beach Progressive and Ratepayers Association (WBPRA)	brucee51@outlook.com	Yes
05/06	Chris & Karen Lane	drchrislane@gmail.com	-
05/07	Waitarere Rise Limited	roger@truebridge.co.nz	Yes
05/08	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (WKNZTA)	natasha.reid@nzta.govt.nz	Yes
05/09	Horizons Regional Council	penelope.tucker@horizons.govt.nz	Yes
05/10	MDHB Public Health Service	PublicHealthOps@midcentraldhb.govt.nz	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter Name	Address for service	Wish to be heard
05/11	Waitarere Sands Limited	bryce@landmatters.nz	Yes
05/12	Director-General of Conservation	smcnicholl@doc.govt.nz	Yes
05/13	Forest & Bird	a.geary@forestandbird.org.nz	Yes
05/14	FRP Investments Limited and FRP Agriculture Limited (FRP)	amanda@proarch	Yes
05/15	Vivienne Bold	155 Moutere Road, RD1 Levin 5571	Yes

6. Summary of Decisions Requested

The below table summarises the decisions requested or inferred by submitters to Proposed Plan Change 5. 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. 05/03 being Plan Change 5, Submission Number 3), a unique numeric identifier (i.e. 05/03.1) 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 by submitter. An alternative document is also available that contains the submissions summarised according to the issue or provision.

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
05/01	05/01.01	Vivienne Bold	General		Not specified	Not specified.	No decision sought
05/02	05/02.01	Charlotte Yates	Commercial Zone		Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the development of destination commercial opportunities.</p> <p>Housing increases need to minimise changes to the environmental & beach culture.</p> <p>The plan change shouldn't create just another suburb.</p>	Further community consultation to ascertain long term environmental impact and changes to the existing beach culture.
05/03	05/03.01	Emma Jane Robinson	General		Oppose	The submitter opposes the implementation of the development of destination commercial opportunities on the basis the existing village functions well and allowing destination shopping will result in crowding and does not enhance the community.	Remove commercial development provisions.
05/03	05/03.02	Emma Jane Robinson	General		Oppose	While the submitter acknowledges there is a need for some further residential development, considers this must be diverse, not negatively impact the beach culture, and viewed carefully to minimise the impact on the natural environment. The impact on bird species and wildlife needs to be fully known.	<p>Minimise housing development.</p> <p>Further consultation regarding rezoning and its environmental and cultural implications.</p>

Submission Number	Submission Point	Submitter Name	Issue	Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
05/04	05/04.01	Sharon Freebairn	General		Support in part	The submitter commends Council on the adoption of the Master Plan which provides a cohesive plan for blending the existing township with the proposed growth area. Notwithstanding the above, the submitter has identified some areas of concern.	Not specified.
05/04	05/04.02	Sharon Freebairn	Integrated Residential Development - Forest Road Integrated Residential Development Area	Planning Map zoning and Rule 15.8.16(b)	Oppose	The submitter notes that the proposed Forest Road Integrated Residential Development Area was not included in the Master Plan and is now an option in PPC5. The submitter notes that the proposed small lots will have significant stresses on bores for water supply, wastewater and stormwater management. The submitter considers that the healthcare facilities within this zone should not exclude access by other residents.	Not specified.
05/04	05/04.03	Sharon Freebairn	Integrated Residential Development - Forest Road Integrated Residential Development Area	Rule 15.8.16(c)	Oppose	The submitter questions the non-notification clause on the basis that the community should have the opportunity to be notified of specific activities planned for this area.	Not specified.

Submission Number	Submission Point	Submitter Name	Issue	Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
05/04	05/04.04	Sharon Freebairn	Commercial Zone	Policies 6.3.50A and 6.3.50B	Oppose	The submitter observes that these policies limit the commercial activity anticipated for the Growth Area, with concerns in relation to the duplication of existing commercial activities which could cause a separation and divide between residents of PPC5 and existing residents.	Not specified.
05/04	05/04.05	Sharon Freebairn	Stormwater		Oppose	The submitter raises concerns with the ability of the growth area to adequately accommodate stormwater management. Particular concerns are raised in regard to runoff into the Wairarawa Stream and the effect on existing services within the township.	Not specified.
05/04	05/04.06	Sharon Freebairn	Wastewater		Not specified.	The submitter notes the proposed plan change address wastewater and there are provisions for r upgrades to the wastewater treatment plant in the 2121-2041 LTP.	Not specified.
05/04	05/04.07	Sharon Freebairn	Fire Fighting		Oppose	The submitter notes that the increase in household numbers could add to stress in the event of a fire in the PPC5 area and	More information on water storage and specifically firefighting water supply.

Submission Number	Submission Point	Submitter Name	Issue	Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
						questions if provisions have been made for sufficient water storage facilities in the absence of reticulated water supply.	
05/04	05/04.08	Sharon Freebairn	Water Supply		Oppose	Concerns are raised regarding the lack of a reticulated water supply, and the priority afforded to other areas and lack of emphasis on Waitarere as the second fastest growing area in the Horowhenua. Climate change forecasts will likely result in less rainfall and induced water shortages.	Not specified.
05/04	05/04.09	Sharon Freebairn	Traffic impacts		Oppose	The submitter raises concerns with additional traffic movements at the Waitarere Beach Road and State Highway 1 intersection and the potential for the intersection to become a high risk area given the increased growth in the district. It is acknowledged that talks are ongoing with Waka Kotahi NZTA.	Not specified.
05/05	05/05.01	Waitarere Beach Progressive and Ratepayers Association (WBPRA)	Servicing		Support in part	While the submitter commends council on the proposed plan change, concerns are raised regarding reticulated water supply, firefighting water supply, stormwater, and village	That in order for the plan change to be supported, servicing matters (regarding reticulated water supply, firefighting water supply,

Submission Number	Submission Point	Submitter Name	Issue	Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
						accessibility. The submitter considers the identified issues all indicate a weakness to the commitment of achieving NPS-UD Objective 1.	stormwater, and village accessibility) be addressed urgently.
05/05	05/05.02	Waitarere Beach Progressive and Ratepayers Association (WBPRA)	Water Supply		Oppose	The submitter raises concerns that with an expanded community and climate change implications, the community cannot place continued reliance upon rainwater collection and/or shallow bore water. This would be contrary to NPS-UD Objective 1 and the One Plan 3.4 Policies.	Make reticulated water supply available as a minimum requirement to the proposed development.
05/05	05/05.03	Waitarere Beach Progressive and Ratepayers Association (WBPRA)	Fire Fighting		Oppose	The submitter notes that as a result of growth and more dense housing, it will be necessary to make available sufficient water supply for firefighting purposes.	Make reticulated water supply available as a minimum requirement to the proposed development.
05/05	05/05.04	Waitarere Beach Progressive and Ratepayers Association (WBPRA)	Stormwater		Oppose	The submitter notes the proposed stormwater infrastructure is for the discharge of stormwater from paved streets into the existing stormwater system which discharges directly into the sea. The submitters raised concerns with the current system in terms of ongoing capacity and	Requests that further considerations of the effects of downstream existing shallow bore users and/or ingress of stormwater into the Wairarawa Stream be investigated, and that stormwater from new

Submission Number	Submission Point	Submitter Name	Issue	Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
						operation issues due to accreting coastline. Concerns are also raised regarding the effects on downstream existing shallow bore users and/or ingress of stormwater into the Wairarawa Stream.	buildings be managed on-site.
05/05	05/05.05	Waitarere Beach Progressive and Ratepayers Association (WBPRA)	Wastewater		Support	Supports the proposed infrastructure for additional infrastructure for wastewater.	Retain proposed provision.
05/05	05/05.06	Waitarere Beach Progressive and Ratepayers Association (WBPRA)	Traffic impacts		Oppose	The submitter notes that no alternative route to connect the community to Levin other than the existing use of SH1 has been proposed and that apart from the current safety improvements by WKNZTA, no plans have been made to improve the highway for the next 20-30 years. The growth area and additional households will only add to the already over stretched roading network on State Highway 1.	Not specified.
05/06	05/06.01	Chris & Karen Lane	Integrated residential development		Oppose	Note that they are the owners and residents of 40 Forest Road and that they have not been approached regarding, or	Not specified.

Submission Number	Submission Point	Submitter Name	Issue	Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
						involved in, the proposed “Integrated residential development” overlay. The submitter is opposed to the development that would see their personal and financial investment, and current lifestyle, permanently changed.	
05/06	05/06.02	Chris & Karen Lane	Social impacts		Oppose	Notes that the addition of 700 additional households would permanently and irrevocably change the nature of the quiet beachside community to its detriment. The submitter is concerned with the social impacts of an increase in density and provision of higher density housing.	Not specified..
05/06	05/06.03	Chris & Karen Lane	Primary Healthcare Services		Oppose	Notes that there is a great demand for access to primary health care with a limited supply of healthcare professionals within the District. The submitter is a GP and notes that the existing primary health care services will not be able to sustainably support the additional households as well as the patrons of a retirement complex.	Not specified.

Submission Number	Submission Point	Submitter Name	Issue	Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
05/06	05/06.04	Chris & Karen Lane	Education Services		Oppose	Notes that schools have rolls that are full and other schools are far from Waitārere Beach. Comments on attracting quality teachers being a challenge and notes that the creation of affordable homes will require households to have their own transport or the development of public transport to support these households.	Not specified.
05/06	05/06.05	Chris & Karen Lane	Water Supply		Oppose	The submitter raises concerns about the privatisation of water supply in the near future and how Council intends to supply water to the proposed households.	Not specified.
05/07	05/07.01	Waitarere Rise Limited	Waitarere Beach Mixed Use Area and Waitarere Beach Greater Density Area		Support in part	The submitter owns land within PC5 which is proposed to be rezoned as part Waitarere Beach Mixed Use Area and part Waitarere Beach Greater Density Area. Supports the proposed rezoning, with identified amendments.	To alter the plan change to meets the requests outlined in the submission.
05/07	05/07.02	Waitarere Rise Limited	Waitarere Beach Mixed Use Area – Site Coverage	Rule 17.7.7(b)(i)	Oppose in part	The submitter raises concerns with the 15% site coverage for retail and commercial activities within the Waitarere Beach Mixed Use Area. Given the strategic location of the WRL Land and high profile of the site	Amend the site coverage restriction to 20% for the Waitarere Beach Mixed Use Area either generally or for the block of land in the Waitarere Beach Greater Density Area

Submission Number	Submission Point	Submitter Name	Issue	Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
						at setting the gateway to Waitarere Beach, the submitter suggests that the proposed site coverage for retail or commercial activities is unnecessarily restrictive, with an increase in site coverage enabling the opportunity for a greater retail or commercial activities or offerings to be explored.	owned by the submitter (Waitarere Rise Limited) and legally described as the land owned by the submitter.
05/07	05/07.03	Waitarere Rise Limited	Waitarere Beach Greater Density Area		Oppose in part	<p>Within the Waitarere Beach Greater Density Area, the submitter supports the provisions enabling higher density lots. However, the submitter notes that the wording of the proposed provisions (including default non complying activity status) would restrict the flexibility of lot sizes and layouts to meet market expectations and ability to deliver the urban outcomes envisaged by the plan change. The prescriptive approach to development density could have the opposite effect to the outcome intended by the plan change in that high density lots may not in reality be developed as envisaged.</p>	<p>Amend provisions to allow for greater flexibility to enable a range of lot sizes and layouts for the balance of the submitter owned land in the Waitarere Beach Greater Density Area, being the land owned by the submitter.</p> <p>Include changes as may be assessed by the landowner as appropriate in order to meet market demand.</p> <p>Include provision that the Structure Plan for the Waitarere Rise Limited owned land is indicative only and may be</p>

Submission Number	Submission Point	Submitter Name	Issue	Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
							amended through the resource consent process.
05/07	05/07.04	Waitarere Rise Limited	General		Oppose	Linked to the submitters request for greater flexibility to enable a range of lot sizes and layouts within the Structure Plan, the submitter requests that the activity status for subdivision not conforming with the Structure Plan should require a consent for a Restricted Discretionary Activity.	Amend the activity status from non-complying to restricted discretionary, where subdivision is not at the density or layout envisaged by the structure plan.
05/08	05/08.01	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (WKNZTA)	General		Neutral	WKNZTA is generally supportive of the proactive approach to planning for urban growth, but has some concerns about the level of information on the transportation effects of the plan change on the state highway network which they believe to not be fully addressed. On this basis Waka Kotahi reserves its position.	Amend PC5 to address the concerns raised, and alternative or consequential relief as may be necessary to achieve the relief sought in relation to mitigation of any adverse traffic and safety effects.
05/08	05/08.02	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (WKNZTA)	Traffic Impacts		Oppose	WKNZTA note that the development will accommodate a significant number of people expected from the development of 700 residential lots and commercial activities, increasing the amount of traffic at the	Prepare an integrated transport assessment (ITA) to demonstrate how: (a) the intersection will operate with the additional vehicle movements expected from the proposed

Submission Number	Submission Point	Submitter Name	Issue	Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
						<p>intersection of Waitarere Beach Road and State Highway 1 but this has not been subject to an Integrated Traffic Assessment.</p> <p>WKNZTA considers an ITA is required to address the potential effects and impact on the state highway network. An ITA would provide detailed analysis of the predicted housing occupancy and development timeframes.</p>	residential lots and commercial activities; and (b) if there will be implications, including cumulative effects, on the wider transport network.
05/08	05/08.03	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (WKNZTA)	Traffic impacts - Timeframe		Oppose in part	WKNZTA seeks further clarification around the projected 20-year development of the residential lots per year, given the unpredictable housing market.	Further discussion with Council over the proposed development timeframe.
05/08	05/08.04	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (WKNZTA)	Traffic impacts - Housing Occupancy Rate		Oppose in part	WKNZTA seeks further clarification from Council regarding the predicted housing occupancy rate of 60% and PC5 s32 statement regarding popularity of the location for permanent residents, as these predictions will influence the intersections level of service flow and the safety risk.	Clarification from Council over the predicted housing occupancy rate.

Submission Number	Submission Point	Submitter Name	Issue	Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
05/09	05/09.01	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. However, significant concerns are raised with some aspects of the proposal.	Seeks the relief sought in the submission, or any further, alternative or consequential relief.
05/09	05/09.02	Horizons Regional Council	Indigenous biodiversity	Policy 6.3.30A	Support	The submitter supports Policy 6.3.30A, 11 th bullet point "Protects and restores ecological features...".	Retain Policy 6.3.30A as proposed.
05/09	05/09.03	Horizons Regional Council	Indigenous biodiversity	Open Space Zone	Oppose in part	The submitter supports in principle the identification and zoning of the Waiarawa Lagoon and associated wetland area as Open Space. However, they note that the basis for identifying the extent of this area is unclear and seeks clarity that PC5 recognises the full extent of the threatened habitat.	Adjust the extent of the Open Space Zone and adjacent zones, if necessary, to ensure the values of the threatened wetland habitat can be adequately safeguarded.
05/09	05/09.04	Horizons Regional Council	Master Plan		Oppose	While the submitter supports the recognition of the habitat through the establishment of the Open Space zone, concerns are raised regarding the basis for identifying the extent of the area, as well as concerns about the indicative Master Plan	Request that an assessment of the proposed Growth Area be undertaken by a qualified ecological expert to (a) identify the full extent of the Waiarawa Lagoon and wetland threatened

Submission Number	Submission Point	Submitter Name	Issue	Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
						showing roading and development adjacent to open water. Furthermore, the Master Plan and Structure Plan do not give the submitter confidence that the proposal recognises the full extent of this threatened habitat.	habitat area, to ensure the full extent of this habitat is identified; and, (b) Identify any other areas of rare, threatened or at-risk habitat in the area so that they can be appropriately protected.
05/09	05/09.05	Horizons Regional Council	Indigenous biodiversity	6.3.30	Oppose	The submitter notes that it is uncertain where policy support for the provision referenced in their submission is located as there is nothing included in proposed amendments to Chapter 6, and existing policies in Chapter 4 emphasise public access and recreational values rather than ecological values.	Insert a policy to guide the achievement of the 11 th bullet point of Objective 6.3.30A.
05/09	05/09.06	Horizons Regional Council	Indigenous biodiversity		Oppose	The submitter considers there to be a high risk of discharges entering into the habitat due to the proximity of the proposed areas of development and roading to the Waiarawa Lagoon and wetland, with strong concerns about the potential for stormwater discharge into this area. The submitter notes that the Master Plan Design Description for 'The Lakes' area states that the indicative design "signals sensitive stormwater management" contrary to the	Amend the policy and rule frameworks applying to all areas within, and within an approximate setback distance of the Lagoon and wetland be amended to recognise and protect the values of the area and to ensure consistency with the One Plan Part 1 and NESFM.

Submission Number	Submission Point	Submitter Name	Issue	Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
						<p>intent of the District Plan policy and regulatory framework for stormwater management.</p> <p>The submitter raises extreme concerns that the proposed Structure Plan, provisions and Master Plan for the area lacks adequate policy and regulatory framework to protect the values of the Waiarawa Lagoon and wetland. The submitter also notes that the plan change, as proposed, establishes and expectation of development which appears in some areas to be inconsistent with the One Plan Part II (Regional Plan) and the NESF.</p>	
05/09	05/09.07	Horizons Regional Council	Indigenous biodiversity		Oppose	<p>The submitter identifies that the One Plan regulates activities include land disturbance and vegetation clearance within 10 metres of any Schedule F wetland habitat; activities within the extent of any area of threatened habitat, including discharges of water and contaminants are a non-complying activity. Further, the National Environmental Statement for Freshwater (NESF) also regulates activities in and within setbacks from wetlands, diversions and</p>	<p>Inclusion of additional advice notes for plan users referring them to Horizons and the One Plan.</p>

Submission Number	Submission Point	Submitter Name	Issue	Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
						discharges of water, and within a 100 metre setback, of a natural wetland are non-complying activities.	
05/09	05/09.08	Horizons Regional Council	Indigenous biodiversity		Oppose	The submitter expresses concerns about the extent of the areas of indigenous habitat in the area that have not been identified or assessed and advise that recent findings indicate that there may be another area of indigenous biodiversity habitat on privately owned land east of Forest Road within the Waitarere Beach Growth Area and note that no ecological assessment has been undertaken to inform the plan change.	That any additional areas of rare, threatened or at risk habitat in the Growth Area are recognised in the District Plan through mechanisms including but not limited to rezoning and the amendment or insertion of objectives, policies and rules to protect their values and to ensure consistency with the One Plan part 1 (Regional Plan) and NESFM.
05/09	05/09.09	Horizons Regional Council	Stormwater		Oppose	The submitter acknowledges the intent of Council's District Plan framework to manage stormwater on-site, however notes the lack of a clear and consistent pathway of implementing its intent, with ambiguous standards and requirements that appear to be disconnected. The submitter indicates concern about the lack of provisions in the existing District Plan (Chapters 15, 17 and 24) or PPC5 that requires ongoing maintenance of	Requests a coherent, consistent framework in the District Plan that enables Council to require the avoidance of adverse effects, through mechanisms including but not limited to the amendment or insertion of objectives, policies and rules to ensure that the standards and conditions for the establishment and ongoing stormwater management systems are

Submission Number	Submission Point	Submitter Name	Issue	Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
						stormwater systems. The submitter also seeks clarification in relation to the inconsistent approach to requiring a rainwater tank for the collection of stormwater as proposed in PPC4 – Tara-ika Growth Area.	explicit and clear and there is consistency with the One Plan Part I (Regional Plan) and NESFM.
05/09	05/09.10	Horizons Regional Council	Transport		Support in part	The submitter supports the inclusion of objectives, policies and rules to provide connectivity, safety, and choice, but notes the lack of specific provision for public transport in the proposed plan provisions (and Master Plan).	Incorporate provisions for future public and school bus services into the plan change area.
05/09	05/09.11	Horizons Regional Council	Transport	Policy 6.3.30A	Support in part	The submitter generally supports those parts of the policy relating to connectivity, but requests additional public transport wording to be included.	Requests the following wording be included; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Enables public transport services, including school buses.</u>
05/09	05/09.12	Horizons Regional Council	Natural hazards	Rule 15.7.5(a)(xiv)	Support	The submitter supports the inclusion of provisions relating to liquefaction and lateral spread.	Retain as proposed.
05/09	05/09.13	Horizons Regional Council	Energy efficiency	Policy 6.3.30A	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 PPC5 gives effect	Amend proposed Policy 6.3.30A to include an additional bullet point; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Require subdivision layout that will enable building to utilise energy efficiency and</u>

Submission Number	Submission Point	Submitter Name	Issue	Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
						to this objective and policy and seeks changes to the wording of objectives, policies, and rules to encourage energy efficient design.	<u>conservation measures.</u>
05/09	05/09.14	Horizons Regional Council	Energy efficiency	Rule 15.7.5(a)(xiv)	Support	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 PPC5 gives effect to this objective and policy and seeks changes to the wording of objectives, policies, and rules to encourage energy efficient design.	Amend Rule 15.7.5(a) Subdivision of Land Matters of Control to include consideration of energy efficiency, conservation and access to solar energy.
05/10	05/10.01	MDHB Public Health Service	Water Supply	Table 15.4	Oppose	The submitter notes that the proposed development without the implementation of reticulated water supply, could create one of the largest urban areas in New Zealand without a reticulated water supply. They also note that private roof water supplies in urban areas are prone to chemical and microbiological contamination and can be a health risk of adequate treatment and ongoing maintenance does not occur.	Amend Table 15.4 to include a new row specifically for the 'Waitarere Beach Growth Area' or some such definition that defines any rezoned residential and high density residential area of the Waitarere Beach Growth Area. <u>Waitarere Beach Growth Area, Residential Zone</u> <u>Residential Allotments</u>

Submission Number	Submission Point	Submitter Name	Issue	Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
						<p>The submitter requests that as a minimum, the proposed Rules should require that any development within the Waitare Beach Growth Area (PC5 area) be connected reticulated water supply in addition to wastewater. Although no specific relief is sought, the submitter raises concerns regarding climate change and fire fighting. The submitter acknowledges that while not in their area of expertise, there is no mention of adequate water capacity for firefighting purposes which poses a risk to public health in the event of smoke from buildings and putting out the fire itself.</p> <p>The submitter notes that the effects of climate change have not been adequately considered for the proposed growth area in the absence of implementing a reticulated water supply system.</p>	<p><u>Where reticulated water and sewerage disposal is available</u></p> <p><u>450m²</u></p> <p><u>18 meters diameter</u></p>
05/10	05/10.02	MDHB Public Health Service	Waitare Beach settlement profile	Chapter 6 - Section 6.1.1.2	Oppose	<p>The submitter identifies that the s32 report notes that water supply for dwellings and other buildings is expected to be from individual roof supply and groundwater bores, but cannot</p>	<p>That the following text be inserted into Section 6.1.1.2 to replace the struck out text under paragraph 2.</p>

Submission Number	Submission Point	Submitter Name	Issue	Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
						identify any assessment of drinking water requirements within the report that justifies the removal of the wording that has been struck out of the provision.	<i>There are some areas of underdeveloped land available for future residential development although the extent of future development may be constrained unless sufficient water supply can be guaranteed.</i>
05/10	05/10.03	MDHB Public Health Service	Water supply - Potable Water	Rule 15.8.16	Oppose	The submitter notes that although consent would be required, lots of 250m ² with on-site water supply could be built. Without reticulated water supply, roof water would be the most likely source of drinking water. The submitter notes that the section 32 report does not confirm that an adequate roof collection area or sized tank for a drinking water supply could be located within such a small section whilst meeting other rules as required by the District Plan. Without confirmation that such a tank or equivalent tanks could be located with buildings within a 250m ² lot, no reasonable assumption can be made that an adequate supply of water could be provided. Adequate potable water is a public health requirement.	Amend Rule 15.8.16(b)(i) to read; <i>For the Forest Road Integrated Residential Development Area, the minimum lot size shall be 250m² where reticulated water and wastewater disposal is available.</i>

Submission Number	Submission Point	Submitter Name	Issue	Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
05/11	05/11.01	Waitarere Sands Limited	General		Support	The submitter generally supports the identification of the land as appropriate for Urban Development on the Planning Maps.	Not specified.
05/11	05/11.02	Waitarere Sands Limited	General		Oppose	<p>The submitter generally opposes the current content of the master plan and layout of the structure plan applicable to the land. The proposed road connections do not provide for a high level of amenity within the land.</p> <p>The Submitter has undertaken a detailed fine grained analysis of its land holding. The current master plan and structure plan do not locate roads (particularly the east – west connections) in the most appropriate locations. In addition there are too many roads which will severely undermine amenity within the land. The structure plan has been designed around car movement rather than pedestrian movement.</p>	Amendments to the structure plan and planning maps to reflect the submitters layout contained in appendix 1 of their submission.
05/11	05/11.03	Waitarere Sands Limited	General		Oppose	The submitter generally opposes the restrictive nature of the planning provisions in	Not specified.

Submission Number	Submission Point	Submitter Name	Issue	Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
						the Plan Change including the policies, rules and standards.	
05/11	05/11.04	Waitarere Sands Limited	Plan Change Area	Chapter 6: Urban environment	Support	The submitter supports the general intent to provide for further residential development within the Plan Change area.	Retain the issue discussion as proposed.
05/11	05/11.05	Waitarere Sands Limited	Structure Plan	Policy 6.3.30A	Oppose	The submitter opposes parts of this policy as it guides towards a restrictive planning framework for the structure plan area. The roading network needs to provide for a high level of residential amenity without a series of inappropriate 'east – west' connections through the Submitters land. The policy should reflect that.	Amend policy 6.3.30A to the following (or similar intent): Policy 6.3.30A <i>Enable residential development in the area identified on Structure Plan 07A – Waitarere Beach that is in <u>general</u> accordance with the structure plan and that:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • <i>Incorporates an interconnected network of streets and movement links that:</i> • <i>Provide connections to local amenities such as the beach and existing commercial centre, including good pedestrian and cycle access;</i> • <i>... and;</i>

Submission Number	Submission Point	Submitter Name	Issue	Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
							<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Integrate with the open space network; <u>and</u></i> • <i><u>Does not distract from residential amenity values within the structure plan area.</u></i>
05/11	05/11.06	Waitarere Sands Limited	Subdivision lot size	Policy 6.3.30B	Oppose	The submitter notes that the policy does not provide for flexibility within the structure plan area. The submitter recommends a need to have a market based approach to residential outcomes within other parts of the structure plan area including the Submitters land which is flat in areas and also next to open space areas.	Amend policy 6.3.30B to (or similar intent): <i>Provide for a range of housing types in the area identified on Structure Plan 07A – <u>including Waitarere Beach</u> by enabling the creation of smaller residential lots in the Waitarere Beach Greater Housing Area, recognising that these areas have the benefit of being relatively flat adjacent to public open space.</i>
05/11	05/11.07	Waitarere Sands Limited	Rules	Rules 15.4 (b) and 15.4 (c)	Oppose	The submitter notes that the rules contain subjective terms that rely on the plan readers judgement as to compliance or otherwise. The rules should be clear and without subjectivity. Rule 15.4(c) (non-complying activity) is too restrictive.	Amend the specified rules to include rule 15.4(b) as a matter of discretion for assessment. Remove rule 15.4(c) and include discretionary activity rules for the same.

Submission Number	Submission Point	Submitter Name	Issue	Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
05/11	05/11.08	Waitarere Sands Limited	Subdivision lot size	Table 15.4	Oppose	The submitter notes that there needs to be a more flexible approach to subdivision lot sizes within the structure plan area and seeks amendment of table 15.4.	Amend table 15.4 to (or similar intent): <i><u>In addition to rule 15.8.16(b)(i), the average lot size within Structure Plan 07A area shall be 600m² with a minimum lot area of 450m².</u></i>
05/11	05/11.09	Waitarere Sands Limited	Structure Plan	Rule 15.8.16 Integrated Residential Development	Oppose	The submitter has undertaken a full analysis of its holdings and does not support the Council's layout approach to east – west connections through its lands.	Amend the structure plan to reflect the Submitters detailed plan for it's land holding (or similar intent).
05/11	05/11.10	Waitarere Sands Limited	Planning Maps	Planning Maps – Waitarere Beach	Oppose	The Submitter has undertaken a full analysis of its holdings and does not support the Council's layout approach to east – west connections through its lands.	Amend the maps to incorporate WSL plans in the Structure Plan and Master Plan (refer to appendix 1 and appendix 2).
05/11	05/11.11	Waitarere Sands Limited	Master Plan and Section 32 Analysis	Master Plan and Section 32 Analysis	Oppose	The submitter has consistently outlined to Council that its master plan is not practical and will not achieve the objective to provide for development in Waitarere Beach. The Master Plan should be amended in accordance with the Submitters submission on the Master Plan (see attached).	Amend the maps to incorporate WSL plans in the Structure Plan and Master Plan (refer to appendix 1 and appendix 2).
05/12	05/12.01	Director-General of Conservation	Indigenous Biodiversity	Policy 6.3.30A	Oppose in part	The submitter notes that the PPC5 and associated reports fail to adequately identify and address the environmental and cultural values of Wairarawa	That the integrity of Wairarawa Lagoon biodiversity site on Lot 1 DP 424782 is protected, maintained and enhanced

Submission Number	Submission Point	Submitter Name	Issue	Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
						Lagoon or any other ecological features in the area, noting that very little consideration has been given to the adverse effects on natural environmental values within the s32 report. As a result, the submitter infers that in the absence of an ecological assessment to support PPC5, the NPSFM has not been considered or assessed.	as a natural habitat and is not used as a stormwater mitigation measure of any development. Insert the following or words to the like effect: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Maintains important cultural and archaeological sites, including sites of significance to mana whenua such as <u>Wairarawa Lagoon</u>.</i> • <i>Protects and restores ecological features within the area, including naturalisation of the Wairarawa Stream and the Wairarawa Lagoon water body and other water bodies.</i>
05/12	05/12.02	Director-General of Conservation	Maps	Planning Map 4, 17, 19 & 20	Oppose in part	The submitter notes that PPC5 identifies Lot 1 DP424782 as having a current zoning of Greenbelt Residential which they believe does not appear to correlate with the mapping for Wairarawa Lagoon area to be rezoned to Open Space.	Amend the references and mapping rezoning Lot 1 DP424782 Wairarawa Lagoon to Open Space so that they correlate.
05/12	05/12.03	Director-General of Conservation	Open Space Zone		Oppose in part	The submitter notes that the Wairarawa Lagoon contains	Amend Plan Change 5:

Submission Number	Submission Point	Submitter Name	Issue	Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
						<p>significant vegetation and / or habitats. The One Plan provisions require that such habitat is recognised, protected and enhanced. The submitter is concerned that PPC5 does not give effect to the associated One Plan provisions, in particular, Plan Change 5 does not appear to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • recognise the biological significance of Wairarawa Lagoon; • provide for appropriate management of the Wairarawa Lagoon. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maps to identify that Wairarawa Lagoon is a significant natural area; and • To identify whether Wairarawa is a lagoon or wetland; and • To align Wairarawa with the provisions of Chapter 3 Natural Features and Values rather than Chapter 4 Open Space and Access to Water Bodies, in order to protect its values and extent (Subpart 3.22 NPSFM).
05/13	05/13.01	Forest & Bird	General		Oppose	The submitter considers the proposed plan change to be inappropriate for the site given the ecological, natural character and landscape values that would be affected by development enabled by the proposed plan change and structure plan in PC5.	Plan Change 5 be withdrawn
05/13	05/13.02	Forest & Bird	Ecological and Natural values		Oppose	The submitter recognises that the function for maintenance of indigenous biodiversity sits with Horizons Regional Council rather than Horowhenua District Council (the Council). However, this does not remove	Plan Change 5 be withdrawn

Submission Number	Submission Point	Submitter Name	Issue	Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
						the Council's responsibilities to protect matters of national importance in s6(c) of the RMA when carrying out its functions under s31. The submitter considers that the s32 assessment lacks consideration of the ecological values of the identified waterbodies that may be adversely affected.	
05/13	05/13.03	Forest & Bird	Ecological and Natural values		Oppose	The submitter raises concerns that no ecological assessment has been undertaken for the site, and it considers an assessment must be undertaken before the plan change can legitimately proceed. The submitter considers it unacceptable of the Council to consider proceeding with rezoning for any residential purposes until all the ecological and natural character feature and landscape values of the site have been assessed.	Plan Change 5 be withdrawn
05/13	05/13.04	Forest & Bird	Ecological and Natural values		Oppose	The submitter is similarly concerned that Council considers it appropriate to notify a plan change in such a sensitive coastal environment when it has failed to undertake basic surveys of fauna such as birds and lizards.	Plan Change 5 be withdrawn

Submission Number	Submission Point	Submitter Name	Issue	Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
05/13	05/13.05	Forest & Bird	Ecological and Natural values		Oppose	The submitter notes that the Wairarawa Lagoon is a Schedule F wetland in the One Plan and thus triggers the NPS-FM. The submission raises concerns that in the absence of any comprehensive ecological assessment, it is not convinced that the proposed Open Space Zone is in any way big enough to protect Te Mana o te Wai and the biodiversity values of the site. Although not specifically identified in the submission as a decision sought, the submitter requests an ecological assessment of Wairarawa Lagoon and a management plan for restoration of the lagoon before this plan change is to proceed any further. Once that information has been considered a "natural open space" zoning may be more appropriate.	Plan Change 5 be withdrawn
05/13	05/13.06	Forest & Bird	Ecological and Natural values		Oppose	The submitter considers PC5 does not give enough certainty of protection and maintenance of indigenous vegetation, habitats, biodiversity, waterbodies, natural character and sites of ecological value across the proposed Waitārere Beach growth area. The plan	Plan Change 5 be withdrawn

Submission Number	Submission Point	Submitter Name	Issue	Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
						change prioritises the use of the NPS-UD but completely fails to give effect to the NPS-FM, or consider the implications in terms of the NES for Freshwater and of the upcoming NPS-IB to be gazetted this year. The plan change ignores the Council's responsibilities under s6(c) of the RMA. The seeks provisions be significantly amended to ensure that the natural values of the site will actually be protected and to ensure consistency with the One Plan.	
05/13	05/13.07	Forest & Bird	Coastal Environment		Oppose	The submitter considers that due to the location of the plan change site near the coast and prominences of sand dunes and coastal vegetation, a reassessment of the extent of the coastal environment in the areas needs to be undertaken	Plan Change 5 be withdrawn
05/13	05/13.08	Forest & Bird	Coastal Environment		Oppose	The submitter considers that the proposed subdivision development and Structure Plan is not consistent with the Horizons provisions for activities within the coastal environment under Policy 6-9 of the Horizon's One Plan. The submission considers there is no functional need for this	Plan Change 5 be withdrawn

Submission Number	Submission Point	Submitter Name	Issue	Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
						subdivision development to be located in or near the coastal environment, and irrespective of functional need, that there are reasonably practical alternatives, including much lower levels of development at Waitāreere and providing for urban development closer to Levin.	
05/13	05/13.09	Forest & Bird	Climate Change		Oppose	The submitter is concerned that the proposed development will increase reliance on private motor vehicles and therefore will fail to reduce carbon emissions or provide efficient transportation alternatives and will contribute to climate change. The economic viability and demand for development at Waitāreere is questionable based on past rates for residential development, the low percentage of permanent residence and the travel distance to likely workplaces.	Plan Change 5 be withdrawn
05/13	05/13.10	Forest & Bird	Plan Change Provisions		Support in part	The submitter indicates that they would support some of the policy wording, however suggest that the wording to provide for ecological values will have limited impact as they will be considered only in accordance with the Structure	Plan Change 5 be withdrawn

Submission Number	Submission Point	Submitter Name	Issue	Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
						Plan. Using Policy 6.3.30A as an example, observe that development proposed as shown on Structure Plan 07A would be contrary to Policy 6.3.30A.	
05/13	05/13.11	Forest & Bird	Open Space Zone		Oppose	The submission states there needs to be clear direction in the plan change to ensure any subdivision is located and designed to achieve protection of the natural features and ecological values of the site. The submitter requests inclusion of reserve areas running west to east to preserve the distinctive landforms and ensure their enduring ecological connectivity with the wider coastal environment. This should be a natural open-space zone within which features and values are to be protected.	Plan Change 5 be withdrawn
05/13	05/13.12	Forest & Bird	Zoning			The submitter prefers the separation of all areas with distinctive features and ecological values from residential zoning and proposed subdivision, and where there is any inclusion of such areas within private property they should be zoned as natural open space to	Plan Change 5 be withdrawn

Submission Number	Submission Point	Submitter Name	Issue	Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
						recognise the values within them and manage land use activities accordingly.	
05/13	05/13.13	Forest & Bird	Subdivision		Oppose	The submitter opposes subdivision within Structure Plan 07A being a controlled activity. This would mean consent applications could not be declined on the basis of adverse ecological effects. The plan change needs to be directive to give certainty of constraints when applying for consent to subdivide. Similarly, there should be notification where adverse effects are more than minor.	Plan Change 5 be withdrawn
05/13	05/13.14	Forest & Bird	Policies		Oppose	The submitter considers that the policy direction is inadequate as remnant indigenous vegetation and the habitat of indigenous species cannot be protected on the scale of subdivision enabled because landowners will expect to develop the land on their sites, establish fences and include various hard surface areas. This will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity and create significant ecological disconnection for any remaining vegetation and habitats.	Plan Change 5 be withdrawn

Submission Number	Submission Point	Submitter Name	Issue	Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
05/13	05/13.15	Forest & Bird	Open Space Zone		Oppose	The submitter seeks clarity regarding the proposed ownership of the land to be rezoned Open Space. The submitter considers it inappropriate to have Wairarawa Lagoon and associated open space zone to carved up into separate titles under private ownership. The submitter notes that fragmentation by subdivision/ ownership will mean that protection of ecological values will become complex and difficult to attain. The submitter urges that sites of ecological significance should be kept as whole titles, and transferred to Council ownership to enable access for the enjoyment of everyone. Covenants, reserve status or similar should be explored to protect the areas in perpetuity. A Natural Open Space would be considered more appropriate.	Plan Change 5 be withdrawn
05/13	05/13.16	Forest & Bird	Stormwater	Rule 15.7.5(b)	Oppose	The submitter notes that the proposed infrastructure for stormwater control is for paved streets via the existing stormwater facility which discharges directly into the sea. The submitter identifies Rule 15.7.5(b) to be ambiguous,	Plan Change 5 be withdrawn

Submission Number	Submission Point	Submitter Name	Issue	Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
						requesting there to be a requirement for all properties to achieve hydraulic neutrality, and any stormwater off paved roads to enter wetlands to catch contaminants, slow the flow and prevent flooding of the Wairarawa stream.	
05/13	05/13.17	Forest & Bird	Setbacks			The submitter notes that in order for PC5 to be binding, there needs to be substantial setbacks from all sites of significance, including Wairarawa Lagoon and stream and the Schedule F stable duneland along Forest Road and that these setbacks must be planted and managed, not just left in rank grass and weeds which will suppress regeneration..	Include setbacks from all sites of significance , including Wairarawa Lagoon and stream and the Schedule F stable duneland along Forest Road and that these setbacks must be planted and managed.
05/13	05/13.18	Forest & Bird	Pest Management		Oppose	The submitter requests that an integrated pest management plan be adopted and implemented to contribute to the protection of the significant ecological values, and contribute to New Zealand's goal to be predator free by 2050. This would need legal arrangements around it to ensure it continued in perpetuity.	Plan Change 5 be withdrawn

Submission Number	Submission Point	Submitter Name	Issue	Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
05/13	05/13.19	Forest & Bird	Policies	All policies	Oppose	The submitter notes that the proposed policies lack alignment with the requirements of the RPS or the purpose of the RMA. The submitter suggests that terminology such as “Maintain and align” is uncertain in terms of protecting the ecological values associated with natural dune formations. The term align is also subjective and detracts from the policy. In addition, the term “responds to” in Policy 6.3.30A is uncertain and does not ensure the protection of such landforms and features. The submitter also notes that it is unclear what “significant landforms” is intended to capture beyond the already specified Otororoa Ridge.	That all the provisions in this plan change be rewritten to eliminate uncertain terms.
05/13	05/13.20	Forest & Bird	Rules	Rules	Oppose	The submitter opposes all rules that are permitted, controlled or restricted discretionary as they could not be declined even if there were significant adverse effects. The submitter also notes that the conditions proposed are inadequate for the protection and maintenance of indigenous biodiversity and for the coastal environment.	Delete all rules and amendments to rules that are lower than a Non-complying activity.

Submission Number	Submission Point	Submitter Name	Issue	Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
						The submitter observes that the assessment criteria, matters for control and discretion are inadequate to indigenous biodiversity and the coastal environment matters, in addition to not giving effect to the RPS or achieve the purpose of the Act.	
05/13	05/13.21	Forest & Bird	Structure Plan	Structure Plan		<p>Linked to all other submission points raised, the submitter opposes the proposal. The submitter notes that the structure plans would result in the loss of indigenous biodiversity and natural values, including sand dunes. The submitter observes that neither these plans nor the rules give effect to the RPS or achieve the purpose of the Act.</p>	<p>Seek all Structure Plans associated with this plan change be withdrawn. Alternatively, significant amendments are required to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce the level and areas of development; • Identify natural sand dune areas to the south of Waitārere Beach Rd that are to be protected, i.e. through scenic reserve status; and • by amended to areas identified for development or infrastructure as indicative until an ecological assessment has been undertaken to ensure the Structure Plan is appropriate according to the

Submission Number	Submission Point	Submitter Name	Issue	Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
							ecological constraints of the site.
05/13	05/13.22	Forest & Bird	General		Oppose	While the submitter generally supports the focusing of new development around areas of existing development rather than ad-hoc and disparate subdivision, it does not support this development as proposed. The justification for this development fails to recognise increasing impacts from cumulative development and disregards any site specific ecological values in favour of further development. The submitter suggests that capacity calculations have not taken into account of ecological constraints and cannot be used to override Council's responsibilities under the RMA.	Plan Change 5 be withdrawn
05/14	05/14.01	FRP Investments Limited and FRP Agriculture Limited (FRP)	General		Oppose	The submitter notes their general support for PC5 but opposes specific aspects of PC5, and unless those specific aspects are satisfactorily resolved, the submitter reserves their position that PC should be declined.	Unless specific aspects are satisfactorily resolved through the submission and hearing process, the submitter reserves their position that PC should be declined.
05/14	05/14.02	FRP Investments Limited and FRP Agriculture Limited (FRP)	Notification		Oppose	The submitter advises that they were not directly notified of the proposed plan change and are directly affected.	Seeks deletions and amendment to PC5 inclusive of any consequential

Submission Number	Submission Point	Submitter Name	Issue	Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
							amendment to the district plan text, definition, and maps as canvassed throughout this submission. Unless the matters are satisfactorily resolved, PC5 should be declined.
05/14	05/14.03	FRP Investments Limited and FRP Agriculture Limited (FRP)	Notification		Oppose	The submitter raises numerous notification concerns and queries. The submitter considers that the notified information included on Council's website links Appendix 1 and Appendix 2 presents differing summary information to the public at the time of notification. The submitter considers that documents (b), (d) and (h) listed under section 4.5 (page 25) of the s32 report were not part of the notified documents. Linked to document (h), the submitter identifies that two documents were not notified. Further, a summary document was added to the Council website at some stage during the notification period.	Seeks deletions and amendment to PC5 inclusive of any consequential amendment to the district plan text, definition, and maps as canvassed throughout this submission. Unless the matters are satisfactorily resolved, PC5 should be declined.
05/14	05/14.04	FRP Investments Limited and FRP Agriculture Limited (FRP)	Section 32 evidence		Oppose	The submitter notes that Appendix 6 of the s32 report contains part of the Tonkin Taylor report and not the full	Seeks deletions and amendment to PC5 inclusive of any consequential

Submission Number	Submission Point	Submitter Name	Issue	Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
						report which the submitter should receive.	amendment to the district plan text, definition, and maps as canvassed throughout this submission. Unless the matters are satisfactorily resolved, PC5 should be declined.
05/14	05/14.05	FRP Investments Limited and FRP Agriculture Limited (FRP)	Greenbelt Residential Zone		Not specified	The submitter owns the land north of Palmer Road at Foxton Beach described as Lot 1 DP 77109 and notes that this land is subject to an Environment Court Consent Order dated 14 th of March 2013 and observes that this is generally translated into the Operative District Plan. They note that the land is within the Greenbelt Residential Zone, and on that basis, the submitter considers their land to be subject to the PC5 proposed text amendments to Section 6 of the plan because the proposed wording of PC5 affects all Greenbelt Residential (including Greenbelt Residential (Foxton Beach North Overlay)).	Seeks deletions and amendment to PC5 inclusive of any consequential amendment to the district plan text, definition, and maps as canvassed throughout this submission. Unless the matters are satisfactorily resolved, PC5 should be declined.
05/14	05/14.06	FRP Investments Limited and FRP Agriculture Limited (FRP)	Horowhenua Growth Strategy 2040		Supports in part	The submitter raised numerous concerns regarding the Horowhenua Growth Strategy 2040, its relationship to other strategies and the district plan,	Seeks deletions and amendment to PC5 inclusive of any consequential amendment to the district

Submission Number	Submission Point	Submitter Name	Issue	Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
						how it is applied to the submitters land, the lack of review of the strategy and discrepancies that are not analysed in the PC5 s32 report. The submitter opposes the imbedding of the Horowhenua Growth Strategy 2040 inclusion in the Horowhenua District Plan and/or being incorporated in the plan by reference in PC5 in any form.	plan text, definition, and maps as canvassed throughout this submission. Unless the matters are satisfactorily resolved, PC5 should be declined.
05/14	05/14.07	FRP Investments Limited and FRP Agriculture Limited (FRP)	Horowhenua Growth Strategy 2040		Opposes	The submitter considers the Horowhenua Growth Strategy 2040 to be in incorrect in respect to Foxton Beach and the yield from the Greenbelt Residential (Foxton Beach North Overlay) Zone that exists within the plan.	Seeks deletions and amendment to PC5 inclusive of any consequential amendment to the district plan text, definition, and maps as canvassed throughout this submission. Unless the matters are satisfactorily resolved, PC5 should be declined.
05/14	05/14.08	FRP Investments Limited and FRP Agriculture Limited (FRP)	Section 6		Opposes	The submitter opposes wording in Section 6 of the plan (in the text of PC5) in relation to the “Horowhenua Growth Strategy 2040) and supports revised text (subject to final rewording).	Amend text to the effect that: <u>Council requires PC5 to give effect to the National Policy Statement Urban Development 2020 or ubsequent NPS issued under section 52(2) of the RMA1991 during the life of the plan.</u>

Submission Number	Submission Point	Submitter Name	Issue	Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
05/14	05/14.09	FRP Investments Limited and FRP Agriculture Limited (FRP)	Section 6		Opposes	The submitter opposes the inclusion of the pre-emption in Chapter 6 of the <i>“preparation of masterplans for the Foxtan Beach...and Tara-Ika areas and associated changes to the District Plan.”</i> And other consequential amendments being introduced into the plan through PC5 and amendments to the plan text at Policy 6.3.30A, Rule 15.7.5(a), 6.1.3 Rules amendment at 15.4(b), and amendments to rules that relate to fencing and landscaping.	Remove the inclusion of the pre-emption in Chapter 6 of the <i>“preparation of masterplans for the Foxtan Beach...and Tara-Ika areas and associated changes to the District Plan.”</i>
05/14	05/14.10	FRP Investments Limited and FRP Agriculture Limited (FRP)	National Planning Standards		Supports	The submitter generally supports the inclusion of the National Planning Standards implementation in PC5. The submitter appreciates the complexities for staged implementation but that aspects of the standards can be added into PC5 because they are mandatory.	Seeks deletions and amendment to PC5 inclusive of any consequential amendment to the district plan text, definition, and maps as canvassed throughout this submission. Unless the matters are satisfactorily resolved, PC5 should be declined.
05/14	05/14.11	FRP Investments Limited and FRP Agriculture Limited (FRP)	Zoning		Supports	The submitter supports the land subject to PC5 being zoned large lot residential zone (LLRZ) and medium density residential zone (MDRZ) and future urban zone (FUZ) and updated	Seeks deletions and amendment to PC5 inclusive of any consequential amendment to the district plan text, definition, and

Submission Number	Submission Point	Submitter Name	Issue	Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
						definitions consistent with the mandatory National Planning Standards 2019.	maps as canvassed throughout this submission. Unless the matters are satisfactorily resolved, PC5 should be declined.
05/14	05/14.12	FRP Investments Limited and FRP Agriculture Limited (FRP)	Flood modelling		Support in part	The submitter considers the adaptation of the NZVD2016 to be relevant to PC5 Lidar base and flood modelling and liquefaction as notified and there is a vertical variance of hundreds of millimetres between the 1953 datum and NZVD2016 as this clarification of the datum is important to understand the effects of PC5. The submitter opposes the s32 reliance on the flood modelling information because the <i>Good Earth</i> information does not clarify the datum used and does not confirm alignment or otherwise with the Horizons Regional Council Flood Modelling datum or any other material relied on and therefore question the interpretation of this modelling in terms of assessment of effects within the PC5 s32 analysis. Linked to the flood modelling information, the submitter also questions the s32 reliance on the Tonkin and	Seeks deletions and amendment to PC5 inclusive of any consequential amendment to the district plan text, definition, and maps as canvassed throughout this submission. Unless the matters are satisfactorily resolved, PC5 should be declined.

Submission Number	Submission Point	Submitter Name	Issue	Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
						Taylor Liquefaction Assessment information reference to "RL's" but do not reference a datum for interpretive information to be assessed by the submitter.	
05/14	05/14.13	FRP Investments Limited and FRP Agriculture Limited (FRP)	Structure Plan	Structure Plan	Oppose	The submitter opposes the structure plan inclusion in PC5.	Seeks deletions and amendment to PC5 inclusive of any consequential amendment to the district plan text, definition, and maps as canvassed throughout this submission. Unless the matters are satisfactorily resolved, PC5 should be declined.
05/14	05/14.14	FRP Investments Limited and FRP Agriculture Limited (FRP)	Master Plan	Master Plan	Oppose	The submitter opposes the Waitarere Beach Master Plan being incorporated into the operative district plan including by reference.	Seeks deletions and amendment to PC5 inclusive of any consequential amendment to the district plan text, definition, and maps as canvassed throughout this submission. Unless the matters are satisfactorily resolved, PC5 should be declined.
05/15	05/15.01	Vivienne Bold	General		Oppose	The submitter references the lack of strategic planning that has gone into PC5. Sections within the plan change area are within close proximity to the	Requests no cheap sale of land to developers.

Submission Number	Submission Point	Submitter Name	Issue	Provision	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
						sea and spring/king tides, and are being eroded, as well as an area of toanga and an urupa.	

Further Submissions must be received by Horowhenua District Council before 4:00pm Monday 14 June 2021.