

Proposed Horowhenua District Plan

Summary of Submissions



Submissions ordered by Submitter

Publicly Notified 5 December 2012

1. INTRODUCTION

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

The Proposed District Plan was publically notified on 14 September 2012 with the period for submissions closing on 12 November 2012.

A total of 118 submissions were received in relation to the Proposed District Plan and this report provides a summary of those submissions in accordance with Clause 7 of the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).

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

- Horowhenua District Council – 126 Oxford Street, Levin
- Foxton Service Centre – Main Street, Foxton
- Shannon Service Centre – Located in the Shannon Library, Plimmer Terrace, Shannon
- Levin Library – 10 Bath Street, Levin
- Foxton Library - 5 Clyde Street, Foxton
- Tokomaru Store – Tokomaru Road, Tokomaru

These documents can also be viewed and downloaded from the Council website www.horowhenua.govt.nz.

2. FURTHER SUBMISSIONS

Further submissions must be in accordance with Clause 8 of the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act and may only support or oppose those submissions already made. In supporting or opposing a submission, a Further Submission may provide reasons for supporting or opposing, however only issues that are related to those that have already been identified in a submission may be raised. The following persons may make a further submission in support of, or in opposition to any of the submissions already received:

- Any person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest; and
- Any person that has an interest in the plan greater than the interest that the general public has.

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

Council is adhering to the prescribed statutory timeframe set out in the Resource Management Act of 10 working days for the lodgement of further submissions.

Further Submissions can be made in writing and will need to be received by the Horowhenua District Council before **5.00pm on Thursday 20 December 2012**.

Further Submissions can be:

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

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

Faxed to: (06) 366 0983

Emailed to: districtplan@horowhenua.govt.nz

Any person making a Further Submission on the Proposed District Plan is required by law to provide a copy of their further submission to the person who made the original submission to which the Further Submission relates within five (5) working days of serving the Further Submission to the Horowhenua District Council.

Section 4 of this report provides the address for service for each person or organisation that has made a submission on the Proposed District Plan.

3. PROCESS FROM HERE

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

Once the Further Submission period has closed (20 December 2012), a Planning Report identifying and summarising all submissions will be produced. This Planning Report will provide an impartial assessment of the merits of the Submissions, including whether the issues are valid

under the relevant legislation. The Planning Report may also contain any recommended amendment to the Proposed District Plan to address matters raised by submitters.

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

The Planning Report will be circulated to all submitters and further submitters in advance of the formal Council hearing. At least 10 working days notice will be given of the hearing date. Anyone can attend the Council hearing, however only those submitters who have indicated that they wish to be heard will have the opportunity to speak about the matters raised in their submission at the hearing, or they can nominate a representative or consultant to speak on their behalf.

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

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

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

4. SUBMITTERS

The following table provides the names and addresses for service of all those who made a submission in relation to the Proposed District Plan. The purpose of this table is to enable any person who makes a Further Submission on the Proposed District Plan to meet the requirements of the law and send a copy of their Further Submission to the person who made the original submission that they have made a Further Submission on. This needs to be done within five (5) working days of submitting their Further Submission to the Horowhenua District Council. Please note several submitters have made multiple submissions, each submissions has been given a unique number. A submitter index which organises submitters alphabetically has also been provided at the end of this document to help readers navigate the document.

Submission Number	Submitter	Address for Service	Wish to be Heard
001	William Scotson & Maria McKay	PO Box 1158 Levin 5540	Yes
002	Homestead Homes Ltd C/-Daniel Lawry	76 Main Road South Levin 5510	Yes
003	Matthew Thredgold	83 Wallace Loop Road RD1 Levin 5571	Yes
004	Malcolm Guy	PO Box 4646 Palmerston North 4442	Yes
005	Elaine Gradock	4 Ross Street Levin 5510	No
006	Heather Benning	28 Durham Street Levin 5510	No
007	Heirs Partnership	756 Foxton Road RD12 Levin 5572	Yes

Submission Number	Submitter	Address for Service	Wish to be Heard
008	Graham & Sonia Broughton	130 Mansfield Street Thornbury Victoria Australia 3071	No
009	Lynn & Anthony Straugheir	6 Hawick Street Karori Wellington 6012	Yes
010	Anne Hunt	17 Nash Parade Foxton Beach 4815	Yes
011	Philip Taueki	PO Box 664 Levin 5540	Yes
012	Daina Parlovskis	175 Kahukura Avenue Waitarere Beach 5510	No
013	John Hammond	32 Tame Porati Street RD31 Levin 5573	No
014	Kornelius du Plessis	6 Conifer Court Raumati Beach 5032	No
015	Charles Wallis	1125A High Street Taita Lower Hutt 5011	Yes
016	Robert White	50 Salisbury Street Levin 5510	No
017	Penelope Brown	29 Keepa Street Levin 5510	No
018	Paul Pearce	157 Mako Mako Road Levin 5510	No
019	Grant & Anne Searle	PO Box 20009 Summerhill Palmerston North 4448	No
020	Robert Kel	481 Arapaepae Road Levin 5570	No

Submission Number	Submitter	Address for Service	Wish to be Heard
021	Errol Skelton	177 Mako Mako Road Levin 5510	No
022	Kevin Macmillan	170 Mako Mako Road Levin 5510	No
023	Cheryl Mangin	172 Park Avenue Waitarere Beach 5510	No
024	Peter & Vivien Wright	673 Waitarere Beach Road Waitarere Beach 5510	No
025	Michael White	141 Oturoa Road RD12 Levin 5572	Yes
026	Horowhenua Astronomical Society Inc	C/-Allen Little 7 Earl Street Levin 5510	Yes
027	Horizons Regional Council	C/-Ian Lowe Private Bag 11025 Palmerston North 4442	Yes
028	Peter & Vivien Wright	673 Waitarere Beach Road Waitarere Beach 5510	No
029	Allen Little	7 Earl Street Levin 5510	Yes
030	Peter Everton	PO Box 1012 Levin 5540	Yes
031	The Surveying Company (Wellington) Limited	C/-Robyne Leach 243 Main Street Upper Hutt 5018	No
032	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	C/-Jaye Hill Massey University (IFNHGH) Private Bag 11222 Palmerston North 4442	Yes

Submission Number	Submitter	Address for Service	Wish to be Heard
033	Levin Golf Club	C/-Harold Thompson 18 Easton Way Levin 5510	Yes
034	Foxton Historical Society	C/-Anthony Hunt 5 Ravensworth Place Foxton 4814	Yes
035	Anthony Hunt	5 Ravensworth Place Foxton 4814	Yes
036	Trucis InvestmentsLtd	PO Box 3820 Wellington 6140	No
037	Homestead Group Limited	C/-Bryce Holmes 20 Addington Road RD 1 Otaki 5581	Yes
038	Range View Limited & M J Page	C/-Bryce Holmes 20 Addington Road RD 1 Otaki 5581	Yes
039	Viv Bold	418 Hokio Beach Road RD 1 Levin 5571	Yes
040	House Movers Section of New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc	C/- Stuart Ryan PO Box 1296 Shortland Street Auckland 1140	Yes
041	Powerco	C/-Georgina McPherson Burton Planning Consultants Limited PO Box 33-817 Takapuna Auckland 0740	Yes

Submission Number	Submitter	Address for Service	Wish to be Heard
042	Vector Gas Ltd	C/-Darryl McMillan Land Management Private Bag 2020 New Plymouth 4342	Yes
043	Franklyn Leong & Heather Brown	48 Bristol Street Levin 5510	Yes
044	Genesis Power Ltd	C/-Kellie Roland Genesis Power Limited PO Box 10568 Wellington	Yes
045	Landlink Ltd	C/-Ben Addington PO Box 370 Waikanae 5250	No
046	Vincero Holdings Ltd	C/-Bryce Holmes 20 Addington Road RD 1 Otaki 5581	Yes
047	Palmerston North City Council	C/-Cynthia Ward Private Bag 11034 Palmerston North 4442	No
048	Carolyn Dawson	57 Wylie Road RD 11 Foxton 4819	No
049	Alan & Marie Blundell	50 Reay Mackay Grove RD 31 Waikawa Beach 5573	Yes
050	Rayonier New Zealand Ltd C/-Kelvin Meredith	PO Box 13285 Tauranga 3141	Yes
051	Waitarere Progressive & Ratepayers Association	C/-The Secretary 53 Rua Ave Waitarere Beach Levin 5500	Yes

Submission Number	Submitter	Address for Service	Wish to be Heard
052	Rosemarie Saunders	57 Toomba Avenue Ashgrove Queensland Australia 4060	No
053	Peter McMenamin & Helen Fitzgerald	302/19 College Street Wellington 6011	No
054	Warwick Meyer	44 Western Rise RD 20 Ohau Levin 5570	Yes
055	KiwiRail	C/-Pam Butler PO Box 593 Wellington 6140	Yes
056	Rod Halliday	PO Box 13-099 Johnsonville Wellington 6440	Yes
057	Friends of Strathnaver C/-Alan Blundell	PO Box 136 Levin 5540	Yes
058	JS & MJ Campbell	PO Box 136 Levin 5540	Yes
059	Peter & Susan Webb	6B/186 The Terrace Wellington 6011	No
060	Muaupoko Co-operative Society C/-Vivian Taueki	24 Painua Road RD 1 Levin 5571	Yes
061	Richard Tingey	56 Kings Drive Levin 5510	Yes
062	Kathleen Bills	258 Makerua Road RD 4 Palmerston North 4474	Yes
063	Taupunga Farming Company C/-Kathleen Bills	258 Makerua Road RD 4 Palmerston North 4474	Yes

Submission Number	Submitter	Address for Service	Wish to be Heard
064	Derek Watt	150 Hill Road Belmont Lower Hutt 5010	No
065	Horowhenua Farmers' Ratepayer Group C/- Christine Mitchell	297 Potts Road RD 1 Levin 5571	Yes
066	Bruce & Christine Mitchell	297 Potts Road RD 1 Levin 5571	Yes
067	Taiao Raukawa Environmental Resource Unit	C/-Dr Huhana Smith 658 State Highway 1 RD 20 Kuku 5570	Yes
068	Te Taitoa Maori o Te Awahou	C/- Hayley Bell 17 Mark Perreau Place Foxton 4814	No
069	Michele Walls-Bennett & Steven Bailey	PO Box 23073 Wellington 6011	No
070	Future Map Limited, Future Map (No2) Ltd and Future Map (No 3) Ltd	C/-David Harford Urbis Ashburton 2012 Limited PO Box 603 Ashburton 7700	Yes
071	Progressive Enterprises Limited	C/-Mike Foster PO Box 103 Whangaparaoa 0932	Yes

Submission Number	Submitter	Address for Service	Wish to be Heard
072	Poultry Industry Association of New Zealand (PIANZ) & Egg Producers Federation of New Zealand (EPFNZ)	C/-Scott Williams Harrison Grierson Consultants Limited PO Box 5760 Wellesley Street Auckland 1141	Yes
073	McDonald's Restaurants (New Zealand) Ltd	C/-Matt Norwell Barker & Associates Limited PO Box 1986 Shortland Street Auckland 1140	Yes
074	Ernslaw One Limited	C/-Richard Heikell PO Box 2042 Gisbourne 4040	Not specified
075	Stuart & Jean Marshall	109 Grace Road Tauranga 3112	Yes
076	Ann Percy	150 Hill Road Belmont Lower Hutt 5010	No
077	Higgins Group Holdings Ltd	C/-Cobus van Vuuren Private Bag 11411, Palmerston North 4442	Yes
078	Telecom New Zealand Ltd	C/-Mary Barton Chorus New Zealand Limited PO Box 632 Wellington 6140	Yes
079	Chorus New Zealand Ltd	C/-Mary Barton PO Box 632 Wellington 6140	Yes

Submission Number	Submitter	Address for Service	Wish to be Heard
080	Todd Energy Ltd	C/-Ann Nicholas Sigma Consultants Limited PO Box 553 Rotorua 3040	Yes
081	Philip Lake	104 Union Street Foxton 4814	No
082	Kevin Doncliff	179 Strathnaver Drive RD 31 Levin 5573	Yes
083	Ross & Margaret Hood	690 State Highway 57 RD 1 Levin 5571	Yes
084	Graeme & Joan Petersen	34 Harbour Street Foxton 4814	Not specified
085	Warren Millar	104 Main Street Foxton 4814	Yes
086	Ivan Chambers	69 Main Street Foxton 4814	No
087	Robin Hapi	112 Union Street Foxton 4814	Yes
088	Gail Chambers	69 Main Street Foxton 4814	No
089	Beverly Fowler	67 Main Street Foxton 4814	No
090	Foxton Community Board	70 Main Street Foxton 4814	No
091	Horowhenua District Council (Community Assets Department)	C/-Warwick Meyer Private Bag 4002 Levin 5540	Yes
092	KCE Mangahao Ltd	C/-Ann Nicholas Sigma Consultants Limited PO Box 553 Rotorua 3040	Yes

Submission Number	Submitter	Address for Service	Wish to be Heard
093	The Oil Companies	C/-Georgina McPherson Burton Planning Consultants Limited PO Box 33-817 Takapuna Auckland 0740	Yes
094	NZ Transport Agency	C/-Cole O'Keefe PO Box 1947 Palmerston North 4440	Yes
095	New Zealand Defence Force	C/-Rob Owen Private Bag 902 Upper Hutt 5140	Yes
096	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	C/-Rhea Dasent PO Box 715 Wellington 6140	Yes
097	Lowe Corporation Ltd & Colyer Mair Assets Ltd	C/- Philip Hocquard 499 Coventry Road Hastings 4172	Not specified
098	Horticulture New Zealand	C/-Chris Keenan PO Box 10-232 Wellington 6143	Yes
099	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	C/-Hywel Edwards Beca 85 Molesworth Street PO Box 3942 Wellington 6140	Yes
100	New Zealand Wind Energy Association ('NZWEA')	C/-Ben Farrell PO Box 553 Wellington 6140	Yes

Submission Number	Submitter	Address for Service	Wish to be Heard
101	Director-General of Conservation	Department of Conservation Wellington Hawkes Bay Conservancy PO Box 5086 Wellington 6145	Yes
102	Christina Paton	6 Warren Street Foxton Beach 4815	Yes
103	Colin Easton	PO Box 127 Foxton 4848	Yes
104	Bill Huzziff	Baker Street RD 11 Foxton 4891	Yes
105	Bill Huzziff	Baker Street RD 11 Foxton 4891	Yes
106	Rosalie Huzziff	Baker Street RD 11 Foxton 4891	Yes
107	Rosalie Huzziff	Baker Street RD 11 Foxton 4891	Yes
108	Horowhenua District Council (Planning Department)	C/-David McCorkindale Private Bag 4002 Levin 5540	Yes
109	Charles Rudd (Snr)	Postal Counter Levin 5510	Yes
110	W Fraser	72 Salisbury Street Levin 5510	Yes
111	Mark Dunn	14 Manchester Street Levin 5510	Yes
112	Shannon Progressive Association	C/-Ross Campbell 44 Margaret Street Shannon 4821	Yes

Submission Number	Submitter	Address for Service	Wish to be Heard
113	Ron & Betty Zanobergen	59A Reay MacKay Grove RD 1 Waikawa Beach Levin 5571	Yes
114	Gary Spelman	42 Salisbury Street Levin 5510	Yes
115	Alan McKenna	80 Main Road South Levin 5510	Yes
116	Truebridge Associates Limited	522 Queen Street Levin 5510	Yes
117	New Zealand Historic Places Trust	C/-Sonia Dolan PO Box 2629 Wellington 6140	Yes
118	Peter & Susan Webb	6B/186 The Terrace, Wellington 6011	No

5. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

The Council Planning Officers are able to provide additional information on making a Further Submission or the proposed District Plan process. Additional information including the proposed District Plan documents, are available from the Council website www.horowhenua.govt.nz.

6. SUMMARY OF DECISIONS REQUESTED

Each decision requested as set out in this summary endeavours to identify the individual outcomes sought in the submission. This is to enable people to quickly establish whether a submission might be of interest to them. It is not a substitute for inspecting the submission itself where the matter may be of interest. Please note the table contains a summary of the submissions. The onus is on the reader to check the full submission for the exact wording used and relief requested by the submitter.

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

Each submission has a unique number, the first three numbers identify who the submission was made by (e.g. 001 = Submitter 1). Each submission point is identified by two numbers which appear after the decimal place.

Submission 001.07

001 Is the submitter/submission number

.07 is the submission point number

Any Further Submission made must specify the number of the original submission that the Further Submission relates to. The unique submission number is also used to cross reference the address for service for all of the submitters contained in the following table. Note that in some submissions the submission point numbers are not consecutive. This only occurs in a few submissions and is due to amendments made to the submission summary table when it was being audited.

The submissions below have been organised and presented in numerical order. An alternative document is available which contains the submissions organised according to the topic or plan provision submitted on.

Where it has been specified or is clear that the submission is either in 'support' or 'opposition', to the proposed District Plan this has been included in the table below. The term 'In-Part' has generally been used for those submissions that are supporting or opposing part of the Plan or a Plan provision while seeking amendments. It has also been used for those submissions that might be neutral on the Plan or a particular matter.

Where specific wording changes have been requested to the Plan by submitters these have been shown in Summary Table in the following ways:

Underlined text = New text to be included in the Plan

~~Strikethrough text~~ = Text in the Proposed Plan to be deleted.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS : PROPOSED HOROWHENUA DISTRICT PLAN

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
1.00	William Scotson & Maria McKay	S3-NT New Tree	In-Part	The submitters seek to have a Podocarpus Totara tree located on their property at 61 Kuku East Road, Levin added to the Schedule of Notable Trees.	Include the Podocarpus Totara at 61 Kuku East Road, Levin as a Notable Tree with Schedule 3.
2.00	Homestead Concrete Homes Ltd	Planning Map 29	Support	Support the proposed rezoning of 70-90 Main Road South, Levin from Rural to Industrial to match the former and current land use of these sites.	Retain proposed rezoning of 70-90 Main Road South, Levin from Rural to Industrial on Planning Map 29.
3.00	Matthew Thredgold	General Matters 3 – Air Quality	In-Part	Open air burning of rubbish and wood causes smoke and odour nuisances beyond property boundaries. Regional Council rules are ineffective and offer no protection from intermittent but serious air pollution. The Rural Zone in the District Plan should therefore limit and control burning off.	Include provisions that prohibit all open air burning of rubbish and wood across the whole district.
3.01	Matthew Thredgold	15 General – Air Quality	In-Part	The Proposed Plan does not address air quality issues such as wood smoke pollution.	Include a provision that prohibits the installation of new solid fuel wood burners, solid fuel stoves and heaters and have provisions for phasing out and eventually prohibiting the use of solid fuel wood burners, solid fuel stoves and heaters in the Residential Zone.
3.02	Matthew Thredgold	17 General – Air Quality	In-Part	The Proposed Plan does not address air quality issues such as wood smoke pollution.	Include a provision that prohibits the installation of new solid fuel wood burners, solid fuel stoves and heaters and have provisions for phasing out and eventually prohibiting the use of solid fuel wood burners, solid fuel

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
					stoves and heaters in the Commercial Zone.
4.00	Malcolm Guy	General Matters 4 – Flood Hazard Area	In-Part	More information is required regarding the Flood zones [Flood Hazard Area Overlay] in the Rural Areas especially the 'boundary areas' in proposed zones.	Include more information regarding the Proposed Flood Hazard Area Overlay.
5.00	Elaine Gradock	6.3.37 Policy	In-Part	Support an identified area for larger scale retail development and ensuring activities do not retract from the heart of the Levin shopping area but also support larger scale retail development within the Levin town centre.	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Amend the identified area for larger scale retail development in Levin to include the commercial town centre.
5.01	Elaine Gradock	Planning Map Planning Map 27A, 27B, 28A and 28B	In-Part	Support an identified area for larger scale retail development but also support larger scale retail development within the Levin town centre.	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Amend the identified area for larger scale retail development in Levin to include the commercial town centre on Planning Maps 27A, 27B, 28A and 28B.
5.02	Elaine Gradock	15.6.11(a)(i) Rule	Support	Support the noise limits and introduction of a noise limit between 7.00pm - 10.00pm.	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Retain proposed Rule 15.6.11(a)(i) noise limits.
5.03	Elaine Gradock	16.6.5(a)(i) Rule	Support	Support the noise limits and introduction of a noise limit between 7.00pm - 10.00pm.	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Retain proposed Rule 16.6.5(a)(i) noise limits.
5.04	Elaine Gradock	17.6.6(a)(i) Rule	Support	Support the noise limits and introduction of a noise limit between 7.00pm - 10.00pm.	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Retain proposed Rule 17.6.6(a)(i) noise limits.
5.05	Elaine Gradock	17.6.7 Rule	Support	Support noise insulation in the Commercial Zone.	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Retain proposed Rule 17.6.7 noise insulation.
5.06	Elaine Gradock	19.6.7(a)(i) Rule	Support	Support the noise limits and introduction of a	No specific relief requested.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				noise limit between 7.00pm - 10.00pm.	Inferred: Retain proposed Rule 19.6.7(a)(i) noise limits.
5.07	Elaine Gradock	20.6.7(a)(i) Rule	Support	Support the noise limits and introduction of a noise limit between 7.00pm - 10.00pm.	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Retain proposed Rule 20.6.7(a)(i) noise limits.
5.08	Elaine Gradock	US 5 - Rates Impact	In-Part	Support Plan provided it does not result in significant rise in rates.	Rates should be kept at 5%.
6.00	Heather Benning	S1-D117	Oppose	Oppose the proposed designation D117 of Lot 5 DP 1713 at 28 Durham Street, Levin.	Delete designation D117 for the designating purpose of a carpark on Lot 5 DP 1713 at 28 Durham Street, Levin.
6.01	Heather Benning	Planning Map 27B	In-Part	The submitter seeks the rezoning of 28 Durham Street, Levin from Commercial to Residential with Medium Density Development Overlay. This zoning and overlay would be consistent with adjacent residential properties.	Amend Planning Map 27B to include 28 Durham Street, Levin within the Residential Zone and Medium Density Development Overlay.
7.00	Heirs Partnership	Planning Map 4	Oppose	Oppose the extent of the Flood Hazard Area. The area marked as susceptible to flooding at 756 Foxton Road, Levin has only been susceptible to spot ponding in low and peaty or sandy parts of the property.	Amend Planning Map 4 to remove 756 Foxton Road, Levin from the Proposed Flood Hazard Area Overlay or if Council wishes to retain it then Council needs to justify the exact behaviour.
7.01	Heirs Partnership	19.4.8 Rule	Oppose	Oppose rule which restricts buildings within the Flood Hazard Area. Unless the Flood Hazard Area boundaries are highly accurate this rule is unjustified and oppressive.	Amend Planning Maps to accurately identify perimeters of the Flood Hazard Area or confine the application of Rule 19.4.8 to areas with a known flood history or incontestable high risk.
7.02	Heirs Partnership	19.6.11 Rule	Oppose	Oppose rule which restricts earthworks within the Flood Hazard Area. Unless the Flood Hazard Area boundaries are highly accurate this rule is unjustified and oppressive. Even with a high level of accuracy there will be	Amend Planning Maps to accurately identify perimeters of the Flood Hazard Area or confine the application of Rule 19.6.11 to areas where it is known that earthworks could create significant

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				areas identified where earthworks are most unlikely to cause a problem.	flood problems.
7.03	Heirs Partnership	19.6.4 Rule	Oppose	Oppose the proposed 10m rural boundary setback for new buildings on properties larger than 5000m ² . This rule would have the undesirable effect of creating a 10m strip all around the perimeter of a property that can no longer be used to site a house. This rule would also fail to address the issue of space between houses on adjacent rural properties. The proposed rule is a blunt instrument which does not target the issue and restrict flexibility.	Amend Rule 19.6.4 to retain the essence of the current 3m setback from any other site boundary and 30m from any other existing residential dwelling on adjoining land for buildings within the Rural Zone (Rule 19.2.4 Operative District Plan) and include a process by which Council and landowners work together to prevent a situation where the 30m setback would limit building sites for landowners.
7.04	Heirs Partnership	19.6.14(b) Rule	Oppose	Oppose the proposed rule requiring a transmission line corridor. There are already government regulations in place which set out existing legal requirements on the distance of buildings and works from powerlines and towers. This rule is a blunt and oppressive instrument and is redundant.	Delete Rule 19.6.14.
8.00	Graham & Sonia Broughton	Planning Map 28A	Oppose	Oppose the rezoning of 189 Cambridge Street, Levin from Residential to Commercial. The rezoning would negatively impact on the residential feel of the street and neighbouring properties.	Amend Planning Map 28A to change the zoning of 189 Cambridge Street, Levin from proposed Commercial to Residential.
9.00	Lynn & Anthony Straugheir	19.1(a) Rule	In-Part	The submitters seek amendment to the permitted activity status of forest harvesting in the Rural Zone. Forest harvesting on the urban boundary of Waitarere Beach township has resulted in a ground water rise and flooding in heavy rain for many urban	Amend Rule 19.1(a) to control forest harvesting in the Rural Zone that is within 500m of the urban boundary of the Waitarere Beach settlement. No more than 25ha of forest should be harvested at one time within 500m of

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				properties.	the urban boundary and the next 25ha within 500m of the urban boundary should not be harvested until the newly planted section is at least five years old.
10.00	Anne Hunt	All	Oppose	Oppose the omission of liquefaction hazard areas on the Planning Maps.	Amend Planning Maps to identify liquefaction hazard areas within the district.
11.00	Philip Taueki	1 General Matters	Oppose	This section of the Proposed Plan fails demonstrably to address matters of importance to Tangata Whenua in Horowhenua by assuming that an Iwi Authority has the mana to speak on behalf of Tangata Whenua.	No specific relief requested.
11.01	Philip Taueki	1 Introduction	Oppose	The statement supposedly made by Muaupoko is not a valid account.	Delete the proposed Muaupoko statement and replace with a statement that is historically and culturally authentic.
11.02	Philip Taueki	1.1.2 Policy	Support	Support Policy 1.1.2	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Retain Policy 1.1.2.
11.03	Philip Taueki	1.1.1 Explanation & Principal Reasons	In-Part	The majority of the Explanation and Principle Reasons for Objective 1.1.1 are laudable and the definition for Kaitiakitanga is helpful. The final paragraph on page 1-11 however, undermines Objective 1.1.1.	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Amend Explanation and Principle Reasons for Objective 1.1.1 to remove the commitment of Council to seek guidance of mandated Iwi Authorities.
11.04	Philip Taueki	1.1 Methods District Plan	In-Part	Bullet four needs adjustment because it is not the tribal authorities who should be consulted on the survey to identify areas and sites of cultural significance, but Tangata Whenua.	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Amend Method 1.1 bullet four to replace Iwi authority with Tangata Whenua.
11.05	Philip Taueki	1.1 Methods	In-Part	Bullet one should be liaison with Tangata	No specific relief requested.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
		Monitoring		Whenua not Iwi authorities.	Inferred: Amend Method 1.1 Monitoring to replace Iwi authority with Tangata Whenua.
11.06	Philip Taueki	1.1 Methods Other Council Initiatives	In-Part	Bullet one and two - Iwi Management Plans and Memoranda of Partnerships are of no value if they are not ratified by the Iwi as they will discourage engagement between Council and Tangata Whenua.	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Ratify Iwi Management Plans and Memoranda of Partnerships with Iwi.
11.07	Philip Taueki	1.1 Methods Other Council Initiatives	In-Part	Bullet three - The establishment of a forum for the discussion of resource management issues of mutual concern to Tangata Whenua and Council will be a waste of time and resources if this forum is developed through relationships with Council and Iwi authorities.	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Open the discussion forum to Tangata Whenua not only Iwi authorities.
11.08	Philip Taueki	1.1 Methods Other Council Initiatives	In-Part	Bullet five will not give full effect to Kaitiakitanga for Council to devolve any functions, powers or duties under the RMA to Iwi authorities.	No specific relief requested.
11.09	Philip Taueki	1.1 Methods Other Council Initiatives	In-Part	Bullet six - For Council to work with Iwi authorities to develop and agree on operational procedures for processing proposed plans, plan changes and resource consent applications for proposals which may adversely affect identified areas and sites of cultural significance, will marginalise the Tangata Whenua.	No specific relief requested.
11.10	Philip Taueki	1.1 Methods Other Council Initiatives	In-Part	Bullet seven - An Iwi Consultation Guide will serve no purpose because it will not devolve consultation to the hapu who have a right under the RMA, to be consulted over these matters.	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Delete method referring to an Iwi Consultation Guide.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
11.11	Philip Taueki	1 General Matters	In-Part	Where the mauri or relationship of Tangata Whenua and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands is not recognised, protected or provided for, the Maori resource management system is compromised.	No specific relief requested.
11.12	Philip Taueki	1 General Matters	In-Part	This whole chapter is in breach of the RMA and needs to be adjusted by removing all reference to Iwi authorities on the grounds that sections 6, 7 and 8 of the RMA refer to Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands not Iwi authorities. An Iwi authority is not a substitute for Tangata Whenua or Maori.	Amend Chapter 1 to remove all references to 'Iwi authorities'.
11.13	Philip Taueki	2 General Matters	In-Part	Any rural activities that are likely to adversely affect the ecological values of Lake Horowhenua, Lake Papaitonga and the rural environment in general must be referred to Tangata Whenua for consultation.	No specific relief requested.
11.14	Philip Taueki	2 General Matters	In-Part	As there are a number of urupa and other sites of cultural significance throughout the rural environment due to the generations of Mua-Upoko who have maintained ahi kaa in the Horowhenua provisions must be in place to avoid disturbing any human remains or taonga while undertaking any activity within the rural environment.	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Include provisions to avoid the disturbance of human remains and taonga in the rural environment.
11.15	Philip Taueki	Planning Maps 7, 24, 26 and 27	In-Part	The 800m buffer zone is culturally offensive and should be deleted.	Delete the 800m buffer zone from Planning Maps 7, 24, 26 and 27.
11.16	Philip Taueki	2.5.21 Policy	Oppose	It is culturally offensive to recognise the existence of the Levin Wastewater Treatment Plant in Mako Mako Road as a legitimate	No specific relief requested.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				activity adjoining the Rural Zone and protect it from the effects of reverse sensitivity.	
11.17	Philip Taueki	3 General Matters	Support	Support the sentiments expressed in Chapter 3.	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Retain and implement the objectives and policies in Chapter 3.
11.18	Philip Taueki	4 Introduction	Oppose	There are no provisions in place to manage contaminants entering Lake Horowhenua and therefore the statement that flows can be managed using low impact urban design development techniques before water enters the District's rivers, lakes and other water bodies is incorrect.	Include provisions restricting all development within the vicinity of Lake Horowhenua to prevent further contamination of this taonga.
11.19	Philip Taueki	4 Introduction	Oppose	It is a serious violation of the Treaty of Waitangi to prepare plans suggesting the development of a pathway around Lake Horowhenua which is privately owned Maori freehold land. Due to the settlement of Mua-Upoko around the lake several centuries ago, there are a number of sites of cultural significance around the perimeter of the lake and therefore it is highly offensive for the Council to suggest that the public should have right of access around the lake.	No specific relief sought. Inferred: Amend Chapter 4 Introduction to clarify the ownership of Lake Horowhenua and restrict rather than provide access to and around the lake.
11.20	Philip Taueki	4.2.2 Objective	In-Part	There is no reference to the cultural significance of waterways and in particular Lake Horowhenua. This is a serious oversight.	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Amend Objective 4.2.2 to recognise and reference the cultural significance of waterways.
11.21	Philip Taueki	4.2.3 Policy	Oppose	The provision to require esplanade reserves or strips along the coasts and identified rivers, lakes and streams that are considered of significant value in the District is a complete	No specific relief requested.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				repudiation of the values espoused in Chapter 1.	
11.22	Philip Taueki	4 General Matters	In-Part	There is no reference to the sites of cultural significance on the periphery of Lake Horowhenua, Lake Papaitonga and other water bodies that would preclude public access without causing cultural offense.	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Include a list/schedule of cultural sites of significance in Chapter 4 where public access would to water bodies would not be appropriate.
11.23	Philip Taueki	5 Introduction	In-Part	There is no reference to customary rights in relation to Hokio Beach. All that is stated in the Introduction is that the coastal landscape contains a significant number of archaeological sites and sites of particular value to Iwi resulting from the historical pattern of settlement in the area. There are no provisions to mitigate the risk of disturbing traditional burial sites.	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Reference customary rights in relation to Hokio Beach in the Introduction of Chapter 5 and recognise and mitigate the risk of disturbance of cultural sites of significance.
11.24	Philip Taueki	6 General Matters	In-Part	There is no reference to Hokio Beach originally being established as a Maori township, and the distinctive issues that arise from its status.	No specific relief sought. Inferred: Acknowledge and reference Hokio Beach as a former Maori township and the issues associated with this.
11.25	Philip Taueki	Planning Map 27B	In-Part	The submitter seeks the rezoning of Pt Sec 28 Levin Suburban (the former Levin School site) from Residential to Commercial. This would provide for greater consistency in zoning along SH1.	Amend Planning Map 27B to include Pt Sec 28 Levin Suburban (former Levin School site) within the Commercial Zone.
11.26	Philip Taueki	8 General Matters	In-Part	There is no reference to Lake Horowhenua becoming a natural hazard due to the toxic algal bloom that appears during the summer months, and which places at risk small children and animals.	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Reference the algal bloom in Lake Horowhenua as a natural hazard in Chapter 8.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
11.27	Philip Taueki	8 General Matters	In-Part	There is no reference to the liquefaction areas within the coastal environment.	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Reference the liquefaction areas within the coastal environment in Chapter 8.
11.28	Philip Taueki	9 General Matters	In-Part	There should be a complete ban on the storage, use and disposal of hazardous substances within a chain strip of any waterway, including Lake Horowhenua.	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Amend Chapter 9 to restrict the storage, use and disposal of hazardous substances within a chain strip of any waterway, including Lake Horowhenua.
11.29	Philip Taueki	10.1 Issue Discussion	In-Part	There is no provision for consultation with Tangata Whenua at any early phase of development in order to bypass sites that are culturally sensitive.	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Amend Chapter 10 to include provision for consultation with Tangata Whenua at any early phase of development in order to bypass sites that are culturally sensitive.
11.30	Philip Taueki	US 11	Oppose	Oppose the approach taken by Council in response to the vandalism at the Rowing Club. The activities occurring at Lake Horowhenua are compromising those values of importance to Tangata Whenua and giving rise to conflicts.	No specific relief requested.
11.31	Philip Taueki	13.1 Methods	In-Part	The survey should apply a thematic approach to the identification of prospective historic heritage buildings and sites to be undertaken in consultation with Iwi, local historical societies, the NZHPT and potentially affected landowners.	No specific relief requested.
11.32	Philip Taueki	Planning Map 7	In-Part	The Kimberley site, the Kohitere site and the Horticulture Research site should be identified as designations allowing the	Amend Planning Map 7 to show the following sites as designations: the Kimberley site, the Kohitere site and

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				facilities to be utilised as of right.	the Horticulture Research site for special purposes and rural and marae-based activities.
11.33	Philip Taueki	1.1.3 Policy	Support	Support Policy 1.1.3	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Retain Policy 1.1.3.
11.34	Philip Taueki	1.1.4 Policy	Support	Support Policy 1.1.4	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Retain Policy 1.1.4.
11.35	Philip Taueki	1.1.5 Policy	Support	Support Policy 1.1.5	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Retain Policy 1.1.5.
11.36	Philip Taueki	1.1.6 Policy	Support	Support Policy 1.1.6	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Retain Policy 1.1.6.
11.37	Philip Taueki	1.1.7 Policy	Support	Support Policy 1.1.7	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Retain Policy 1.1.7
11.38	Philip Taueki	S1 – New Designation	In-Part	The Kimberley site, the Kohitere site and the Horticulture Research site should be designated so they can continue to be used for special purposes other than rural or marae-based activities. this would provide greater flexibility regarding future usage and would not compromise the landscape, soil usage or even traffic management.	Designate the Kimberley site, the Kohitere site and the Horticulture Research site for special purposes other than just rural and marae-based activities.
12.00	Daina Parlovskis	19.1(a) Rule	In-Part	The submitter seeks amendment to the permitted activity status of forest harvesting in the Rural Zone. Forest harvesting on the urban boundary of Waitarere Beach township has resulted in a ground water rise and flooding in heavy rain for many urban properties.	Amend Rule 19.1(a) to control forest harvesting in the Rural Zone that is within 500m of the urban boundary of the Waitarere Beach settlement. No more than 25ha of forest should be harvested at one time within 500m of the urban boundary and the next 25ha within 500m of the urban boundary should not be harvested until the newly planted section is at least five

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
					years old.
13.00	John Hammond	General Matters 13	In-Part	The Proposed District Plan includes a comprehensive list of policies but does not include specific objectives. Objectives should be measurable in terms of cost to implement and of outcome. It is not reasonable to expect Council to have the resources to implement all policies tabulated which could result in higher rates in the future if future councils are compelled to adopt excessively expensive policies.	Include in the Plan a comment that identifies that ratepayers will have the opportunity to comment on specific objectives, priorities and costs at each annual and 10 year plan submission time.
14.00	Kornelius du Plessis	Planning Map 12	Oppose	Oppose the rezoning of 50 Signal Street, Foxton Beach from Residential to Commercial. The rezoning would not match the current residential use of the site and there is concern for a rise in rates in the future.	Amend Planning Map 12 to change the zoning of 50 Signal Street, Foxton Beach from proposed Commercial to Residential.
15.00	Charles Wallis	19.1(a) Rule	In-Part	The submitter seeks amendment to the permitted activity status of forest harvesting in the Rural Zone. Forest harvesting on the urban boundary of Waitarere Beach township has resulted in a ground water rise and flooding in heavy rain for many urban properties.	Amend Rule 19.1(a) to control forest harvesting in the Rural Zone that is within 500m of the urban boundary of the Waitarere Beach settlement. No more than 25ha of forest should be harvested at one time within 500m of the urban boundary and the next 25ha within 500m of the urban boundary should not be harvested until the newly planted section is at least five years old.
15.01	Charles Wallis	15.6.20 Rule	In-Part	The submitter seeks the inclusion of a clause to ensure that where Council staff are made aware of surface water disposal issues, that	Include a clause which ensures that when Council staff are made aware of a surface water disposal issue affecting

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				the issues are followed up on a six monthly basis and a request made in writing to Council of action taken to resolve.	another property that a report is made to Council and a follow up report be completed every six months outlining the action taken to resolve the issue.
16.00	Robert White	3.4 Methods	Support	Support the method for providing financial incentives for landowners with notable trees on their property. Submitter seeks repairs to the submitter's broken path caused by Notable Trees.	No specific decision requested. Inferred: Retain the method which outlines the potential for Council to provide financial assistance through a fund for land owners with notable trees on their property. Assist the submitter with repair of broken path.
17.00	Penelope Brown	13.3 Issue	Support	Support the initiative that Council may commit resources such as rates relief to owners of heritage buildings as owners are hindered in some areas of renovation due to restrictions put on buildings and difficulties with insuring heritage buildings.	Retain the method for Issue 13.3 so that Council commit resources such as rates relief to encourage the management and protection of historic heritage buildings.
18.00	Paul Pearce	Planning Map 26	Support	Support the rezoning of Lot 4 DP 53896 on the corner of Hamaria and Mako Mako Roads, Levin from Industrial to Rural. The rezoning of this property reflects the long term activity of the land and is in keeping with the other lifestyle properties in the area.	Retain proposed rezoning of Lot 4 DP 53896 (corner of Hamaria and Mako Mako Roads, Levin) from Industrial to Rural.
19.00	Grant Leslie & Anne Searle	Planning Map 26	Support	Support the rezoning of Lot 4 DP 53896 on the corner of Hamaria and Mako Mako Roads, Levin from Industrial to Rural. The rezoning of this property reflects the long term activity of the land and is in keeping with the other lifestyle properties in the area.	Retain proposed rezoning of Lot 4 DP 53896 (corner of Hamaria and Mako Mako Roads, Levin) from Industrial to Rural.
20.00	Robert Kel	Planning Map 26	Support	Support the rezoning of Lot 4 DP 53896 on the corner of Hamaria and Mako Mako Roads,	Retain proposed rezoning of Lot 4 DP 53896 (corner of Hamaria and Mako

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				Levin from Industrial to Rural. The rezoning of this property reflects the long term activity of the land and is in keeping with the other lifestyle properties in the area.	Mako Roads, Levin) from Industrial to Rural.
21.00	Errol Skelton	Planning Map 26	Support	Support the rezoning of Lot 4 DP 53896 on the corner of Hamaria and Mako Mako Roads, Levin from Industrial to Rural. The rezoning of this property reflects the long term activity of the land and is in keeping with the other lifestyle properties in the area.	Retain proposed rezoning of Lot 4 DP 53896 (corner of Hamaria and Mako Mako Roads, Levin) from Industrial to Rural.
22.00	Kevin Macmillan	Planning Map 26	Support	Support the rezoning of Lot 4 DP 53896 on the corner of Hamaria and Mako Mako Roads, Levin from Industrial to Rural. The rezoning of this property reflects the long term activity of the land and is in keeping with the other lifestyle properties in the area.	Retain proposed rezoning of Lot 4 DP 53896 (corner of Hamaria and Mako Mako Roads, Levin) from Industrial to Rural.
23.00	Cheryl Mangin	19.1(a) Rule	In-Part	The submitter seeks amendment to the permitted activity status of forest harvesting in the Rural Zone. Forest harvesting on the urban boundary of Waitarere Beach township has resulted in a ground water rise and flooding in heavy rain for many urban properties. The felling of trees has directly affected 172 Park Avenue, Waitarere Beach in that a third of the property cannot be used now due to flooding.	Amend Rule 19.1(a) to control forest harvesting within 500m of the urban boundary in the Rural Zone. No more than 25ha of forest should be harvested at one time within 500m of the urban boundary and the next 25ha within 500m of the urban boundary should not be harvested until the newly planted section is at least five years old.
24.00	Peter & Vivien Wright	Planning Map 17	Oppose	Oppose the rezoning of 677 Waitarere Beach Road, Waitarere from Residential to Commercial. This property is commercial desirable however there is no demand for commercial land in Waitarere Beach.	Amend Planning Map 17 to change the zoning of 677 Waitarere Beach Road, Waitarere from proposed Commercial to Residential.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				Commercial zoning will lower the value of the property and complicate consent applications for future additions and improvements to the existing residence. It will also impact on annual rating differentials.	
25.00	Michael White	3 General Matters	In-Part	The submitter seeks the inclusion of an issue and associated policies on the preservation and reclamation of the night sky. The feature of the night sky is being eroded by light pollution. There are proven detrimental effects of light pollution to flora, fauna and human health as well as depriving all citizens of their right to see and observe the night sky.	Amend Chapter 3 to include the night sky as a natural feature and the protection of the night time environment through proper lighting controls and rules a priority. Council should register the Levin Adventure Park as a Star Park and commit to reducing and controlling light pollution around this area to a minimum.
25.01	Michael White	12.1.3 Policy	In-Part	The submitter seeks the inclusion of street and highway lighting as a network utility that should be managed in such a way as to negate adverse effects on the night environment with reference to AS/NZS 1158.	Amend Policy 12.2.3 to manage light spill and glare of street and highway lighting networks.
25.02	Michael White	12.1 Issue	In-Part	The submitter seeks the inclusion of street and highway lighting as a network utility that should be managed in such a way as to negate adverse effects on the night environment with reference to AS/NZS 1158.	Amend Issue 12.1 to manage light spill and glare of street and highway lighting networks.
25.03	Michael White	15.6 Rule	In-Part	The submitter seeks rules or conditions which govern outdoor lighting.	Amend Permitted Activity Conditions 15.6 to include rules that control the emission of outdoor lighting at and above the horizontal and to limit the level and timing of lighting in the Residential zone.
25.04	Michael White	16.6 Rule	In-Part	The submitter seeks rules or conditions which	Amend Permitted Activity Conditions

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				govern outdoor lighting.	16.6 to control the emission of outdoor lighting at and above the horizontal and to limit the level and timing of lighting in the Industrial zone.
25.05	Michael White	17.6 Rule	In-Part	The submitter seeks rules or conditions which govern outdoor lighting.	Amend Permitted Activity Conditions 17.6 to include rules that control the emission of outdoor lighting at and above the horizontal and to limit the level and timing of lighting in the Commercial zone.
25.06	Michael White	19.6 Rule	In-Part	The submitter seeks rules or conditions which govern outdoor lighting.	Amend Permitted Activity Conditions 19.6 to include rules that control the emission of outdoor lighting at and above the horizontal and to limit the level and timing of lighting in the Rural zone.
25.07	Michael White	20.6 Rule	In-Part	The submitter seeks rules or conditions which govern outdoor lighting.	Amend Permitted Activity Conditions 20.6 to include rules that control the emission of outdoor lighting at and above the horizontal and to limit the level and timing of lighting in the Open Space zone.
25.08	Michael White	22.1 Rule	In-Part	The submitter seeks the inclusion of rules for managing street lights and other external lighting to avoid impacts on the environment. Developers should be specifically required to provide lighting that complies with the general objectives of AS/NZS 1158 to limit light spill and glare, and to also comply with Sustainable Procurement Guidelines.	Amend Rule 22.1 to include performance rules around the provision of lighting systems associated with the development of subdivisions. These rules should avoid or minimise impacts on the environment, reduce energy and maintenance costs over the life of the lighting system and provide effective lighting services.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
25.09	Michael White	12.1.5 Policy	In-Part	The submitter seeks the inclusion of street and highway lighting as a network utility that should be managed in such a way as to negate adverse effects on the night environment with reference to AS/NZS 1158.	Amend Policy 12.1.5 to manage light spill and glare of street and highway lighting networks.
25.10	Michael White	12.2.12 Policy	In-Part	The submitter seeks the inclusion of street and highway lighting as a network utility that should be managed in such a way as to negate adverse effects on the night environment with reference to AS/NZS 1158.	Amend Policy 12.2.12 to manage light spill and glare of street and highway lighting networks.
26.00	Horowhenua Astronomical Society Inc	3.2.2 Policy	In-Part	The submitter seeks the inclusion of the protection of the natural light cycle at night as a way of maintaining and enhancing indigenous biological diversity to Policy 3.2.2.	Amend Policy 3.2.2 to incorporate protection of the natural light cycle at night as a way of maintaining and enhancing indigenous biological diversity.
26.01	Horowhenua Astronomical Society Inc	General Matters 26 A	In-Part	The submitter seeks the inclusion of rules around prevention of light spill, glare and excessive lighting levels for highway and street lighting, subdivisions, land use and development.	Amend the Proposed Plan to include rules to prevent light spill, glare and excessive lighting levels for highway and street lighting, subdivisions, land use and development.
26.02	Horowhenua Astronomical Society Inc	3.3.4 Policy	In-Part	The submitter seeks that the natural processes of the night should be sustained, restored and rehabilitated in areas related to lakes, rivers and other water bodies. Excessive inefficient artificial lighting systems can disrupt natural processes both adjacent to and within water bodies and can be reflected into the night sky causing skyglow.	Amend Policy 3.3.4 to consider and control the amount and type of artificial lighting for any subdivision or development proposals close to a water body.
26.03	Horowhenua Astronomical Society Inc	3.4.4 Policy	Support	The submitter refers to Issue 3.4 and Objective 3.4.1 (Notable Trees) which links to Policy 3.4.4.	Retain Policy 3.4.4.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				Policy 3.4.4 has reference to “support of community initiatives for the protection and conservation of Notable Trees”. There is support for Policy 3.4.4 with an emphasis on 'protection and conservation'.	
26.04	Horowhenua Astronomical Society Inc	General Matters 26	In-Part	The submitter seeks the inclusion of rules to discourage or prevent the up-lighting of trees as a way of highlighting them. The addition of artificial light at night is known to adversely affect some trees and is likely to disrupt insect and bird ecosystems that rely on the tree and an excess of light will contribute to sky glow.	Amend the Proposed Plan to include rules to discourage or prevent the uplighting of trees.
26.05	Horowhenua Astronomical Society Inc	5.1.1 Objective	In-Part	The submitter seeks the incorporation of the protection of the natural night environment as an intrinsic feature of the character of the Coastal Environment as proposed by Policy 13-2-e of the NZCPS.	Amend Objective 5.1.1 to provide for the protection of the natural night environment as an intrinsic feature of the character of the Coastal Environment.
26.06	Horowhenua Astronomical Society Inc	5.1.7 Policy	In-Part	The submitter seeks the incorporation of the protection of the natural night environment as an intrinsic feature of the character of the Coastal Environment as proposed by Policy 13-2-e of the NZCPS.	Amend Policy 5.1.7 to provide for the protection of the natural night environment as an intrinsic feature of the character of the Coastal Environment.
26.07	Horowhenua Astronomical Society Inc	General Matters 26	In-Part	The submitter seeks rules which preserve the natural character of coastal areas by restricting lighting to essential lighting only and that this lighting be shielded and directed to the area intended to be lit, limited to the levels and times required.	Amend the Proposed Plan to include rules which preserve the natural character of coastal areas by restricting lighting to essential lighting only.
26.08	Horowhenua Astronomical Society	12 General Matters	In-Part	The submitter seeks the recognition that the street and highway lighting is a network utility	Amend Chapter 12 to ensure Council manages street and road lighting

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
	Inc			and that it should be managed in a way that limits adverse effects on the environment.	networks in a way that minimises impacts on the environment, both directly through minimising light spill and glare, and through improving the energy efficiency and effectiveness of the network.
26.09	Horowhenua Astronomical Society Inc	15.6 Rule	In-Part	The submitter seeks rules or conditions that manage artificial outdoor lighting. Wasteful lighting practices reduce amenity values though light spill and impact on ecological values.	Amend Permitted Activity Conditions 15.6 to include rules that control the emission of light at and above the horizontal and to limit the level and timing of lighting in the Residential Zone.
26.10	Horowhenua Astronomical Society Inc	16.6 Rule	In-Part	The submitter seeks rules or conditions that manage artificial outdoor lighting. Wasteful lighting practices reduce amenity values though light spill and impact on ecological values.	Amend Permitted Activity Conditions 16.6 to include rules that control the emission of light at and above the horizontal and to limit the level and timing of lighting in the Industrial Zone.
26.11	Horowhenua Astronomical Society Inc	17.6 Rule	In-Part	The submitter seeks rules or conditions that manage artificial outdoor lighting. Wasteful lighting practices reduce amenity values though light spill and impact on ecological values.	Amend Permitted Activity Conditions 17.6 to include rules that control the emission of light at and above the horizontal and to limit the level and timing of lighting in the Commercial Zone.
26.12	Horowhenua Astronomical Society Inc	18.6 Rule	In-Part	The submitter seeks rules or conditions that manage artificial outdoor lighting. Wasteful lighting practices reduce amenity values though light spill and impact on ecological values.	Amend Permitted Activity Conditions 18.6 to include rules that control the emission of light at and above the horizontal and to limit the level and timing of lighting in the Greenbelt Residential Zone.
26.13	Horowhenua Astronomical Society	19.6 Rule	In-Part	The submitter seeks rules or conditions that manage artificial outdoor lighting. Wasteful	Amend Permitted Activity Conditions 19.6 to include rules that control the

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
	Inc			lighting practices reduce amenity values though light spill and impact on ecological values.	emission of light at and above the horizontal and to limit the level and timing of lighting in the Rural Zone.
26.14	Horowhenua Astronomical Society Inc	20.6 Rule	In-Part	The submitter seeks rules or conditions that manage artificial outdoor lighting. Wasteful lighting practices reduce amenity values though light spill and impact on ecological values.	Amend Permitted Activity Conditions 20.6 to include rules that control the emission of light at and above the horizontal and to limit the level and timing of lighting in the Open Space Zone.
26.15	Horowhenua Astronomical Society Inc	21 General	In-Part	The submitter seeks the inclusion of provisions to manage the environmental effects of lighting associated with vehicle access, parking, loading and roading.	Amend Chapter 21 to include provisions that manage the effects of lighting with particular regard to limiting light spill, glare and energy consumption.
26.16	Horowhenua Astronomical Society Inc	24 General Matters	In-Part	The submitter seeks the inclusion of specific rules to be applied to manage street lights and other external lighting to avoid impacts on the environment. Developers should be specifically required to provide lighting that complies with the general objectives of AS/NZS 1158 to limit light spill and glare, and to also comply with the Sustainable Procurement Guidelines.	Amend Chapter 24 to include rules around the provision of lighting systems associated with the development of subdivisions. These rules should avoid or minimise impacts on the environment, reduce energy and maintenance costs over the life of the lighting system and provide effective lighting services.
26.17	Horowhenua Astronomical Society Inc	3.2.3 Policy	In-Part	The submitter seeks the inclusion of the protection of the natural light cycle at night as a way of maintaining and enhancing indigenous biological diversity to Policy 3.2.3.	Amend Policy 3.2.3 to incorporate protection of the natural light cycle at night as a way of maintaining and enhancing indigenous biological diversity.
27.00	Horizons Regional Council	2.5.6 Policy	In-Part	Policy 2.5.6 is not clear about what 'wastes' are intended to be encompassed by this policy and therefore what rules in links to. It	Amend Policy 2.5.6 to provide more specificity around the adverse effects that are intended to be avoided,

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				would seem that Policy 2.5.6 may link to Rule 19.6.27 in which case there are issues about the wastes that are addressed by that rule. Sewage and effluent are Regional Council functions, and the regulation of these types of discharges through a District Plan would be inappropriate.	remedied or mitigated through this policy.
27.01	Horizons Regional Council	26 Definitions –New definition “Wastes”	In-Part	Policy 2.5.6 is not clear about what “wastes” are intended to be encompassed by this policy and therefore what rules it links to.	Include a definition for “wastes” in relation to Policy 2.5.6 and only cover areas within Council's jurisdiction.
27.02	Horizons Regional Council	2.5.14 Policy	In-Part	There is concern regarding the overlap and potential implications with the Proposed One Plan (POP). Policy 8-2, Table 8.3 of the POP specifies the following regional standard for ambient air quality : Odour A discharge must not cause any offensive or objectionable odour beyond the property boundary. Policy 2.5.14 makes only reference to adverse odours not "offensive or objectionable odour" as the POP does. In addition this policy does not cover dust nuisance. There is also a question around whether this policy crosses over into Regional Council jurisdiction.	Delete Policy 2.5.14 if it is found to be outside the territorial authority jurisdiction; OR Amend Policy 2.5.14 to align with Policy 8-2 of the Proposed Regional Policy Statement.
27.03	Horizons Regional Council	2.5.15 Policy	In-Part	Consider that Policy 2.5.15 be reworded to include 'intensive farming activities' in line with Rule 19.6.4(b).	Amend Policy 2.5.15 to include 'intensive farming activities'.
27.04	Horizons Regional Council	3.2.1 Objective	Oppose	This objective does not give effect to the Regional Policy Statement as it attempts to cover areas outside territorial authority jurisdiction. Policy 7-1(b)(ii) of the POP specifies what territorial authorities must be	Delete Objective 3.2.1 and replace with an objective that covers the matters signalled in Policy 7-1(b)(ii) of the POP as the areas of territorial authority jurisdiction.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				responsible for. The District Council is not required to address protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna that are covered by Schedule E of the POP. If the intent of the objective is to deal with amenity issues associated with notable trees and amenity trees then this should be made explicit.	
27.05	Horizons Regional Council	3.2.2 Policy	Oppose	Policy 3.2.2 does not give effect to the Regional Policy Statement as they attempt to cover areas outside territorial authority jurisdiction. Policy 7-1(b)(ii) of the POP specifies what territorial authorities must be responsible for. The District Council is not required to address protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna that are covered by Schedule E of the POP. There is a related issue of managing the effects of subdivision which may impact on significant habitat areas and the ability to impose covenants and the like. This is a matter that could be addresses through the policy stream as would be a policy for areas of indigenous biodiversity not listed in Schedule E of the POP.	Delete Policy 3.2.2 and replace with a policy that seeks to recognise and retain notable trees and amenity trees within the district, in line with the requirements of the POP.
27.06	Horizons Regional Council	8.1.2 Policy	Support	Support Policy 8.1.2 and would like to stress that the areas identified do not necessarily cover all floodable areas within the district.	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Retain Policy 8.1.2.
27.07	Horizons Regional	Planning Maps 4	Support	Support the identification of the Moutoa	No specific relief requested.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
	Council	and 5		floodway.	Inferred: Retain the identification of the Moutoa Floodway on Planning Maps 4 and 5.
27.08	Horizons Regional Council	8.1.3 Policy	Support	Support Policy 8.1.3 and would like to stress that the areas identified do not necessarily cover all floodable areas within the district.	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Retain Policy 8.1.3.
27.09	Horizons Regional Council	8.1.6 Policy	Oppose	Oppose Policy 8.1.6 as it proposes that flood hazard avoidance is preferred to flood hazard mitigation. This is not aligned to the POP.	Amend Policy 8.1.6 to be consistent with the POP: Flood hazard avoidance <u>is must be</u> preferred to flood hazard mitigation.
27.10	Horizons Regional Council	9.1.1 Objective	In-Part	Oppose the inclusion of the word 'disposal'. Disposal of hazardous substances is a Regional Council function specified within Policy 3-10(a) of the POP and should not sit within a District Plan objective.	Delete the word disposal from Objective 9.1.1: To ensure that adequate measures are taken to avoid or mitigate the adverse environmental effects of the use, storage, <u>and</u> transport and disposal of hazardous substances.
27.11	Horizons Regional Council	9.1.5 Policy	In-Part	Oppose the inclusion of the word 'disposal'. Disposal of hazardous substances is a Regional Council function specified within Policy 3-10(a) of the POP and should not sit within a District Plan objective.	Delete the word disposal from Policy 9.1.5: Limit the use, <u>and</u> storage and disposal of hazardous substances near any of the following areas...
27.12	Horizons Regional Council	9.1.6 Policy	In-Part	Oppose the inclusion of the word 'disposal'. Disposal of hazardous substances is a Regional Council function specified within Policy 3-10(a) of the POP and should not sit within a District Plan objective.	Delete the word disposal from Policy 9.1.6: Establish controls to ensure that facilities which involve the use, storage, <u>or</u> transport or disposal of hazardous substances...
27.13	Horizons Regional Council	10.1 Issue	In-Part	Consider the possibility of decreased funding streams from the National Land Transport Fund due to declining trend in vehicle	Amend Issue 10.1 through considering the ongoing impacts of decreased funding streams from the National

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				kilometres travelled.	Land transport Fund on future transportation needs.
27.14	Horizons Regional Council	10.1 Issue	In-Part	The New Zealand Transport Agency's current thinking in regards to the Roads of National significance project in the SH57 will become a heavy vehicle bypass of Levin which will relieve some of the traffic congestion issues on Oxford Street.	Amend Issue 10.1 to reflect the thinking of the New Zealand Transport Agency.
27.15	Horizons Regional Council	10.1.8 Policy	In-Part	The submitter advocates that new subdivisions and developments consider the mandatory installation of bike racks, where appropriate, at schools, shopping centres, recreation reserves and public transport collection points and terminals, for safe and easy storage of bikes when not in use.	No specific relief sought. Inferred: Amend Policy 10.1.8 to consider the mandatory installation of bike racks.
27.16	Horizons Regional Council	10 Explanation & Principal Reasons	Support	Horizons recognises that in districts, such as Horowhenua, traffic congestion and parking supply are not issues as they are in other districts, however this does not relieve the District Council of the burden to consider reviewing minimum parking requirements as this affects other land use issues, such as urban form. Horizons is pleased to note that the District Council will consider reductions in parking provisions, subject to a resource consent where demand will not occur simultaneously and that the operational hours or arrangement of those activities means that sharing of parking spaces will occur.	No specific relief requested. Infer Retain Explanation & Principal Reasons.
27.17	Horizons Regional	15.6 Rule	In-Part	There is concern that the Permitted Activity	Amend the Permitted Activity

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
	Council			Conditions limit the ability of Regional Council to carry out its functions in all areas of its river and drainage scheme areas as permitted activities.	Conditions to provide for soil conservation, erosion protection, river control or flood protection works undertaken by, or on behalf of Horizons Regional Council as a permitted activity; and Provide for this criterion to be carried over to all other activity types in the Proposed Plan regarding soil conservation, erosion protection, river control or flood protection works undertaken by, or on behalf supervised by of Horizons Regional Council.
27.18	Horizons Regional Council	15.1(j) Rule	In-Part	The submitter seeks expansion of this rule to recognise and provide for the wide range of activities within its river and drainage scheme areas which extend beyond the identified Flood Hazard Area Overlay. There is some concern that the wording of this rule could limit the ability of Regional Council to carry out its functions in all areas of its river and drainage scheme areas as permitted activities. The rule correctly refers to rules in the POP in relation to activities in the beds of lakes and rivers and adjacent land but there are now also controls in relation to setbacks from rivers generally.	Amend Rule 15.1(j)(ii): Refer to rules in Horizons Regional Council's Proposed One Plan relating to activities in the bed of lakes and rivers, for land adjacent to rivers zoned for river and flood control , all land use activities...
27.19	Horizons Regional Council	16.6 Rule	In-Part	There is concern that the Permitted Activity Conditions limit the ability of Regional Council to carry out its functions in all areas of its river and drainage scheme areas as permitted	Amend the Permitted Activity Conditions to provide for soil conservation, erosion protection, river control or flood protection works

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				activities.	undertaken by, or on behalf of Horizons Regional Council as a permitted activity; and Provide for this criterion to be carried over to all other activity types in the Proposed Plan regarding soil conservation, erosion protection, river control or flood protection works undertaken by, or on behalf supervised by of Horizons Regional Council.
27.20	Horizons Regional Council	17.6 Rule	In-Part	There is concern that the Permitted Activity Conditions limit the ability of Regional Council to carry out its functions in all areas of its river and drainage scheme areas as permitted activities.	Amend the Permitted Activity Conditions to provide for soil conservation, erosion protection, river control or flood protection works undertaken by, or on behalf of Horizons Regional Council as a permitted activity; and Provide for this criterion to be carried over to all other activity types in the Proposed Plan regarding soil conservation, erosion protection, river control or flood protection works undertaken by, or on behalf supervised by of Horizons Regional Council.
27.21	Horizons Regional Council	19.6 Rule	In-Part	There is concern that the Permitted Activity Conditions limit the ability of Regional Council to carry out its functions in all areas of its river and drainage scheme areas as permitted activities.	Amend the Permitted Activity Conditions to provide for soil conservation, erosion protection, river control or flood protection works undertaken by, or on behalf of Horizons Regional Council as a permitted activity; and

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
					Provide for this criterion to be carried over to all other activity types in the Proposed Plan regarding soil conservation, erosion protection, river control or flood protection works undertaken by, or on behalf supervised by of Horizons Regional Council.
27.22	Horizons Regional Council	20.6 Rule	In-Part	There is concern that the Permitted Activity Conditions limit the ability of Regional Council to carry out its functions in all areas of its river and drainage scheme areas as permitted activities.	Amend the Permitted Activity Conditions to provide for soil conservation, erosion protection, river control or flood protection works undertaken by, or on behalf of Horizons Regional Council as a permitted activity; and Provide for this criterion to be carried over to all other activity types in the Proposed Plan regarding soil conservation, erosion protection, river control or flood protection works undertaken by, or on behalf supervised by of Horizons Regional Council.
27.23	Horizons Regional Council	15.7.5(b) Rule	In-Part	The lot sizes of 800m ² for Hokio Beach, Waikawa Beach, Ohau (West) and Manakau, specified in Table 15-3 do not meet the requirements of the POP. Additionally the lot sizes as specified in Table 15-3 appear to be in contradiction with the lot design parameter table under Rule 19.7.3 which has been addressed by Plan change 20-22.	Amend Table 15-3 (Rule 15.7.59b)) to change the minimum net site area/minimum average site areas reflect the minimum lot sizes specified on page 19-27(Rule 19.7.3).
27.24	Horizons Regional Council	19.6.4 (b) Rule	In-Part	Setbacks from effluent storage and treatment facilities only apply to residential units. This	Amend Rule 19.6.4(b) to include setback requirements for effluent

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				rule should also require new effluent storage units and treatment facilities to meet minimum setback distances from residential dwelling units and sensitive areas.	storage and treatment facilities.
27.25	Horizons Regional Council	19.6.4(c) Rule	In-Part	The submitter notes that dairy farming is specifically excluded from the definition of an 'intensive farming activity'. Dairy farming activities should be considered within this rule framework.	Amend Rule 19.6.4(c) to include dairy farming activities OR Amend the definition of 'intensive farming activity' to include dairy farming activities.
27.26	Horizons Regional Council	19.6.9 Rule	In-Part	There is concern regarding the overlap and potential implications with the Proposed One Plan (POP). Policy 8-2, Table 8.3 of the POP specifies the following regional standard for ambient air quality : Odour A discharge must not cause any offensive or objectionable odour beyond the property boundary. Rule 19.6.9 makes reference only to adverse odours not "offensive or objectionable odour" as the POP does. In addition this policy does not cover dust nuisance. This rule also states the methods for defining whether an odour is offensive. These methods differ to the methods Regional Council rely on and could cause conflict. There is also a question around whether this policy crosses over into Regional Council jurisdiction.	Delete Rule 19.6.9 if it is found to be outside the territorial authority jurisdiction; OR Amend Rule 19.6.9 to align with Policy 8-2 of the Proposed Regional Policy Statement and reference the guidance given under 14.2 of the POP for assessing whether an odour is offensive or objectionable.
27.27	Horizons Regional Council	19.6.16 Rule	Oppose	Oppose the inclusion of Rule 19.6.16 as this rule addresses re-vegetation following forest harvesting - a matter that is already covered by the previous rule 19.6.15. In addition, this	Delete Rule 19.6.16.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				rule appears to cross over into Regional Council functions that are dealt with in the POP.	
27.28	Horizons Regional Council	19.6.17 Rule	In-Part	The reference to waste is too general and gives no certainty about what wastes in particular are captured by the rule. It is considered that this rule makes reference only to refuse as sewage and effluent are matters covered by Regional Council jurisdiction.	Amend Rule 19.6.17 to define the wastes covered by this rule excluding those wastes that are controlled by the Regional Council. In its current format deleting sewage and effluent from the wastes description would only leave refuse to be listed. Any other wastes managed by the District Council and intended to be captured by this rule should also be listed.
27.29	Horizons Regional Council	19.6.19 Rule	In-Part	The submitter notes that if an activity, subdivision or development were not to connect to a reticulated scheme, then it would need to meet the POP stormwater discharge rules.	No specific relief requested.
27.30	Horizons Regional Council	19.6.28(b) Rule	In-Part	The submitter seeks clarification on what structures the phrase 'other structures' captures, why the rule is restricted to bridges associated with the roading resource and not stock bridges and farm bridges also.	Amend Rule 19.6.28(b) to provide clarification.
27.31	Horizons Regional Council	24.1.5, 24.2.4 Rule	In-Part	More certainty needs to be given on what a satisfactory system for the collection and containment of contaminant and what disposal of surface water actually refers to. This Rule should be amalgamated with Rule 24.2.4.	Delete Rule 24.1.5 and amend Rule 24.2.4 to amalgamate the two rules. Amend 24.2.4 to provide more certainty on what a 'satisfactory system' means.
27.32	Horizons Regional Council	26 Definitions - Intensive Farming	In-Part	There is concern that dairy milking sheds have been specifically excluded from the definition	Amend the definition for Intensive Farming activities to include dairy

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				of intensive farming and effluent storage and/or treatment facilities are not mentioned in the definition. Horizons consider that dairy farming activities to fall within the intensive farming category.	farming activities or provide clarification around the exclusion of such activities.
27.33	Horizons Regional Council	26 Definitions - Primary Production Activity	In-Part	The submitter seeks clarification as to whether non-habitable dwellings are included within this definition as this may affect the intention behind Rule 19.1(m).	Amend as required/provide clarification.
27.34	Horizons Regional Council	3.2.3 Policy	Oppose	Policy 3.2.3 does not give effect to the Regional Policy Statement as they attempt to cover areas outside territorial authority jurisdiction. Policy 7-1(b)(ii) of the POP specifies what territorial authorities must be responsible for. The District Council is not required to address protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna that are covered by Schedule E of the POP. There is a related issue of managing the effects of subdivision which may impact on significant habitat areas and the ability to impose covenants and the like. This is a matter that could be addresses through the policy stream as would be a policy for areas of indigenous biodiversity not listed in Schedule E of the POP.	Delete Policy 3.2.3 and replace with a policy that seeks to recognise and retain notable trees and amenity trees within the district, in line with the requirements of the POP.
28.00	Peter & Vivien Wright	Planning Map 17	Oppose	Oppose the rezoning of Lot 42 DP 10023 being 673/675 Waitarere Beach Road, Waitarere from Residential to Commercial. This property is commercial desirable	Amend Planning Map 17 to change the zoning of 677 Waitarere Beach Road, Waitarere from proposed Commercial to Residential.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				however there is no demand for commercial land in Waitarere Beach. Commercial zoning will lower the value of the property and complicate consent applications for future additions and improvements to the existing residence. It will also impact on annual rating differentials.	
29.00	Allen Little	US 29 - General Matters 2	In-Part	There needs to be more stringent survey and inspection within rural areas to ensure maximum compliance with land use understandings. Effluent disposal, land irrigation along with safety of access and egress from properties need to be monitored for compliance issues. Synergies with the Regional Council should be explored with a view to rationalising resources.	No specific relief requested.
29.01	Allen Little	US 29 - General Matters 3	In-Part	Care should be taken not to alter landscapes and natural features. It seems important that some commitment is made to restorative work with Lake Horowhenua with its shores and parkland being available for family recreation.	No specific relief requested.
29.02	Allen Little	US 29 - General Matters 4	In-Part	There is an important issue with regards to waste water disposal in the Horowhenua and to a lesser extent Lake Papaitonga. There is a need to look at the in-flow and the effect of surface drainage on these bodies of water. Resources should be committed to consult with owners and interested parties to advance natural restoration of Horowhenua's lakes.	No specific relief requested.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
29.03	Allen Little	US 29 - General Matters 5	In-Part	Care should be taken to ensure these localities are valued as unique places of worth with residents accorded access to services and facilities common to residents in principle urban areas.	No specific relief requested.
29.04	Allen Little	US 29 - General Matters 6	In-Part	Real care needs to be taken when considering the subdivision of property not to foster overcrowding and congestion of resources. When considering infill development the natural coastal settlements must be protected and minimal loss of character must be assured.	No specific relief requested.
29.05	Allen Little	US 29 - General Matters 6	In-Part	Affordable and accessible housing with convenient access and services is required to provide for older citizens.	No specific relief requested.
29.06	Allen Little	US 29 - General Matters 6	In-Part	A shared purpose license should be required for home based business operations with controls for traffic, advertisements.	Include provision for a shared purpose license for home based businesses.
29.07	Allen Little	US 29 - General Matters 6	In-Part	Noise pollution in particular intrusive noise from 'subwoofers' should be controlled in residential areas through policy and/or local by-laws.	Include/amend noise policy to control subwoofer noise intrusion in the Residential Zone on private property and on public roads.
29.08	Allen Little	US 29 - General Matters 6	In-Part	There is a general issue of excessive and inappropriate night time illumination. The submitter seeks appropriate provisions to be included with measures which avoid excessive, poorly designed intrusive lighting.	Include provisions to manage the effects of lighting with particular regard to limiting spill light, glare and energy consumption.
29.09	Allen Little	US 29 -Local Alcohol Policy	In-Part	Council should introduce a local alcohol policy which would relate directly to what people can or can't do in a particular location.	Include a policy/provision around local alcohol.
29.10	Allen Little	US 29 -Footpath &	In-Part	Council should commit to more active	Include a commitment of Council to

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
		Walkway Foliage		monitoring of foliage over footpaths and pedestrian walkways. Foliage is an issue for the blind and visually impaired.	actively monitor foliage over footpaths and pedestrian walkways.
29.11	Allen Little	US 29 - General Matters 10	In-Part	A comprehensive study on the need for public transport in the District should be undertaken. A feasibility study should also be undertaken on the development of a light rail link between Levin, Waikanae and Palmerston North.	No specific relief requested: Inferred: Undertake studies on the potential for public transport in the Horowhenua which would inform policies/provisions to be included in Chapter 10.
29.12	Allen Little	US 29 - General Matters 10	In-Part	The submitter seeks greater collaboration over all areas of government and in particular with Regional Council in development of roading infrastructure and signage.	No specific relief requested.
29.13	Allen Little	US 29 - General Matters 10	In-Part	Council should collaborate with neighbouring local entities and the business community to ensure an adequate rail system is available in the district when required.	Establish an Innovation and public facilities working party to explore options, study and recommend futurist development of transport and communications services for the Horowhenua.
29.14	Allen Little	12 General Matters	In-Part	The community must learn to practice energy efficiency and avoid wastage of resources such as electricity. Electrical reticulation should comply with current best practice with aging infrastructure assessed for operational efficiencies.	No specific relief requested.
29.15	Allen Little	US 29 - General Matters 13	In-Part	It would be useful if Council appointed a qualified archivist to care for historical documents at Te Takere.	No specific relief requested.
29.16	Allen Little	US 29 - General Matters 14	In-Part	A major issue of public interest must be the re-emergence of awareness around re-configuring local government. Horowhenua	No specific relief requested.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				should be actively pursuing synergies with both Palmerston North City and other communities to the south of Levin such as Otaki and Waikanae.	
29.17	Allen Little	US 29 - General Matters 15	In-Part	The Residential Zone should ideally accommodate a diverse mix of men women and children of all ages, dispositions and callings.	Amend Polices to ensure that every citizen has full and convenient access to common amenities or facilities.
29.18	Allen Little	US 29 - General Matters 16 & 17	In-Part	Council should devise policies which inspire and encourage the development of sustainable industry to attract business and enterprise. A survey of Industrial Zone occupancy and usage should be undertaken with a view to identifying any capacity for development.	Attention should be given to developing a package of 'Start Up' incentives which attract new business enterprise and innovation. This could be achieved through the formation of a 'Business Intelligence Unit' within Council.
29.19	Allen Little	US 29 - General Matters 18 & 20	In-Part	Need realistic policies with facilitate careful maintenance of the Greenbelt Residential area particularly open spaces and the natural environment which is what make these locations attractive.	No specific relief requested.
29.20	Allen Little	US 29 - General Matters 19	In-Part	Council should be working in partnership with agricultural, horticultural, viticulture and primary production interests to ensure common sense policies and practices are in place to manage the Rural Zone. Residential occupancy should be in line with traditional practices with constraints put on subdivision for lesser purposes.	No specific relief requested.
29.21	Allen Little	US 29 - General Matters 22	In-Part	As a progressive futuristic community, Horowhenua should expect access to all utilities readily available in New Zealand.	Council should set an example and establish an energy conservation initiative to avoid wastage of

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				Network utilities and structures associated with them must comply with both regulatory and local conditions. Excessive and inappropriate street lighting should be reduced.	electricity.
29.22	Allen Little	US 29 - General Matters 24	In-Part	All future subdivisions should be required to submit evidence of best practice and how structures or residents will be connected to utilities. Sensor lights should be used and subdivisions should demonstrate energy efficiency. Flood lighting should be of non-spill, non-intrusive type.	Include Polices and controls which will allow the Council to set the standard for local energy efficient and conservation.
30.00	Peter Everton	Planning Map 27	Support	Support the proposed rezoning on Hokio Beach Road, Levin from Rural to Industrial.	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Retain the proposed rezoning of properties from Rural to Industrial on Hokio Beach Road, Levin on Planning Map 27.
30.01	Peter Everton	Planning Map 27	In-Part	The submitter seeks the rezoning of Lot 2 DP 431415 from Rural to Industrial. This zoning would be consistent with the rezoning of adjoining properties.	Amend Planning Map 27 to include Lot 2 DP 431415 within the Industrial Zone.
31.00	The Surveying Company (Wellington) Ltd	Planning Map 29	In-Part	The properties at 15 and 15A Keepa Street, Levin are respectively zoned Residential and predominantly Industrial. The owner plans to undertake a boundary adjustment to add more land to the Industrial site at 15a to extend the current workshop. The owners seeks that the new Lot 2 be rezoned Industrial.	Amend Planning Map 29 to rezone Lot 2 of the proposed subdivision of Lots 1 & 2 DP 56588 (15 and 15a Keepa Street, Levin) from Residential to Industrial.
32.00	NZ Pork Industry Board	Introduction – The Horowhenua	Oppose	Oppose the current wording of the Introduction. The district plan should assist in	Amend Introduction Chapter as follows The Horowhenua District Plan is

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
		District Plan		managing sustainable land use which includes social, cultural and economic effects of the use and development of land. It is not appropriate for the plan to focus solely on environmental effects.	intended to assist the Council manage the environmental <u>social, cultural and economic</u> effects, of the use, development, and protection of land (and associated resources), including the control of the subdivision of land.
32.01	NZ Pork Industry Board	Introduction – The Horowhenua District Plan	Oppose	Insert a paragraph outlining the importance of encouraging sustainable development and commercial activities which includes primary production into the district including economic and cultural effects.	Amend the Plan to reflect these concerns
32.02	NZ Pork Industry Board	2.4 Issue	Oppose	Oppose provisions which place undue financial and time constraints on farmers due to over regulation. These do not appear appropriate and are extensively covered by the Regional Council's One Plan.	Delete Issue 2.4 and all associated provisions
32.03	NZ Pork Industry Board	2.4.1 Objective	Oppose	Submitter opposes provisions which place undue financial and time constraints on farmers due to over regulation. These do not appear appropriate and are extensively covered by the Regional Council's One Plan.	Delete provisions associated with Issue 2.4
32.04	NZ Pork Industry Board	2.4.2 Policy	Oppose	Submitter opposes provisions which place undue financial and time constraints on farmers due to over regulation. These do not appear appropriate and are extensively covered by the Regional Council's One Plan.	Delete provisions associated with Issue 2.4
32.05	NZ Pork Industry Board	2.4.2 Explanation & Principal Reasons	Oppose	Oppose provisions which place undue financial and time constraints on farmers due to over regulation. These do not appear appropriate and are extensively covered by the Regional Council's One Plan.	Delete provisions associated with Issue 2.4

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
32.06	NZ Pork Industry Board	2.4 Methods	Oppose	Oppose provisions which place undue financial and time constraints on farmers due to over regulation. These do not appear appropriate and are extensively covered by the Regional Council's One Plan.	Delete provisions associated with Issue 2.4
32.07	NZ Pork Industry Board	2.5 Issue	In-Part	Support the intent of Issue 2.5 however requests the rephrasing for clarity if the issue.	Amend Issue 2.5 as follows: <u>A diverse</u> diversity range of primary production and non-primary production activities occur in the rural environment. These activities can have a wide range of effects on the nature, character and amenity values of the rural environment as well as the potential for incompatibility between activities and use . However, some of these effects are anticipated and expected in a rural <u>working</u> environment. <u>This can result in the potential for incompatibility between rural activities and more sensitive land use.</u>
32.08	NZ Pork Industry Board	2.5.1 Objective	In-Part	The objective focuses on avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse effects from primary production activities but does not mention similar provisions for avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse effects associated with inappropriate placement sensitive activities in the zone. The Objective also needs to link to the economic impacts that can occur as a result of reverse sensitivity.	Amend Objective 2.5.1 as follows: To enable primary production activities and other associated rural based land uses to function efficiently and effectively in the Rural Zone, while avoiding, remedying or mitigating the adverse effects of activities, including reverse sensitivity effects <u>from inappropriately located sensitive activities</u> , in a way that maintains and

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
					enhances the <u>productive capacity</u> , character and amenity values of the rural environment.
32.09	NZ Pork Industry Board	2.5.2 Policy	Support	Submitter supports Policy 2.5.2.	Retain intent of Policy 2.5.2
32.10	NZ Pork Industry Board	2.5.3 Policy	Support	Submitter supports Policy 2.5.3.	Retain the intent of Policy 2.5.3
32.11	NZ Pork Industry Board	2.5.4 Policy	In-Part	Oppose the current wording of the Policy 2.5.4. the policy needs to explicitly state that this included adverse effects including reverse sensitivity on existing lawfully established rural operations	Amend Policy 2.5.4 as follows: Control and manage the establishment and operation of a range of other land use activities, including sensitive activities, in the rural environment to ensure their adverse effects (<u>including reverse sensitivity on existing operations</u>) on the environment are avoided, remedied or mitigated.
32.12	NZ Pork Industry Board	2.5.6 Policy	In-Part	Oppose Policy 2.5.6 as it is too broad to meet the requirements of a district plan needs to specifically outline parameters of effects.	Amend Policy 2.5.6 as follows: Ensure that all activities within the rural environment dispose of wastes in a manner that avoids remedies or mitigates adverse effects on <u>nuisance and amenity</u> .
32.13	NZ Pork Industry Board	2.5.9 Policy	In-Part	Support In-Part. NZ Pork supports the intent of the policy however the focus of the policy on the life supporting capacity of the soils ignores industries that are reliant on the rural environment not necessarily the soils.	Amend Policy 2.5.9 as follows: Manage the effects of additional dwellings on the life supporting capacity <u>versatility of soils landscape</u> and the character and amenity values of the rural environment, recognising any farm worker accommodation should be located and related to the scale and intensity of the primary

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
					production activities on site.
32.14	NZ Pork Industry Board	2.5.11 Policy	Support	Submitter supports the intent of Policy 2.5.11.	Retain the intent of Policy 2.5.11
32.15	NZ Pork Industry Board	2.5.15 Policy	Support	Submitter supports the intent of Policy 2.5.15.	Retain the intent of Policy 2.5.15
32.16	NZ Pork Industry Board	2 Anticipated Environmental Result	Oppose	NZ Pork questions the focus of this section on environmental results. District plans are to provide for sustainable development which includes environment, social, economic and cultural considerations. This plan appears to overlook these considerations for the rural environment.	Delete term environmental from the title and rephrase section to address concerns. Social, economic and cultural considerations need to be included in this section.
32.17	NZ Pork Industry Board	2(d) Anticipated Environmental Result	Oppose	Oppose Anticipated Environmental Result 2(d) as it is not appropriate for a district plan.	Delete Anticipated Environmental Result 2(d)
32.18	NZ Pork Industry Board	19.1(a) Rule	Support	Support primary production activities being a permitted activity.	Retain intent of Rule 19.1(a)
32.19	NZ Pork Industry Board	19.1(m) Rule	Support	Support primary production activities being a permitted activity.	Retain intent of Rule 19.1(m).
32.20	NZ Pork Industry Board	19.6.4(b) Rule	Support	Submitter supports the intent of Rule 19.6.4(b).	Retain intent of Rule 19.6.4(b).
32.21	NZ Pork Industry Board	19.6.4(c) Rule	Oppose	Oppose the inclusion open space, industrial zoning within the rule. The definition for 'open space' applies to both public and private unoccupied space and vacant land and that does not require specific zoning requirements. The definition for open space is therefore not rigorous enough to trigger the setback requirements. Additionally industrial environments have	Amend Rule 19.6.4(c) as follows. (i) 300 metre from any residential dwelling unit, and other sensitive activities on any other site; (ii) 50 metres from any site boundary; (iii) 600 metres from any Residential, Greenbelt Residential, Open Space, Industrial or Commercial Zone.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				similar parameters to the rural environment in terms of the potential for industries to produce odour and noise and we therefore see it inappropriate to require a setback similar to sensitive environments such as residential zones.	
32.22	NZ Pork Industry Board	19.6.9 Rule	Oppose	Oppose current wording of Rule 19.6.9. Within the plan there is an acknowledgment that for some rural industries the discharges of odours are a component of the rural environment. The RMA requires activities to avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse effects such as odours as far as practically possible however this rule outlines no offensive odours detected beyond the boundary of the property and is therefore opposed.	Amend Rule 19.6.9 as follows: (a) No activity shall give rise to offensive odours able to be detected at the boundary of any adjoining property. <u>Activities emitting odours will avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects as far as practically possible.</u>
32.23	NZ Pork Industry Board	19.6.17 Rule	Oppose	Oppose current wording of Rule 19.6.17 'Roads and road users' have been removed from the Horizons One plan following appeals from rural industries. NZ Pork submitted that the plan overlooks the practical implications of imposing significant adverse effects of nuisance and odour from any consideration of who "affected parties" might be. We therefore oppose the inclusion of point (ii) in the district plan for the same reasons. NZ Pork also opposes the inclusion of (iv) any channel or water body as we submit it is not appropriate for a district plan. It is also	Amend Rule 19.6.17 as follows (a) All wastes (including sewage, effluent, and refuse) that are generated or stored on any site shall be collected, treated, and disposed of in a manner that avoids, <u>remedy or mitigate</u> any significant adverse effects or of nuisance <u>or</u> odour for: (i) an adjoining property; (ii) roads and road users; (iii) any natural habitat or indigenous species; (iv) any channel, stream or water body;

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				comprehensively covered in the regional plan so NZ Pork sees no reason for further regulation.	...
32.24	NZ Pork Industry Board	25.2.1(d) Assessment Criteria	Support		Retain intent of 25.2.1(d)
32.25	NZ Pork Industry Board	25.2.1(h) Assessment Criteria	Support		Retain intent of 25.2.1(h)
32.26	NZ Pork Industry Board	25.2.6(b) Assessment Criteria	Support		Retain intent of 25.2.6(b)
32.27	NZ Pork Industry Board	25.2.6(f) Assessment Criteria	Support		Retain intent of 25.2.6(f)
32.28	NZ Pork Industry Board	25.7.5(b)(ii) Assessment Criteria	In-Part	Support for the intent of the criteria however opposes the provisions requirement within a district plan as it is already a requirement of Regional plan. NZ Pork is opposed to provisions which place undue financial and time constraints due to over regulation on farmers at a time when consent compliance costs are becoming a genuine concern for producers.	Delete 25.7.5(b)(ii) (ii) The ability of the proposed system to allow the discharge of wastewater in a sustainable and environmentally acceptable manner, including whether the necessary discharge consents have been applied for or granted.
32.29	NZ Pork Industry Board	26 Abbreviations	In-Part	Ensure list of abbreviations used in the Plan is complete e.g. add CPTED	Add CPTED and other abbreviations used in the Plan to list of abbreviations.
32.30	NZ Pork Industry Board	26 Definitions – Intensive Farming	In-Part	NZ Pork supports the definition which seeks to link outdoor intensive farming practices with the ability to maintain ground cover. However, opposes the current definitions inclusions of ‘substantially proving food and fertilizers from off the site’. In our view this is not what should trigger an intensive farm	Amend Definition of Intensive Farming as follows: Intensive Farming means any farming activity which predominantly involves the housing or raising of animals, plants or other living organism within buildings or in closely fenced

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				definition as it is unclear as to what constitutes 'substantial' i.e. could a dairy farms that provide supplement feeds and apply fertilizer trigger the definition The definition also does not allow for free range pig farms with over 5 pigs, where ground cover can be maintained and therefore any potential effect on amenities is low.	enclosures where the stocking density precludes the maintenance of pasture or ground cover, and which is substantially provided for by food or fertiliser from off the site ; and includes intensive pig farming, poultry farming, and mushrooms farms; but excludes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • horticulture undertaken in greenhouses, • shearing sheds; and dairy milking sheds; • keeping, rearing or breeding of poultry of 20 or fewer birds; and • the keeping, breeding or rearing of five (5) or fewer pigs that have been weaned, or more than two (2) sows (with progeny until weaned).
32.31	NZ Pork Industry Board	26 Definitions – Open Space	Oppose	The definition for open space is opposed due to the content in which it is used within the plan in relation to set backs from intensive farms. See submission point (32.21) for Rule 19.6.4	Amend as follows: Open Space means any public or private area of substantially unoccupied space or vacant land; and includes parks, reserves, playgrounds, landscaped areas, gardens, together with any ancillary seating and vehicle parking and pedestrian shelters and conveniences; but excludes any recreation facilities. It need not specifically be zoned as Open Space.
32.32	NZ Pork Industry	26 Definitions –	Support	Submitter supports the definition for Primary	Retain definition of Primary Production

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
	Board	Primary Production Activity		Production.	Activities are notified.
32.33	NZ Pork Industry Board	26 Definitions – New definition “Reverse sensitivity”	In-Part	Several references are made to the term ‘reverse sensitivity’. For certainty and clarity this term should be defined within the Plan.	Include new definition for “Reverse sensitivity” as follows: <u>Reverse sensitivity means the vulnerability of an existing lawfully established activity to complaints from new activities which are sensitive to the adverse environmental effects being generated by the existing activity, thereby creating the potential for the operation and/or expansion of the existing activity to be constrained.</u>
33.00	Levin Golf Club	Planning Map 7	In-Part	Support the creation of the Open Space zone and believe that the Levin Golf Club would be more suited to being zoned as Open Space instead of the proposed Rural zone.	Amend Planning Map 7 to rezone the Levin Golf Club site (160 Moutere Road) from Rural to Open Space.
33.01	Levin Golf Club	4 General Matters	In-Part	Support the creation of the Open Space zone its associated policies and believe that the Levin Golf Club would be more suited to being zoned as Open Space instead of the proposed Rural Zone.	Amend Chapter 4 to make consequential amendments arising from the Levin Golf Club site (160 Moutere Road) being rezoned as Open Space.
34.00	Foxton Historical Society	S2-General	In-Part	Schedule 2 is incomplete and does not recognise Policies 13.3.3 and 13.3.4 with regards to the Foxton area. A list of properties/locations in Foxton has been provided to Council to be added to this Schedule.	Include the Foxton properties/locations from the list provided by the Historical Society within Schedule 2.
35.00	Anthony Hunt	Planning Map 15A	Oppose	Oppose the area west of Harbour Street north of the Foxton Hotel Service Lane (including the site of Designation 143) being zoned	Amend Planning Map 15A to rezone the area west of Harbour Street north of the Foxton Hotel Service Lane

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				residential. This area is a focal point for the work being done to reclaim the River as an integral part of Foxton's tourist development.	(including the site of Designation 143) from Residential to Recreational (Open Space) or place under some covenant that recognises the heritage qualities of this area.
36.00	Trucis Investments Ltd	Planning Map 7	Oppose	Oppose the current Rural zoning for the property at 654 State Highway 1 (Lot 1 DP 71431). This site should be rezoned Industrial to reflect the purpose built buildings on site and the current land use.	Amend Planning Map 7 to rezone the property at 654 State Highway 1 (Lot 1 DP 71431) from Rural to Industrial.
37.00	Homestead Group Limited	Planning Map 29	Support	Support the extent of the proposed rezoning of land from Rural to Industrial on Planning Map 29.	Retain the proposed rezoning of land from Rural to Industrial on Planning Map 29.
37.01	Homestead Group Limited	6.3.3 Objective	Oppose	Oppose Objective 6.3.3 in its current form. The Industrial zone is a dynamic working environment where it is not always possible to protect surrounding amenity. The word protected in this objective gives an impression of a no change situation.	Amend Objective 6.3.3 as follows: ..., and the character and amenity values of adjoining areas are protected <u>maintained</u> .
37.02	Homestead Group Limited	16.6.3(a) Rule	Oppose	Oppose the permitted activity requirement for buildings to be set back 10 metres from SH1. The condition is restrictive and does not allow flexibility for the placement of buildings on site. There is no explanation about whether the set back is for transportation matters or amenity considerations.	Delete Rule 16.6.3(a)
37.03	Homestead Group Limited	26 Definitions – Building	In-Part	The definition of Building needs to be amended to ensure that hard stand and car parking areas are excluded. Applying the RMA definition of structure could see these hard stand areas captured by setback	Amend the definition of Building to avoid hardstand and car park areas being captured.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				conditions	
37.04	Homestead Group Limited	16.6.9(a) Rule	Oppose	Oppose condition 16.6.9(a) as it is subjective and open to interpretation. The condition could never be complied with for new buildings because to comply would assume a continuous construction period.	Delete Rule 16.6.9(a)
37.05	Homestead Group Limited	16.6.21(a) Rule	Oppose	Oppose this rule as the sites of significance to Maori have not been identified in the Plan and it could lead to the situation where people use this rule inappropriately.	Delete Rule 16.6.21(a)
37.06	Homestead Group Limited	25.4 Assessment Criteria	Oppose	Oppose assessment criteria 25.4 as it contains extensive and subjective matters. The criteria could lead to costly information requirements for the simplest application. Section 104 of the RMA is sufficient consideration of land use activities requiring resource consent.	Delete Assessment Criteria 25.4
38.00	Range View Ltd & MJ Page	19.6.13(a) Rule	Oppose	Oppose this rule as the sites of significance to Maori have not been identified in the Plan and it could lead to the situation where people use this rule inappropriately.	Delete Rule 19.6.13(a).
38.01	Range View Ltd & MJ Page	19.6.14 Rule	Oppose	Oppose 19.6.14(a) and (b) as compliance with these conditions needs to be made clear and not left to unknown interpretation. The management of transmission lines operate under other legislation. For these reasons this rule should be deleted.	Delete Rule 19.6.14 in its entirety.
38.02	Range View Ltd & MJ Page	24.1.1 Rule	Oppose	Oppose part 24.1.1 which requires compliance with NZS 4404:2010 for all subdivision and development. Development as defined in the Plan definitions is all encompassing. With NZS 4404:2010	Delete Rule 24.1.1 in its entirety and have these matters becomes matters that are considered in the consent process.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				containing provisions for roads to be less than 20 metres wide there are inconsistencies between the rules. Compliance with NZS 4404:2010 is problematic in itself given there are elements in the standard that are discretionary on the part of the relevant Territorial Authority.	
38.03	Range View Ltd & MJ Page	General Matters 38	In-Part	There is a relationship between Plan Change 22 and Plan Change 20 of which there are issues that are currently being addressed between parties. This relationship will need to be reflected in the Proposed Plan.	Amend the Plan to incorporate the matters between the parties in relation to Plan Changes 20 and 22 once addressed to the submitter's satisfaction.
39.00	Viv Bold	General Matters 39	Oppose	Oppose Hokio being made Industrial from Rural. Can't see how it is going to help the residents that live in this area. We don't need extra charges put on our rate demands. Oppose the Proposed District Plan as the money is not there to pay for this increase in rates.	Inferred: Do not proceed with the Proposed District Plan.
40.00	House Movers Section of NZ Heavy Haulage Association Inc.	General Matters 40	Oppose	Oppose the Proposed Plan's treatment of removal, re-siting, and relocation of buildings in its entirety. The regulation of removal and relocation of buildings in the proposed plan does not meet the aims of the RMA. The Proposed Plan also fails to apply the decision of the Environment Court, where the judge held that there was no real difference in effect and amenity value terms between the situ construction of a new dwelling and relocation of a second-hand dwelling. The policies, objectives, rules, methods and	Amend the policies and objectives, rules, methods and reasons in the Proposed District Plan to reflect the reasons for this submission which opposes the regulation of removal and relocation of buildings.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				reasons in the Proposed District Plan are inconsistent and contrary to Section 5 of the RMA (sustainable management). Any potential adverse effects on amenity values from building relocation is remedied after an initial establishment period.	
40.01	House Movers Section of NZ Heavy Haulage Association Inc.	General Matters 40	Oppose	Oppose the Proposed Plan's treatment of removal, re-siting, and relocation of buildings in its entirety. Provisions on removal, re-siting, and relocation of buildings in the Proposed District Plan are inconsistent and contrary to Section 5 of the RMA (sustainable management). Any potential adverse effects on amenity values from building relocation is remedied after an initial establishment period.	Delete all provisions on removal, re-siting, and relocation of buildings in the Proposed Plan, the definitions section, and elsewhere.
40.02	House Movers Section of NZ Heavy Haulage Association Inc.	26 Definitions	In-Part	The definitions in the Plan should be amended to accord with trade practice and usage. The definitions in the Proposed District Plan are inconsistent and contrary to Section 5 of the RMA (sustainable management). Any potential adverse effects on amenity values from building relocation is remedied after an initial establishment period.	Amend the Definitions section of the plan to accord with trade practice and usage so as to distinguish between the activities of removal, re-siting, and relocation of dwellings and buildings.
40.03	House Movers Section of NZ Heavy Haulage Association Inc.	General Matters 40	Oppose	The submitter seeks that the Plan be amended to provide for the coordination between the Building Act and Resource Management Act, to avoid regulatory duplication.	Amend the objectives, policies, rules and methods of the Plan the need to provide for the coordination between the Building Act and Resource Management Act, to avoid regulatory

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
	House Movers Section of NZ Heavy Haulage Association Inc.			The policies, objectives, rules, methods and reasons in the Proposed District Plan are inconsistent and contrary to Section 5 of the RMA (sustainable management). Any potential adverse effects on amenity values from building relocation is remedied after an initial establishment period.	duplication.
40.04	House Movers Section of NZ Heavy Haulage Association Inc.	General Matters 40	Oppose	<p>The submitter seeks that the demolition and removal and re-siting of buildings be provided for in the Proposed Plan as a permitted activity.</p> <p>The provisions relating to demolition, removal and re-siting in the Proposed District Plan are inconsistent and contrary to Section 5 of the RMA (sustainable management). Providing for notifiable resource consents controlled/restricted discretionary activity does not recognise transaction costs involved. Any potential adverse effects on amenity values from building relocation is remedied after an initial establishment period.</p>	<p>Amend the Proposed Plan to provide for the demolition and removal and re-siting of buildings as a permitted activity in all areas and zones, except in relation to any scheduled identified heritage buildings, or any properly established conservation heritage precinct.</p> <p>Or</p> <p>In the event that demolition and or removal and re-siting of buildings is not a permitted activity then as a default rule, provide for relocation of dwellings and buildings no more restrictively than a restricted controlled activity, provided that such application be expressly provided for on a non-notified, non-service basis.</p>
40.05	House Movers Section of NZ Heavy Haulage Association Inc.	General Matters 40	Oppose	<p>The submitter seeks that relocated dwellings and buildings be provided for in the Proposed Plan as a permitted activity.</p> <p>The policy provisions relating to relocated dwellings and buildings in the Proposed District Plan are inconsistent and contrary to</p>	Amend the policy provisions relating to relocated dwellings and buildings in their entirety (either by rewriting the plan, or alternatively, by deleting the relevant sections and replacing the provision in each section or zone of the

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
	House Movers Section of NZ Heavy Haulage Association Inc.			Section 5 of the RMA (sustainable management). Providing for notifiable resource consents controlled/restricted discretionary activity does not recognise transaction costs involved. Any potential adverse effects on amenity values from building relocation is remedied after an initial establishment period.	Plan as is appropriate) with objectives, policies, rules, assessment criteria, methods, reasons and other provisions which expressly provide for relocation of buildings as permitted activities in all zones/areas subject to performance standards and conditions.
40.06	House Movers Section of NZ Heavy Haulage Association Inc.	15 General – Relocated Buildings	Oppose	The submitter seeks that relocated dwellings and buildings be provided for in the Proposed Plan as a permitted activity subject to the suggested performance standards/conditions. The policy provisions relating to relocated dwellings and buildings in the Proposed District Plan are inconsistent and contrary to Section 5 of the RMA (sustainable management). Providing for notifiable resource consents controlled/restricted discretionary activity does not recognise transaction costs involved. Any potential adverse effects on amenity values from building relocation is remedied after an initial establishment period.	Amend the Proposed District Plan to provide for the relocation of dwellings and buildings as a permitted activity subject to the following performance standards/conditions (or to the same or similar effect): <u>Relocated buildings are permitted where the following matters can be satisfied:</u> <u>a) Any relocated building can comply with the relevant standards for Permitted Activities in the District Plan</u> <u>b) Any relocated dwelling must have been previously designed, built and used as a dwelling;</u> <u>c) A building inspection report shall accompany the building consent for the building/dwelling. The report is to identify all reinstatement work required to the exterior of the building/dwelling; and</u> <u>d) The building shall be located on permanent foundations approved by</u>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
					<u>building consent, no later than 12 months of the building being moved to the site.</u> <u>e) All work required to reinstate the exterior of any relocated building/dwelling, including the siting of the building/dwelling on permanent foundations, shall be completed within 12 month of the building being delivered to the site.</u>
40.07	House Movers Section of NZ Heavy Haulage Association Inc.	16 General – Relocated Buildings	Oppose	<p>In the event that the relocation of a building/dwelling is not a permitted activity under this Plan, then the Plan shall provide for them no more restrictively than a restricted discretionary activity which is expressly provided for on a non-notified, non-service basis and subject to the suggested assessment criteria.</p> <p>The policy provisions relating to relocated dwellings and buildings in the Proposed District Plan are inconsistent and contrary to Section 5 of the RMA (sustainable management). Providing for notifiable resource consents controlled/restricted discretionary activity does not recognise transaction costs involved.</p> <p>Any potential adverse effects on amenity values from building relocation is remedied after an initial establishment period.</p>	<p>Amend the Proposed Plan to provide for the relocation of buildings/dwellings as no more restrictively than a restricted discretionary activity (in the event that it is not a permitted activity) and that such application e expressly provided for on a non-notified, non-service basis and subject to the following assessment criteria:</p> <p><u>Where an activity is not permitted by this Rule, Council will have regard to the following matters when considering an application for resource consent:</u></p> <p><u>i) proposed landscaping</u> <u>ii) the proposed timetable for completion of the work required to reinstate</u> <u>iii) the appearance of the building following reinstatement</u></p>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
40.08	House Movers Section of NZ Heavy Haulage Association Inc.	17 General – Relocated Buildings	Oppose	<p>In the event that the relocation of a building/dwelling is not a permitted activity under this Plan, then the Plan shall provide for them no more restrictively than a restricted discretionary activity which is expressly provided for on a non-notified, non-service basis and subject to the suggested assessment criteria.</p> <p>The policy provisions relating to relocated dwellings and buildings in the Proposed District Plan are inconsistent and contrary to Section 5 of the RMA (sustainable management). Providing for notifiable resource consents controlled/restricted discretionary activity does not recognise transaction costs involved.</p> <p>Any potential adverse effects on amenity values from building relocation is remedied after an initial establishment period.</p>	<p>Amend the Proposed Plan to provide for the relocation of buildings/dwellings as no more restrictively than a restricted discretionary activity (in the event that it is not a permitted activity) and that such application e expressly provided for on a non-notified, non-service basis and subject to the following assessment criteria:</p> <p><u>Where an activity is not permitted by this Rule, Council will have regard to the following matters when considering an application for resource consent:</u></p> <p><u>i) proposed landscaping</u></p> <p><u>ii) the proposed timetable for completion of the work required to reinstate</u></p> <p><u>iii) the appearance of the building following reinstatement</u></p>
40.09	House Movers Section of NZ Heavy Haulage Association Inc.	19 General – Relocated Buildings	Oppose	<p>In the event that the relocation of a building/dwelling is not a permitted activity under this Plan, then the Plan shall provide for them no more restrictively than a restricted discretionary activity which is expressly provided for on a non-notified, non-service basis and subject to the suggested assessment criteria.</p> <p>The policy provisions relating to relocated dwellings and buildings in the Proposed</p>	<p>Amend the Proposed Plan to provide for the relocation of buildings/dwellings as no more restrictively than a restricted discretionary activity (in the event that it is not a permitted activity) and that such application e expressly provided for on a non-notified, non-service basis and subject to the following assessment criteria:</p>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				<p>District Plan are inconsistent and contrary to Section 5 of the RMA (sustainable management). Providing for notifiable resource consents controlled/restricted discretionary activity does not recognise transaction costs involved.</p> <p>Any potential adverse effects on amenity values from building relocation is remedied after an initial establishment period.</p>	<p><u>Where an activity is not permitted by this Rule, Council will have regard to the following matters when considering an application for resource consent:</u></p> <p>i) <u>proposed landscaping</u></p> <p>ii) <u>the proposed timetable for completion of the work required to reinstate</u></p> <p>iii) <u>the appearance of the building following reinstatement</u></p>
40.10	House Movers Section of NZ Heavy Haulage Association Inc.	20 General – Relocated Buildings	Oppose	<p>In the event that the relocation of a building/dwelling is not a permitted activity under this Plan, then the Plan shall provide for them no more restrictively than a restricted discretionary activity which is expressly provided for on a non-notified, non-service basis and subject to the suggested assessment criteria.</p> <p>The policy provisions relating to relocated dwellings and buildings in the Proposed District Plan are inconsistent and contrary to Section 5 of the RMA (sustainable management). Providing for notifiable resource consents controlled/restricted discretionary activity does not recognise transaction costs involved.</p> <p>Any potential adverse effects on amenity values from building relocation is remedied after an initial establishment period.</p>	<p>Amend the Proposed Plan to provide for the relocation of buildings/dwellings as no more restrictively than a restricted discretionary activity (in the event that it is not a permitted activity) and that such application e expressly provided for on a non-notified, non-service basis and subject to the following assessment criteria:</p> <p><u>Where an activity is not permitted by this Rule, Council will have regard to the following matters when considering an application for resource consent:</u></p> <p>i) <u>p proposed landscaping</u></p> <p>ii) <u>the proposed timetable for completion of the work required to reinstate</u></p> <p>iii) <u>the appearance of the building</u></p>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
					<u>following reinstatement</u>
40.11	House Movers Section of NZ Heavy Haulage Association Inc.	15.2(a) Rule	Oppose	The submitter seeks that relocated dwellings and buildings be provided for in the Proposed Plan as a permitted activity subject to the suggested performance standards/conditions.	Delete Rule 15.2(a)
40.12	House Movers Section of NZ Heavy Haulage Association Inc.	15.7.1 Rule	Oppose	The submitter seeks that relocated dwellings and buildings be provided for in the Proposed Plan as a permitted activity subject to the suggested performance standards/conditions.	Delete Rule 15.7.1
40.13	House Movers Section of NZ Heavy Haulage Association Inc.	15.1 Rule	In-Part	The submitter seeks that relocated dwellings and buildings be provided for in the Proposed Plan as a permitted activity subject to the suggested performance standards/conditions.	Amend Rule 15.1 to include <u>“The placement of any Relocated building and/or accessory building on any site subject to the conditions at [rule ref]”.</u>
40.14	House Movers Section of NZ Heavy Haulage Association Inc.	15.6 Rule	In-Part	The submitter seeks that relocated dwellings and buildings be provided for in the Proposed Plan as a permitted activity subject to the suggested performance standards/conditions.	Include the following performance standards/conditions (or to the same or similar effect) for relocated buildings: Permitted Activity Standards for Relocated Buildings i) <u>Any relocated building intended for use as a dwelling (excluding previously used garages and accessory buildings) must have previously been designed, built and used as a dwelling.</u> ii) <u>A building pre-inspection report shall accompany the application for a building consent for the destination sit. That report is to identify all reinstatement works that are to be completed to the exterior of the</u>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
					<u>building.</u> <u>iii) The building shall be located on permanent foundations approved by building consent, no later than [2] months of the being moved to the site.</u> <u>iv) All other reinstatement work required by the building inspection report and the building consent to reinstate the exterior of any relocated dwelling shall be completed with [12] months of the building being delivered to the site. Without limiting (iii) (above) reinstatement work is to include connections to all infrastructure services and closing in and ventilation of the foundations.</u> <u>v) The proposed owner of the relocated building must certify to the Council that the reinstatement work will be completed within the [12] month period.</u>
40.15	House Movers Section of NZ Heavy Haulage Association Inc.	16.2(c) Rule	Oppose	The submitter seeks that relocated dwellings and buildings be provided for in the Proposed Plan as a permitted activity subject to the suggested performance standards/conditions.	Delete Rule 16.2(c)
40.16	House Movers Section of NZ Heavy Haulage Association Inc.	16.7.3 Rule	Oppose	The submitter seeks that relocated dwellings and buildings be provided for in the Proposed Plan as a permitted activity subject to the suggested performance standards/conditions.	Delete Rule 16.7.3
40.17	House Movers	16.1 Rule	In-Part	The submitter seeks that relocated dwellings	Amend Rule 16.1 to include

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
	Section of NZ Heavy Haulage Association Inc.			and buildings be provided for in the Proposed Plan as a permitted activity subject to the suggested performance standards/conditions.	<u>“The placement of any Relocated building and/or accessory building on any site subject to the conditions at [rule ref]”.</u>
40.18	House Movers Section of NZ Heavy Haulage Association Inc.	16.6 Rule	In-Part	The submitter seeks that relocated dwellings and buildings be provided for in the Proposed Plan as a permitted activity subject to the suggested performance standards/conditions.	<p>Include the following performance standards/conditions in (or to the same or similar effect) for relocated buildings:</p> <p>Permitted Activity Standards for Relocated Buildings</p> <p>i) <u>Any relocated building intended for use as a dwelling (excluding previously used garages and accessory buildings) must have previously been designed, built and used as a dwelling.</u></p> <p>ii) <u>A building pre-inspection report shall accompany the application for a building consent for the destination sit. That report is to identify all reinstatement works that are to be completed to the exterior of the building.</u></p> <p>iii) <u>The building shall be located on permanent foundations approved by building consent, no later than [2] months of the being moved to the site.</u></p> <p>iv) <u>All other reinstatement work required by the building inspection report and the building consent to reinstate the exterior of any relocated dwelling shall be completed with [12]</u></p>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
					<u>months of the building being delivered to the site. Without limiting (iii) (above) reinstatement work is to include connections to all infrastructure services and closing in and ventilation of the foundations.</u> <u>v)The proposed owner of the relocated building must certify to the Council that the reinstatement work will be completed within the [12] month period.</u>
40.19	House Movers Section of NZ Heavy Haulage Association Inc.	17.2(c) Rule	Oppose	The submitter seeks that relocated dwellings and buildings be provided for in the Proposed Plan as a permitted activity subject to the suggested performance standards/conditions.	Delete Rule 17.2(c)
40.20	House Movers Section of NZ Heavy Haulage Association Inc.	17.7.3 Rule	Oppose	The submitter seeks that relocated dwellings and buildings be provided for in the Proposed Plan as a permitted activity subject to the suggested performance standards/conditions.	Delete Rule 17.7.3
40.21	House Movers Section of NZ Heavy Haulage Association Inc.	17.1 Rule	In-Part	The submitter seeks that relocated dwellings and buildings be provided for in the Proposed Plan as a permitted activity subject to the suggested performance standards/conditions.	Amend Rule 17.1 to include <u>“The placement of any Relocated building and/or accessory building on any site subject to the conditions at [rule ref]”.</u>
40.22	House Movers Section of NZ Heavy Haulage Association Inc.	17.6 Rule	In-Part	The submitter seeks that relocated dwellings and buildings be provided for in the Proposed Plan as a permitted activity subject to the suggested performance standards/conditions.	Include the following performance standards/conditions (or to the same or similar effect) for relocated buildings: Permitted Activity Standards for Relocated Buildings

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
	House Movers Section of NZ Heavy Haulage Association Inc.				<p>i) <u>Any relocated building intended for use as a dwelling (excluding previously used garages and accessory buildings) must have previously been designed, built and used as a dwelling.</u></p> <p>ii) <u>A building pre-inspection report shall accompany the application for a building consent for the destination site. That report is to identify all reinstatement works that are to be completed to the exterior of the building.</u></p> <p>iii) <u>The building shall be located on permanent foundations approved by building consent, no later than [2] months of the being moved to the site.</u></p> <p>iv) <u>All other reinstatement work required by the building inspection report and the building consent to reinstate the exterior of any relocated dwelling shall be completed with [12] months of the building being delivered to the site. Without limiting (iii) (above) reinstatement work is to include connections to all infrastructure services and closing in and ventilation of the foundations.</u></p> <p>v) <u>The proposed owner of the relocated building must certify to the Council that the reinstatement work will be completed within the [12] month</u></p>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
					<u>period.</u>
40.23	House Movers Section of NZ Heavy Haulage Association Inc.	19.2(d) Rule	Oppose	The submitter seeks that relocated dwellings and buildings be provided for in the Proposed Plan as a permitted activity subject to the suggested performance standards/conditions.	Delete Rule 19.2(d)
40.24	House Movers Section of NZ Heavy Haulage Association Inc.	19.7.6 Rule	Oppose	The submitter seeks that relocated dwellings and buildings be provided for in the Proposed Plan as a permitted activity subject to the suggested performance standards/conditions.	Delete Rule 19.7.6
40.25	House Movers Section of NZ Heavy Haulage Association Inc.	19.1 Rule	In-Part	The submitter seeks that relocated dwellings and buildings be provided for in the Proposed Plan as a permitted activity subject to the suggested performance standards/conditions.	Amend Rule 19.1 to include <u>“The placement of any Relocated building and/or accessory building on any site subject to the conditions at [rule ref]”.</u>
40.26	House Movers Section of NZ Heavy Haulage Association Inc.	19.6 Rule	In-Part	The submitter seeks that relocated dwellings and buildings be provided for in the Proposed Plan as a permitted activity subject to the suggested performance standards/conditions.	Include the following performance standards/conditions (or to the same or similar effect) for relocated buildings: Permitted Activity Standards for Relocated Buildings i) <u>Any relocated building intended for use as a dwelling (excluding previously used garages and accessory buildings) must have previously been designed, built and used as a dwelling.</u> ii) <u>A building pre-inspection report shall accompany the application for a building consent for the destination sit.</u> <u>That report is to identify all reinstatement works that are to be completed to the exterior of the</u>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
	House Movers Section of NZ Heavy Haulage Association Inc.				<u>building.</u> iii) The building shall be located on permanent foundations approved by building consent, no later than [2] months of the being moved to the site. iv) All other reinstatement work required by the building inspection report and the building consent to reinstate the exterior of any relocated dwelling shall be completed with [12] months of the building being delivered to the site. Without limiting (iii) (above) reinstatement work is to include connections to all infrastructure services and closing in and ventilation of the foundations. v) The proposed owner of the relocated building must certify to the Council that the reinstatement work will be completed within the [12] month period.
40.27	House Movers Section of NZ Heavy Haulage Association Inc.	20.21 Rule	Oppose	The submitter seeks that relocated dwellings and buildings be provided for in the Proposed Plan as a permitted activity subject to the suggested performance standards/conditions.	Delete Rule 20.21
40.28	House Movers Section of NZ Heavy Haulage Association Inc.	20.7.3 Rule	Oppose	The submitter seeks that relocated dwellings and buildings be provided for in the Proposed Plan as a permitted activity subject to the suggested performance standards/conditions.	Delete Rule 20.7.3
40.29	House Movers Section of NZ Heavy	20.1 Rule	In-Part	The submitter seeks that relocated dwellings and buildings be provided for in the Proposed	Amend Rule 20.1 to include <u>"The placement of any Relocated</u>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
	Haulage Association Inc.			Plan as a permitted activity subject to the suggested performance standards/conditions.	<u>building and/or accessory building on any site subject to the conditions at [rule ref]".</u>
40.30	House Movers Section of NZ Heavy Haulage Association Inc.	20.6 Rule	In-Part	The submitter seeks that relocated dwellings and buildings be provided for in the Proposed Plan as a permitted activity subject to the suggested performance standards/conditions.	<p>Include the following performance standards/conditions (or to the same or similar effect) for relocated buildings:</p> <p>Permitted Activity Standards for Relocated Buildings</p> <p>i) <u>Any relocated building intended for use as a dwelling (excluding previously used garages and accessory buildings) must have previously been designed, built and used as a dwelling.</u></p> <p>ii) <u>A building pre-inspection report shall accompany the application for a building consent for the destination sit. That report is to identify all reinstatement works that are to be completed to the exterior of the building.</u></p> <p>iii) <u>The building shall be located on permanent foundations approved by building consent, no later than [2] months of the being moved to the site.</u></p> <p>iv) <u>All other reinstatement work required by the building inspection report and the building consent to reinstate the exterior of any relocated dwelling shall be completed with [12] months of the building being delivered</u></p>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
	House Movers Section of NZ Heavy Haulage Association Inc.				<u>to the site. Without limiting (iii) (above) reinstatement work is to include connections to all infrastructure services and closing in and ventilation of the foundations. v)The proposed owner of the relocated building must certify to the Council that the reinstatement work will be completed within the [12] month period.</u>
40.31	House Movers Section of NZ Heavy Haulage Association Inc.	General Matters 40 – Relocated Buildings	Oppose	The submitter seeks that any provision in the Plan for a performance bond or any restrictive covenants for the removal, re-siting, and relocation of dwellings and buildings be deleted.	Delete any provision in the Plan for a performance bond or any restrictive covenants for the removal, re-siting, and relocation of dwellings and buildings
40.32	House Movers Section of NZ Heavy Haulage Association Inc.	15.7.1(a)(iii) Rule	Oppose	Submitter seeks that any provision in the Plan for a performance bond or any restrictive covenants for the removal, re-siting, and relocation of dwellings and buildings be deleted.	Delete any provision in the Plan for a performance bond or any restrictive covenants for the removal, re-siting, and relocation of dwellings and buildings. Inferred delete Rule 15.7.1(a)(iii).
40.33	House Movers Section of NZ Heavy Haulage Association Inc.	16.7.3(a)(iii) Rule	Oppose	Submitter seeks that any provision in the Plan for a performance bond or any restrictive covenants for the removal, re-siting, and relocation of dwellings and buildings be deleted.	Delete any provision in the Plan for a performance bond or any restrictive covenants for the removal, re-siting, and relocation of dwellings and buildings. Inferred delete Rule 16.7.3(a)(iii).
40.34	House Movers Section of NZ Heavy Haulage Association Inc.	17.7.3(a)(iii) Rule	Oppose	Submitter seeks that any provision in the Plan for a performance bond or any restrictive covenants for the removal, re-siting, and relocation of dwellings and buildings be	Delete any provision in the Plan for a performance bond or any restrictive covenants for the removal, re-siting, and relocation of dwellings and

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				deleted.	buildings. Inferred delete Rule 17.7.3(a)(iii).
40.35	House Movers Section of NZ Heavy Haulage Association Inc.	19.7.6(a)(iii) Rule	Oppose	Submitter seeks that any provision in the Plan for a performance bond or any restrictive covenants for the removal, re-siting, and relocation of dwellings and buildings be deleted.	Delete any provision in the Plan for a performance bond or any restrictive covenants for the removal, re-siting, and relocation of dwellings and buildings. Inferred delete Rule 19.7.6(a)(iii).
40.36	House Movers Section of NZ Heavy Haulage Association Inc.	20.7.3.(b) Rule	Oppose	Submitter seeks that any provision in the Plan for a performance bond or any restrictive covenants for the removal, re-siting, and relocation of dwellings and buildings be deleted.	Delete any provision in the Plan for a performance bond or any restrictive covenants for the removal, re-siting, and relocation of dwellings and buildings. Inferred delete Rule 20.7.3(b).
40.37	House Movers Section of NZ Heavy Haulage Association Inc.	General Matters 40 -Relocated Buildings	In-Part	The submitter seeks a discretionary activity rule to restrict the use of restrictive covenants for the removal, resiting, and relocation of dwellings and buildings.	Include a discretionary activity rule to restrict the use of restrictive covenants for the removal, resiting, and relocation of dwellings and buildings.
40.38	House Movers Section of NZ Heavy Haulage Association Inc.	26 Definitions – Relocated Building	In-Part	Amend the definition of relocated building	Amend the definition of Relocated Building. Relocated Building means any previously used building which is transported in whole or In-Parts and re-located from its original site to a new <u>its destination</u> site; but excludes any pre-fabricated building which is delivered dismantled to a site for erection on that site.
40.39	House Movers Section of NZ Heavy Haulage Association	15.1(f) Rule	In-Part	Amend permitted activity rule to include removal and re-siting of buildings.	Amend Rule 15.1(f) as follows: “The construction, alteration of, addition to, <u>removal, re-siting</u> and

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
	Inc.				demolition of buildings and structures for any permitted activity”.
40.40	House Movers Section of NZ Heavy Haulage Association Inc.	16.1(k) Rule	In-Part	Amend permitted activity rule to include removal and re-siting of buildings.	Amend Rule 16.1(k) as follows: “The construction, alteration of, addition to, <u>removal, re-siting</u> and demolition of buildings and structures for any permitted activity”.
40.41	House Movers Section of NZ Heavy Haulage Association Inc.	17.1(m) Rule	In-Part	Amend permitted activity rule to include removal and re-siting of buildings.	Amend Rule 17.1(m) as follows: “The construction, alteration of, addition to, <u>removal, re-siting</u> and demolition of buildings and structures for any permitted activity”.
40.42	House Movers Section of NZ Heavy Haulage Association Inc.	19.1(g) Rule	In-Part	Amend permitted activity rule to include removal and re-siting of buildings.	Amend Rule 19.1(g) as follows: “The construction, alteration of, addition to, <u>removal, re-siting</u> and demolition of buildings and structures for any permitted activity”.
40.43	House Movers Section of NZ Heavy Haulage Association Inc.	20.1(d) Rule	In-Part	Amend permitted activity rule to include removal and re-siting of buildings.	Amend Rule 20.1(d) as follows: “The construction, alteration of, addition to, <u>removal, re-siting</u> and demolition of buildings and structures for any permitted activity”.
41.00	Powerco	6.1.1 Objective	Support	The submitter supports Objective 6.1.1	Retain Objective 6.1.1 without modification
41.01	Powerco	6.1.4 Policy	In-Part	Amend Policy 6.1.4 to recognise the need to provide a secure energy supply, comprising gas and/or electricity, in addition to water supply, stormwater and wastewater disposal infrastructure.	Amend Policy 6.1.4 to read as follows Ensure that all developments within the urban settlements provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water supply suitable for human consumption and fire fighting; • Facilities for the collection, treatment, and disposal of sewage

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
					<p>and other wastes in a manner that maintains community and environmental health; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For the collection and disposal of surface-water run-off in a way which avoids worsening any localised inundation; <u>and</u> <u>The ability to connect to a secure gas and / or electricity supply.</u>
41.02	Powerco	12.1.1 Objective	Support	Submitter supports Objective 12.1.1	Retain Objective 12.1.1 without modification.
41.03	Powerco	12.1.2 Policy	Support	Submitter supports Policy 12.1.2	Retain Policy 12.1.2 without modification.
41.04	Powerco	12.1.3 Policy	Support	Submitter supports Policy 12.1.3	Retain Policy 12.1.3 without modification.
41.05	Powerco	12.1.4 Policy	Support	Submitter supports Policy 12.1.4	Retain Policy 12.1.4 without modification.
41.06	Powerco	12.1.5 Policy	Support	Submitter supports Policy 12.1.5	Retain Policy 12.1.5 without modification.
41.07	Powerco	12.1.6 Policy	Support	Submitter supports Policy 12.1.6	Retain Policy 12.1.6 without modification.
41.08	Powerco	12.1.7 Policy	Support	Submitter supports Policy 12.1.7	Retain Policy 12.1.7 without modification.
41.09	Powerco	12.1.8 Policy	Support	Submitter supports Policy 12.1.8	Retain Policy 12.1.8 without modification.
41.10	Powerco	12.1.9 Policy	Support	Submitter supports Policy 12.1.9	Retain Policy 12.1.9 without modification.
41.11	Powerco	12.1 Issue Discussion	Support	Submitter supports the fourth paragraph if the issue discussion for 12.1.	Retain the fourth paragraph of the issue discussion for 12.1 without modification.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
41.12	Powerco	12.1 Methods	Support	Submitter supports the Methods for Issue 12.1 and Objective 12.1.1.	Retain the Methods for Issue 12.1 and Objective 12.1.1 without modification.
41.13	Powerco	14.1.1 Objective	Support	Submitter supports Objective 14.1.1	Retain Objective 14.1.1 without modification.
41.14	Powerco	14.1.2 Policy	Support	Submitter supports Policy 14.1.2.1	Retain Policy 14.1.2 without modification.
41.15	Powerco	15.1(i) Rule	Support	Submitter supports Rule 15.1(i)	Retain Rule 15.1(i) without modification.
41.16	Powerco	16.1(m) Rule	Support	Submitter supports Rule 16.1(m)	Retain Rule 16.1(m) without modification
41.17	Powerco	17.1(o) Rule	Support	Submitter supports Rule 17.1(o)	Retain Rule 17.1(o) without modification
41.18	Powerco	19.1(k) Rule	Support	Submitter supports Rule 19.1(k)	Retain Rule 19.1(k) without modification.
41.19	Powerco	20.1(f) Rule	Support	Submitter supports Rule 20.1(f)	Retain Rule 20.1(f) without modification.
41.20	Powerco	26 Definitions – Official Signs	In-Part	The Plan should include provision for asset identification and health and safety sign to be erected without the need for consent. The definition of ‘official signs’ should be amended.	Amend the definition of Official signs to encompass asset identification and health and safety signs, Or, alternatively asset identification and health and safety signs could be included within the list of permitted signs by adding “ <u>identification and/or health and safety signs associated with infrastructure</u> ” to the following zones, Residential, Industrial, Commercial, Rural and Open Space.
41.21	Powerco	15.1(j) Rule	Support	Submitter supports Rule 15.1(j)	Retain Rule 15.1(j) without modification
41.22	Powerco	16.1(n) Rule	Support	Submitter supports Rule 16.1(n)	Retain Rule 16.1(n) without modification

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
41.23	Powerco	17.1(p) Rule	Support	Submitter supports Rule 17.1(p)	Retain Rule 17.1(p) without modification
41.24	Powerco	19.1(m) Rule	Support	Submitter supports Rule 19.1(m)	Retain Rule 19.1(m) without modification.
41.25	Powerco	20.1(g) Rule	Support	Submitter supports Rule 20.1(g)	Retain Rule 20.1(g) without modification
41.26	Powerco	15.4(h) Rule	Support	Submitter supports Rule 15.4(h)	Retain Rule 15.4(h) without modification
41.27	Powerco	16.4(e) Rule	Support	Submitter supports Rule 16.4(e)	Retain Rule 16.4(e) without modification
41.28	Powerco	17.4(g) Rule	Support	Submitter supports Rule 17.4(g)	Retain Rule 17.4(g) without modification
41.29	Powerco	19.4.8 Rule	Support	Submitter supports Rule 19.4.8	Retain Rule 19.4.8 without modification
41.30	Powerco	20.4(d) Rule	Support	Submitter supports Rule 20.4(d)	Retain Rule 20.4(d) without modification
41.31	Powerco	15.6.23 Rule	Support	Submitter supports Rule 15.6.23	Retain Rule 15.6.23 without modification
41.32	Powerco	16.6.15 Rule	Support	Submitter supports Rule 16.6.15	Retain Rule 16.6.15 without modification
41.33	Powerco	17.6.17(a) Rule	Support	Submitter supports Rule 17.6.17(a)	Retain Rule 17.6.17(a) without modification
41.34	Powerco	19.6.22 Rule	Support	Submitter supports Rule 19.6.22	Retain Rule 19.6.22 without modification
41.35	Powerco	20.6.15 Rule	Support	Submitter supports Rule 20.6.15	Retain Rule 20.6.15 without modification
41.36	Powerco	15.7.5(a)(iv)	In-Part	Submitter seeks amendment to Rule 15.7.5(a)(iv) to include reference to gas.	Amend Rule 15.7.5(a)(iv) as follows The provision of servicing, including water supply, wastewater systems, stormwater management and disposal, streetlighting, telecommunications and

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
					electricity <u>and, where applicable, gas.</u>
41.37	Powerco	16.7.1(a)(iv) Rule	In-Part	Submitter seeks amendment to Rule 16.7.1(a)(iv) to include reference to gas.	Amend Rule 16.7.1(a)(iv) as follows The provision of servicing, including water supply, wastewater systems, stormwater management and disposal, streetlighting, telecommunications and electricity <u>and, where applicable, gas.</u>
41.38	Powerco	17.7.1(a)(iv) Rule	In-Part	Submitter seeks amendment to Rule 17.7.1(a)(iv) to include reference to gas.	Amend Rule 17.7.1(a)(iv) as follows The provision of servicing, including water supply, wastewater systems, stormwater management and disposal, streetlighting, telecommunications and electricity <u>and, where applicable, gas.</u>
41.39	Powerco	20.7.1(a)(iv) Rule	In-Part	Submitter seeks amendment to Rule 20.7.1(a)(iv) to include reference to gas.	Amend Rule 20.7.1(a)(iv) as follows The provision of servicing, including water supply, wastewater systems, stormwater management and disposal, streetlighting, telecommunications and electricity <u>and, where applicable, gas.</u>
41.40	Powerco	22 General Matters	Support	Submitter supports the first paragraph of the introduction to Chapter 22	Retain without modification the first paragraph of the introduction to Chapter 22.
41.41	Powerco	22.1.1 Rule	Support	Submitter supports the approach of Rule 22.1.1 and seeks the retention of this rule.	Retain Rule 22.1.1 without modification.
41.42	Powerco	22.1.5(a) Rule	Support	Submitter supports the approach of Rule 22.1.5(a) and seeks the retention of this rule.	Retain Rule 22.1.5(a) without modification.
41.43	Powerco	22.1.5(c) Rule	Support	Submitter supports the approach of Rule 22.1.5(c) and seeks the retention of this rule.	Retain Rule 22.1.5(c) without modification.
41.44	Powerco	22.1.6 Rule	Support	Submitter supports the approach of Rule	Retain Rule 22.1.6 without

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				22.1.6 and seeks the retention of this rule.	modification.
41.45	Powerco	22.1.10(a) Rule	In-Part	Submitter seeks that Rule 22.1.10 be amended to provide for the maintenance and replacement of existing gas transmission and distribution infrastructure as a permitted activity.	Amend Rule 22.1.10(a) as follows The maintenance and replacement of the following utilities: (i) Existing transformers and lines above ground for conveying electricity at all voltages and capacities. (ii) Existing telecommunication lines. (iii) Existing telecommunication and radiocommunication facilities. (iv) Existing buildings and depots. (v) Existing weather radar. (vi) Existing river protection works. (vii) Existing gas transmission and distribution facilities.
41.46	Powerco	23.1.1(h) Rule	Support	Submitter supports Rule 23.1.1(h) as it exempts gas and oil pipelines from this requirement.	Retain without modification Rule 23.1.1(h)
41.47	Powerco	24.2.7 Rule	In-Part	Submitter seeks amendments to Rule 24.2.7 to provide greater certainty around the obligation on developers to ensure the availability of network utility services such as gas, electricity and telecommunications to new subdivision and development.	Amend Rule 24.2.7 as follows: (a) Utility services, <u>including electricity, telecommunications and gas (where proposed), shall be provided to the boundary of each additional allotment at the time of subdivision in accordance with:</u> <u>(i) The requirements of the relevant supply authority, including any necessary easements. Written confirmation from the relevant supply authority shall be provided so that the subdivision can be adequately</u>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
	Powerco				<p><u>supplied.</u></p> <p>(ii) shall be provided in accordance with the permitted activity conditions in Rule 22.1.</p> <p><u>Except that installation of utility services will not be required at the time of subdivision where only one additional lot is being created and where the supply authority has confirmed in writing that connection is available at the standard fee.</u></p> <p><u>(b) Any necessary easements for the protection of utility services shall be provided where they traverse any new allotment, right of way of access lot. All such easements shall be in favour of the utility provider.</u></p>
41.48	Powerco	25.7.5 Assessment Criteria	In-Part	Submitter seeks amendment to Assessment Criteria 25.7 to address the provision of network utilities, such as electricity, gas and telecommunications to new subdivision and development.	<p>Amend Assessment Criteria 25.7.5 by adding new clause as follows:</p> <p><u>Provision of electricity, gas and telecommunications</u></p> <p>(i) <u>The extent to which connections electricity, gas and telecommunications networks are available to service the needs of the development and/or subdivision.</u></p>
41.49	Powerco	25.7.12 Assessment	Support	Submitter supports the retention of	Retain Assessment Criteria 25.7.12

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
		Criteria		Assessment Criteria 25.7.12 without modification.	without modification.
41.50	Powerco	26 Definitions – Network Utility	Support	Submitter supports the definition of Network Utility which includes any pipeline for the distribution or transmission of natural or manufactured gas and any necessary incidental equipment, including compressors and gate stations.	Retain the definition of Network Utility without modification.
41.51	Powerco	28.2.2(b)	In-Part	Submitter seeks the introduction of an information requirement to 28.2.2(b) for all consents to identify the location of any gas pipelines (and infrastructure generally) on the development site.	Amend 28.2.2(b) as follows: (46)A description of the site of the proposed activity including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Any existing network utility infrastructure, including underground services.</u>
41.52	Powerco	28.2.4(n)	In-Part	Submitter supports the general intent of 28.2.4 but seeks a specific reference to gas and to the potential need to create easements associated with network utility provisions.	Amend 28.2.4 as follows: (n) Lighting and Other Services: Road lighting and the proposed location and type of power <u>electricity, gas</u> and telephone services <u>as well as details of any easements necessary for the protection of utility services</u>
41.53	Powerco	28.3	In-Part	Submitter supports the general intent of 28.3 In-Particular the first three paragraphs which relate to the developer's obligations. The submitter seeks a specific reference to gas infrastructure.	Amend the first paragraph of 28.3 to include a specific reference to 'gas' infrastructure.
42.00	Vector Gas Ltd	22.1.10 Rule	In-Part	Submitter seeks amendments to Rule 22.1.10 to undertake necessary routine planned maintenance work and emergency repair work and to enable Vector, as a utility	Amend Rule 22.1.10 as follows: ...(vii) <u>Existing gas pipelines and associated above ground station sites.</u>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				operator, to maintain its asset in a safe and efficient manner.	
42.01	Vector Gas Ltd	25.1.1 Assessment Criteria	In-Part	Submitter seeks amendment to Assessment Criteria to ensure that advice is sought from the utility operator to understand the effect an activity can have on the operating requirements of particular infrastructure.	Amend Assessment Criteria 25.1.1 as follows: (m) The extent a proposed subdivision and subsequent land use will affect the efficient and effective operative of district significant infrastructure. <u>Such consideration will be based on advice provided by the infrastructure manager.</u>
42.02	Vector Gas Ltd	25.7.12 Assessment Criteria	In-Part	Submitter seeks amendment to ensure that consideration is given to other activities such as land use that have the potential to adversely affect the safe and effective operation of significant infrastructure such as gas transmission pipelines.	Amend Assessment Criteria 25.7.12 as follows: ...(g) <u>The extent to which a proposed activity will affect the efficient and effective operation of district significant infrastructure. Such consideration will be based on advice provided by the infrastructure manager.</u>
42.03	Vector Gas Ltd	28.2.3	In-Part	Submitter seeks that any resource consent application for an activity near regionally significant infrastructure should provide specific information to ensure that such effects are considered and recognised appropriately. To understand the effect an activity may have on the operation of such infrastructure communication with the infrastructure operator is crucial.	Amend 28.2.3 as follows: ...(j) <u>Regionally Significant Infrastructure</u> <u>Any resource consent application for an activity near regionally significant infrastructure shall supply the following information:</u> <u>(i) The location of any existing regionally significant infrastructure in relation to the proposed activity.</u> <u>(ii) Comments from the infrastructure</u>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
					<u>operator confirming what effects the proposed activity may have on the operation of such infrastructure.</u>
43.00	Franklyn Leong & Heather Brown	Planning Map 28A	Oppose	The submitter lives on the corner of Bristol Street and Essex Street and opposes the rezoning of Residential properties to Commercial. Reasons for opposing this rezoning generally include concerns relating to traffic, the environment, health, pets, children and elderly. Existing vacant commercial and industrial buildings should be utilised before encroaching on Residential dwellings.	Amend Planning Map 28A to rezone the properties in Essex Street that are proposed to be rezoned Commercial, by zoning them Residential.
44.00	Genesis Power Ltd	Introduction – Part B Objectives & Policies	In-Part	When assessing a resource consent application under section 104 of the RMA, the activity does not have to comply with each and every objective and policy in the relevant plan, but rather the relevant objectives and policies must be looked at in a holistic and comprehensive manner. This should be outlined within Part B – Objectives and Policies.	Amend the following paragraph after the third paragraph In-Part A Introduction (Part B – Objectives and Policies) as follows: <u>While the objectives and policies form a comprehensive suite of outcomes for the region, the individual provisions can conflict with one another. For this reason, no single objective or policy should be read in isolation. Assessing whether an activity is appropriate requires an overall broad judgement to be made as to how it fits within the overall scheme of the District Plan and provides for the achievement of the environmental outcomes sought for the Horowhenua District.</u>
44.01	Genesis Power Ltd	12.2.1 Objective	In-Part	Objective 12.2.1 generally gives effect to the	Amend Objective 12.2.1 as follows:

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
	Genesis Power Ltd			Renewables NPS however it would benefit from being reworded to be clearer in its meaning and more concise.	To recognise the need for , and provide for the development and use of <u>renewable electricity generation infrastructure, where the adverse effects on the environment can be energy utilising renewable resources through appropriately sited and designed renewable electricity generation activities, while ensuring environmental effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated.</u>
44.02	Genesis Power Ltd	12.2.2 Policy	Support	Policy 12.2.2 gives effect to Policy E1 of the Renewables NPS and on this basis it is supported.	Retain Policy 12.2.2 without modification.
44.03	Genesis Power Ltd	12.2.3 Policy	In-Part	Policy 12.2.3 provides for the continued operation, maintenance and upgrading of existing renewable electricity generation infrastructure. Submitter seeks to amend the policy to ensure consistency with the Act.	Amend Policy 12.2.3 as follows: Provide for small domestic scale renewable electricity generation facilities where their adverse effects on the environment are not significant <u>can be avoided, remedied or mitigated.</u>
44.04	Genesis Power Ltd	12.2.4 Policy	In-Part	While the submitter supports the intent of Policy 12.2.4 it repeats Objective 12.2.1 and should be deleted.	Delete Policy 12.2.4 in its entirety.
44.05	Genesis Power Ltd	12.2.5 Policy	In-Part	Policy 12.2.5 gives effect to the renewables NPS however would be better served if it was separated into two policies, given the diversity of the issues that it covers.	Amend Policy 12.2.5 to read: Recognise the contribution of renewable energy use and development to the well-being of the District, Region and Nation and the technical, locational and operational requirements of energy generation and

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
					<p>distribution operations and infrastructure in setting environmental standards and assessing applications for resource consent.</p> <p>Include Policy XX which reads: <u>Recognise the technical, locational and operational requirements of energy generation and distribution operations and infrastructure in setting environmental standards and assessing applications for resource consent.</u></p>
44.06	Genesis Power Ltd	12.2.6 Policy	Oppose	<p>Submitter opposes Policy 12.2.6 as it replicates Objective 12.2.1 and seeks to afford greater protection to “those parts of the environment most sensitive to change”. The plan defines Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes (Plan Change 22), however does not identify “parts of the environment most sensitive to change”. On the basis that the assessment of this policy will be subjective and replicates Objective 12.2.1, it is considered Policy 12.2.6 should be deleted in its entirety.</p>	Delete Policy 12.2.6 in its entirety.
44.07	Genesis Power Ltd	12.2.7 Policy	In-Part	<p>Submitter seeks amendment to Policy 12.2.7. Plan Change 22 has adopted a noncomplying activity status for activities within Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Features. The two tiered non-complying threshold test requires applicants to meet one of the two threshold tests in order for consent to be granted. Policy 12.2.7 sets an</p>	<p>Amend Policy 12.2.7 as follows: Avoid the development of renewable electricity generation facilities where they will adversely affect effects on the character and values of Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes <u>cannot be avoided, remedied or mitigated.</u></p>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
	Genesis Power Ltd			inappropriate policy framework in that it seeks to avoid any development that generates adverse effects on the character and values of Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes.	
44.08	Genesis Power Ltd	12.2.8 Policy	Oppose	Submitter opposes Policy 12.2.8. The Tararua Ranges are identified as an Outstanding Landscape within the District Plan. Policy 12.2.8 essentially extends the Outstanding Landscape zone to encompass any property outside of the area, by requiring views from the Levin urban area of the ranges are not interrupted. This creates a pseudo Outstanding Landscape overlay on a large portion of the District. On this basis, Policy 12.2.8 is considered to be onerous and does not give effect to the Renewables NPS.	Delete Policy 12.2.8 in its entirety.
44.09	Genesis Power Ltd	12.2.9 Policy	Support	Submitter supports Policy 12.2.9 as it gives effect to Policy G of the Renewables NPS, which provides for the investigation, identification and assessment of potential sites and energy sources for renewable electricity generation.	Retain Policy 12.2.9 in its entirety.
44.10	Genesis Power Ltd	12.2.10 Policy	Support	Submitter supports Policy 12.2.10 as it gives effect to Policy G of the Renewables NPS, which provides for the investigation, identification and assessment of potential sites and energy sources for renewable electricity generation.	Retain Policy 12.2.10 in its entirety.
44.11	Genesis Power Ltd	12.2.11 Policy	Support	Submitter supports Policy 12.2.11 as it gives effect to Policy D of the Renewables NPS,	Retain Policy 12.2.11 in its entirety.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				which seeks to avoid reverse sensitivity effects.	
44.12	Genesis Power Ltd	12.2.12 Policy	In-Part	Submitter generally supports Policy 12.2.12 but considers that it does not appropriately respond to the identified issues within the Utilities and Energy Chapter, nor does it support Objective 12.2.1. Submitter seeks that the policy would be better suited to those chapters which provide for subdivision and development (i.e. zone chapters).	Delete Policy 12.2.12 from Chapter 12 and reinstate in Chapters 2, 5, 6, and 7.
44.13	Genesis Power Ltd	12.2.13 Policy	In-Part	Submitter generally supports Policy 12.2.13 but considers that it does not appropriately respond to the identified issues within the Utilities and Energy Chapter, nor does it support Objective 12.2.1. Submitter considers that the policy would be better suited to those chapters which provide for subdivision and development (i.e. zone chapters).	Delete Policy 12.2.13 from Chapter 12 and reinstate in Chapters 2, 5, 6, and 7.
44.14	Genesis Power Ltd	12.2.14 Policy	In-Part	Submitter generally supports Policy 12.2.14 but considers that it does not appropriately respond to the identified issues within the Utilities and Energy Chapter, nor does it support Objective 12.2.1. Submitter considers that the policy would be better suited to chapter 10 (Transportation).	Delete Policy 12.2.14 from Chapter 12 and reinstate in Chapter 10.
44.15	Genesis Power Ltd	22 General Matters	In-Part	Chapter 22 contains a list of permitted activities. It is not clear in the chapter what activity status an activity defaults to if it does not meet the permitted activity standard. The plan appears to be silent in this regard. If the	Include statement within Chapter 22 clarifying the activity status of those activities not complying with the permitted activity criteria. Include new Controlled Activity rule for

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
	Genesis Power Ltd			intention is for activities not complying with the permitted activity criteria to default to a discretionary activity, it is proposed that a new controlled activity provision is applied to wind monitoring masts.	wind monitoring masts not complying with Rule 22.1.8(b). <u>Rule XX</u> <u>Any wind monitoring mast not complying with Condition 22.1.8 is a controlled activity. Control is reserved over:</u> <u>i. The scale and bulk of the wind monitoring mast in relation to the site;</u> <u>ii. The built characteristic of the locality;</u> <u>iii. The extent to which the effects of the height can be mitigated by setbacks, planting, design or the topography of the site;</u> <u>iv. Effects on landscape values;</u> <u>v. Effects on amenity values;</u> <u>vi. Duration of consent sought.</u>
44.16	Genesis Power Ltd	22 General Matters	In-Part	For completeness, it is considered that all rules pertaining to Utilities and Energy should be included within Chapter 22. For example, Rule 19.4.6(b) provides for wind energy facilities in the Rural Zone as a discretionary activity. The discretionary activity status for wind energy facilities is supported. Furthermore, it is noted that the plan does not specifically provide for other forms of renewable electricity generation. It would be helpful if this matter was addressed in Chapter 22 also.	Include all rules relating to Utilities and Energy in Chapter 22. Include new Rule in Chapter 22 which provides for the development and on-going use of renewable energy infrastructure as a Discretionary Activity.
44.17	Genesis Power Ltd	22.1.8(b)(i) Rule	Support	Submitters supports Rule 22.1.8(b)(i) as it	Retain Rule 22.1.8(b)(i)

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				provides for wind monitoring masts, up to 80 metres in height as a permitted activity, which is considered appropriate.	
44.18	Genesis Power Ltd	22.1.8(b)(ii) Rule	In-Part	Submitter opposes Rule 22.1.8(b)(ii) as it prescribes a maximum diameter of 250mm as a permitted activity. It is considered that the maximum diameter prescribed by this rule may preclude the use of typical wind monitoring structures which have a width greater than 250mm	Amend Rule 22.1.(b)(ii) as follows (ii) Maximum Diameter 250mm <u>500mm.</u>
44.19	Genesis Power Ltd	22.1.8(b)(iii) Rule	In-Part	Submitter opposes Rule 22.1.8(b)(iii) as it imposes an arbitrary setback of 500 metres from all boundaries. Often wind farms comprise of multiple computer freehold registers (formerly certificates of titles) and as such the rule has the potential to default the erection of a wind monitoring device to a Discretionary Activity. The 500 metre setback seems excessive. It is considered that any offset required should be from the notional boundary of the site as this is where the amenity is likely to be affected.	Amend Rule 22.1.8(b)(iii) to read: (ii) Minimum Setback: 500 metres from all boundaries <u>25 metres from the notional boundary of any site, not owned by the owner of the site on which the wind monitoring mast is to be located.</u> Sub-sequential Amendment to the definition of “site” as follows: an area of land comprised wholly of one (1) <u>computer freehold register certificate of title</u> ; or the area of land contained within an allotment on an approved plan of subdivision; or the area of land which is intended for the exclusive occupation by one (1) residential unit; or an area of land held in one (1) computer <u>freehold</u> register. Sub-sequential Amendment to the

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
	Genesis Power Ltd				definition of “notional boundary” as follows: with regard to the measurement of noise, the legal boundary of the property site on which any rural dwelling is located or a line 20m from the dwelling whichever point is closer to the dwelling.
44.20	Genesis Power Ltd	26 Definitions – Site	In-Part	Submitter seeks sub-sequential amendment to definition of “Site”. See submission point 44.19	Amend definition of Site as follows: an area of land comprised wholly of one (1) <u>computer freehold register certificate of title</u> ; or the area of land contained within an allotment on an approved plan of subdivision; or the area of land which is intended for the exclusive occupation by one (1) residential unit; or an area of land held in one (1) computer <u>freehold</u> register
44.21	Genesis Power Ltd	26 Definitions – Notional Boundary	In-Part	Submitter seeks sub-sequential amendment to definition of Site. See submission point 44.19	Amend definition of Notional Boundary as follows: ...with regard to the measurement of noise, the legal boundary of the property site on which any rural dwelling is located or a line 20m from the dwelling whichever point is closer to the dwelling.
44.22	Genesis Power Ltd	25.2.1(d) Assessment Criteria	In-Part	Submitter seeks amendment to Assessment Criteria 25.2.1(d). To give effect to the Renewables NPS, it is considered appropriate that regard is had to any reverse sensitivity effect that may be generated by the	Amend Assessment Criteria 25.2.1(d) as follows: The likelihood of the proposed activity to generate reverse sensitivity effects on the primary production, existing

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				establishment of a land use activity in proximity to an existing renewable energy generation site.	renewable energy generation sites and intensive farming activities, and the potential impact these may have on the continuing effective and efficient operation of the primary production, <u>existing renewable energy generation</u> and intensive farming activities.
44.23	Genesis Power Ltd	25.7.12(f) Assessment Criteria	In-Part	Submitter seeks amendment to Assessment Criteria 25.7.12(f) to include wind monitoring masts. Wind monitoring masts are located in the most operationally and technically practicable location on a site to obtain the necessary wind speed and direction data.	Amend Assessment Criteria 25.7.12(f) as follows: <u>With respect to network utilities,</u> W whether alternative locations, routes or other options are economically, operationally, physically or technically practicable.
44.24	Genesis Power Ltd	25.2.1 Assessment Criteria	In-Part	Submitter seeks that the positive local, regional and national benefits of an activity are recognised in the assessment of an activity.	Amend Assessment Criteria 25.2.1 to include the following: <u>(l) The positive local, regional and national benefits promoted by the development or use</u>
44.25	Genesis Power Ltd	25.7.13(a)(ii) Assessment Criteria	Oppose	Submitter opposes Assessment Criteria 25.7.13(a) (ii). The effects of a windfarm should be considered based on the information supplied in an application and balanced with a broad judgement of effects of the development accordingly. On this basis, it is considered that Assessment criteria 25.7.13(a)(ii) is inappropriate and should be deleted in its entirety.	Delete Assessment Criteria 25.7.13(a)(ii) in its entirety.
44.26	Genesis Power Ltd	25.7.13(b) Assessment Criteria	In-Part	Submitter seeks an amendment to Assessment Criteria 25.7.13(b). The	Amend Assessment Criteria 25.7.13(b) as follows:

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				management of waterways is a Regional Council function and as such reference to “impacts on waterways” should be removed from Assessment Criteria 25.7.13(b).	The ecological impact of the proposal, including the extent of disruption to vegetation and habitat, any impacts on waterways, and the likely effect on birds and other fauna.
44.27	Genesis Power Ltd	25.7.13(i) Assessment Criteria	In-Part	Submitter seeks amendment to Assessment Criteria 25.7.13(i). It is considered appropriate that the positive, local, regional and national benefits of an activity are recognised in the assessment of the development and use of renewable energy infrastructure.	Amend Assessment Criteria 25.7.13(i) as follows: The <u>positive local, regional and national</u> benefits to be derived from <u>the use and development of renewable energy infrastructure.</u>
45.00	Landlink Ltd	19.6.4(viii) Rule	Support	Submitter supports Rule 19.6.4(viii).	Retain Rule 19.6.4(viii)
46.00	Vincero Holdings Ltd	19.6.13(a) Rule	Oppose	Oppose this rule as the sites of significance to Maori have not been identified in the Plan and it could lead to the situation where people use this rule inappropriately.	Delete Rule 19.6.13(a)
46.01	Vincero Holdings Ltd	24.1.1 Rule	Oppose	Oppose part 24.1.1 which requires compliance with NZS 4404:2010 for all subdivision and development. Development as defined in the Plan definitions is all encompassing. With NZS 4404:2010 containing provisions for roads to be less than 20 metres wide there are inconsistencies between the rules. Compliance with NZS 4404:2010 is problematic in itself given there are elements in the standard that are discretionary on the part of the relevant Territorial Authority.	Delete Rule 24.1.1 in its entirety and have these matters becomes matters that are considered in the consent process.
46.02	Vincero Holdings Ltd	Planning Map 7	Oppose	Submitter opposes Planning Map 7 which	Amend Planning Map 7 so that the

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				show part of the submitter's land within the Proposed Coastal Natural Character and Hazards Area and Coastal Outstanding Natural Feature Landscape (ONFL). These matters have already been addressed through a comprehensive management plan for the property. The implications of the planning maps could result in inconsistent administration of the provisions applying the planning maps and management plan.	Proposed Coastal Natural Character and Hazards Area and Coastal Outstanding Natural Feature Landscape (ONFL) are amended to the area covered by D135 on the Planning Maps and removed from Lot 1 DP 48282.
46.03	Vincero Holdings Ltd	Planning Map 41	Oppose	Submitter opposes Planning Map 41 which show part of the submitter's land within the Proposed Coastal Natural Character and Hazards Area and Coastal Outstanding Natural Feature Landscape (ONFL). These matters have already been addressed through a comprehensive management plan for the property. The implications of the planning maps could result in inconsistent administration of the provisions applying the planning maps and management plan.	Amend Planning Map 41 so that the Proposed Coastal Natural Character and Hazards Area and Coastal Outstanding Natural Feature Landscape (ONFL) are amended to the area covered by D135 on the Planning Maps and removed from Lot 1 DP 48282.
46.04	Vincero Holdings Ltd	General Matters 46	In-Part	The relationship between Plan Change 22, earlier Plan Change 20 and now the overlay of the Proposed Coastal Natural character and Hazard Area could lead to inconsistent administration between the District Plan and the Management Plan specifically developed through the RMA process for the submitter's land. The submitter opposes the provisions which could result in these inconsistencies.	Amend the Plan so that the Proposed Coastal Natural Character and Hazards Area and Coastal Outstanding Natural Feature Landscape (ONFL) are amended to the area covered by D135 on the Planning Maps and removed from Lot 1 DP 48282. Alternatively amend the provisions in Chapters 3, 5, 8 and 19 to give effect

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
					and enables the certified Muhunua Forest Park management Plan that is contained in file SUB/2729/2009.
47.00	Palmerston North City Council	14 General Matters	Support	Submitter is supportive of the consultative approach and process outlined in relation to consenting Windfarm developments which have the potential to impact on the submitter. The proposed objective, policies and methods outline in Chapter 14 is supported.	Retain the planning approach and process for managing cross boundary issues in relation to wind farm applications.
48.00	Carolyn Dawson	19.6.4(a) Rule	In-Part	Submitter supports the 10 metres setback distance for all houses on rural properties. Oppose the allowance made for smaller (<5000m ²) rural properties to have a reduced setback distance of 3 metres. The rural aspect of subdivision is being taken away by housing being concentrated too close together.	Retain 10 metre setback requirement for rural properties and require smaller rural properties (<5000m ²) to apply for the 10 metre setback distance to be reduced with neighbouring parties having the ability to have their say about the reduced setback sought.
49.00	Alan & Marie Blundell	Planning 36	Oppose	Oppose the Rural grading [zoning] of Reay MacKay/Strathnaver Drives at Waikawa Beach and seek that it be rezoned Residential. Submitter seeks to be aligned with the same arrangements as those given to Waitarere.	Amend Planning Map 36 so that the properties of Reay MacKay/Strathnaver Drives at Waikawa Beach are rezoned from Rural to Residential.
49.01	Alan & Marie Blundell	19.4.7 Rule	Oppose	Oppose the rural grading [zoning] of Reay MacKay/Strathnaver Drives at Waikawa Beach and seek that it be rezoned residential. The hazard situation [overlay] is opposed as the setting up of the area and the margin of sandhill reserve does in no way require hazard zoning and is quite different to the situation faced by Paekakariki and Raumati.	No specific relief requested. Inferred that Rule 19.4.7 should not be applied to the properties in Reay MacKay/Strathnaver Drive, Waikawa Beach.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				The sandhill reserve in place before the development resource consent was granted over compensates for any expected erosion and as such took into consideration any environmental or erosion predictions.	
50.00	Rayioner NZ Ltd	2.4 Methods	Support	Support the Method stating that Council will encourage land users to use Codes of Practice and other good practice guidelines.	Retain Methods for Issue 2.4 and Objective 2.4.1.
50.01	Rayioner NZ Ltd	2.5.11 Policy	Support	Submitter supports Policy 2.5.11, as it is important that the rural area is recognised as a working landscape and that primary production activities, namely plantation forestry, should not be adversely affected by reverse sensitivity issues.	Retain Policy 2.5.11 with no modification.
50.02	Rayioner NZ Ltd	2.5.12 Policy	In-Part	Submitter supports Policy 2.5.11, as it is important that the rural area is recognised as a working landscape and that primary production activities, namely plantation forestry, should not be adversely affected by reverse sensitivity issues.	Amend Policy 2.5.12 as follows: Avoid, remedy or mitigate any the adverse environmental effects of shading of on <u>sealed</u> roads and reduction in rural amenity caused by tree shelterbelts or plantation forestry on adjacent and adjoining properties.
50.03	Rayioner NZ Ltd	5.1.1 Objective	In-Part	It is important that the HDC recognise that the Waitarere forest was planted as production/protection forest. One of the intentions of planting was to stem the inland march of sand dunes. Much of the productive landscape behind the forest would not existing if forests had not been planted and the forest acting as a safeguard.	Amend the Plan to recognise plantation forestry as a significant mitigator from the adverse effects of inland drift of sand dunes in the district.
50.04	Rayioner NZ Ltd	19.1(a) Rule	Support	Submitter supports the permitted activity status of primary production activities in the	Retain Rule 19.1(a) and keep primary production activities as a permitted

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				Horowhenua District provided the definition of Primary Production is amended.	activity. (Separate submission point 50.04 regarding definition of Primary Production Activities).
50.05	Rayioner NZ Ltd	26 Definitions – Primary Production	In-Part	Submitter seeks to amend the definition of Primary Production Activity to specify plantation forestry.	Amend definition of Primary Production as follows: Primary Production Activity includes any agricultural, horticultural, floricultural, arboricultural, <u>plantation</u> forestry or intensive farming activity....
50.06	Rayioner NZ Ltd	26 Definitions – Plantation Forestry	Oppose	Submitter seeks to amend the definition of Plantation Forestry as the proposed definition does not encompass the entire spectrum of plantation forestry activities.	Delete the proposed definition of Plantation Forestry and include a replacement definition as follows: <u>Plantation forestry means the commercial production of trees for wood products and ancillary activities. Activities ancillary to plantation forestry include; establishment and planting , earthworks, infrastructure maintenance, harvesting and the minor and temporary disturbance of indigenous vegetation.</u>
50.07	Rayioner NZ Ltd	19.6.15(a) Rule	In-Part	Submitter supports the proposed setback distance of 10 metres from site boundaries. However clarification is required that this only applies to new forest plantings only and not for existing forests which have existing use rights	Amend Rule 19.6.15(a) as follows: No <u>new</u> plantation forest shall be planted within 10 metres from any site boundary.
50.08	Rayioner NZ Ltd	19.6.15(b) Rule	Oppose	Submitter opposes Rule 19.6.15(b) as proposed. Alternative wording is sought relating the rule to new dwelling units.	Delete Rule 19.6.15(b) and include a new replacement rule as follows: <u>No new residential dwelling unit should</u>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
					<u>be located within 50 metres adjacent to any plantation forest.</u>
50.09	Rayioner NZ Ltd	19.6.15(d) Rule	In-Part	Submitter seeks amendment to Rule 19.6.15(d) to relate the rule to new plantation forests or shelterbelts and sealed public roads.	Amend Rule 19.6.15(d) as follows: No <u>new</u> plantation forest or shelterbelt shall be planted or allowed to grow in any position which could result in any icing of any <u>sealed</u> public road carriageway as a result of shading of the road between 10:00am and 2:00pm on the shortest day.
50.10	Rayioner NZ Ltd	19.6.16 Rule	Oppose	Submitter opposes Rule 19.6.16 as the rule is confusing and unclear. What constitutes managed revegetation?	Delete Rule 19.6.16 in its entirety.
51.00	Waitarere Progressive Association	5 General Matters	Support	Submitter is pleased to see that access to the beach for vehicles will be maintained and allow users to spread along the expanse of the coast line.	No specific relief requested. Inferred: retain provisions that maintain vehicle access to the beach.
51.01	Waitarere Progressive Association	17 General – Commercial Zone Waitarere	In-Part	Submitters recognise the potential need of a dedicated area for future commercial activities and to keep this to a confined area but need to ensure existing residential owners are not disadvantaged.	No relief specified. Inferred: ensure that residential activities and development can continue on the existing residential sites identified for commercial zoning.
51.02	Waitarere Progressive Association	15 General – Medium Density Housing	In-Part	Submitter has concerns regarding the rezoning of existing residential area to allow for Medium Density Housing. Submitter seeks a high building standard to ensure that it doesn't result in poor quality infill housing. Practical considerations include the space required for water tanks. Consideration needs to be given to maintaining the beach feel of Waitarere.	Amend the District Plan to plan for smaller plot sizes in an area of undeveloped land to allow for more appropriate design of plots rather than infill development.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
51.03	Waitarere Progressive Association	15 General – Relocated Houses	In-Part	Submitter seeks that if relocatable houses are to remain a permitted activity, rules need to be put in place to ensure the dwelling meets the building code for coastal conditions just as new dwellings are expected to comply.	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Amend the District Plan to make relocatable housing comply with the same standards as new dwellings.
51.04	Waitarere Progressive Association	15.6.8 Rule	In-Part	Submitter seeks that further consideration is given to the size of permitted accessory buildings. Accessory buildings should be large enough for a couple of vehicles, boat and gear.	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Amend the District Plan to provide for accessory buildings large enough for a couple of vehicles, boat and gear.
51.05	Waitarere Progressive Association	4 General Matters	In-Part	Submitter seeks consultation if land originally designated for future requirements is to be rezoned. There is currently land held by Council which could be valuable for future infrastructure.	No specific relief requested. Inferred: that Council land which may have potential for future infrastructure should not be rezoned Open Space without local consultation.
51.06	Waitarere Progressive Association	US 51	In-Part	Submitter seeks consideration of a permanent recycling drop off facility. The facility does not necessarily need to be in the village itself.	No specific requested. Inferred: That consideration is given to providing Waitarere with a permanent recycling drop-off facility.
51.07	Waitarere Progressive Association	General Matters 51	In-Part	Submitter seeks the Plan consider future development of public facilities. There are public facilities that need upgrading. There is the need for an agreed strategy for development of the facilities and infrastructure for Waitarere so that they work in harmony and preserve the feel of the area.	No specific relief requested. Inferred: That a strategy for the development of Waitarere be agreed so that the development of the area's facilities and infrastructure all work in harmony.
51.08	Waitarere Progressive Association	21 General	In-Part	Submitter seeks consideration be given for planning infrastructure requirements that embrace, maintain, and preserve the "feel" of the area. Submitter seeks the Plan consider future development of public facilities. The	No specific relief requested. Inferred: That the infrastructure and engineering standards for Waitarere maintain and embrace the "feel" of Waitarere rather than the standard

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				Plan should go further than the front gate and set the future type and look of the area including street lights and vehicle entrances. The type of kerbs and footpaths, grass or alternative rather concrete is preferred.	engineering requirements and standards.
52.00	Rosemaire Saunders	19.4.7 Rule	Oppose	Submitter opposes Rule 19.4.7 as this rule should only relate to the Hazard zone and not the Coastal Natural Character zone. The hazard area should only relate to the dunes by the foreshore. In the Waikawa Beach rural zone, both Strathnaver and Reay MacKay Grove area have already been subject to subdivision which has shaped and developed the area into a residential lifestyle subdivision.	Amend the Rule 19.4.7 by removing the reference to the Coastal Natural Character Zone and making associated amendments to the Planning Maps (see submission point 52.01) to distinguish between the Coastal Natural Character and Hazard area and limit the Hazard area in the location south of the Waikawa Village to the dunes immediately adjacent to the foreshore.
52.01	Rosemaire Saunders	Planning Map 10	Oppose	Submitter opposes Planning map 10 as it joins the Coastal Natural Character area and Hazard zone together as if they are the same thing. It is an area of Coastal Natural Character. Submitter opposes the area being called a Hazard zone. The Hazard zone should relate to the dunes by the foreshore.	Amend Planning Map 10 by distinguishing between the Coastal Natural Character zone and the Hazard zone and identify as two separate areas. The Hazard area should be limited in the location south of the Waikawa Village to the dunes immediately adjacent to the foreshore.
52.02	Rosemaire Saunders	19.6.4(a)(viii) Rule	Oppose	Submitter opposes Rule 19.6.4 as there are many lots in Waikawa area that have an area of less than 5000m ² . The separation distance between dwellings is important. Such a rule could affect some of the existing dwellings that have already been established. Dwellings were constructed on a first in first	Amend Rule 19.6.4(a)(viii) by replacing it with a requirement that all new dwellings shall be 20 metres from any established dwelling. This would make it consistent with 16.6.4(a)(iii).

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				served basis which could lead to neighbouring properties needing to get permission from the existing dwelling owner when they came to build. Some protection needs to be provided to people who have already built.	
53.00	Peter McMenamin & Helen Fitzgerald	Planning Map 7	Oppose	Submitter opposes the proposed Flood Hazard Area. The scientific basis for the flood hazard is questionable, the actual delineation does not make sense (e.g. the exclusion of the Waikawa Beach settlement), and the proposal will adversely and unnecessarily affect the values of the properties in the area.	Amend the Planning Maps so that the boundaries of the Flood Hazard Area more realistically reflect the most vulnerable areas No specific relief requested. The whole basis for the Flood Hazard Area needs to be examined and the science verified before any such zone is imposed.
53.01	Peter McMenamin & Helen Fitzgerald	19.6.4(a)(viii) Rule	Oppose	Submitter opposes Rule 19.6.4(a)(viii) as the 3 metre setback is unrealistically low and could allow a building to be erected much too close to a boundary in a Rural zone	Amend Rule 19.6.4(a)(viii) by changing the 3 metre setback to 30 metres.
54.00	Warwick Meyer	Planning Map 30	In-Part	The submitter seeks the Plan to be amended to make provision for the site on the corner of Queen Street and Arapaepae Road, Levin (Part Lot 1 DP 86925) to be used for businesses normally associated with roads such as vehicle service stations, food preparation and sales, visitor accommodation and local produce stores. The site has substantial transport corridor restrictions on it for future highway work. The proposed activities sought by the submitter provide controlled development for activities associated with transport corridors.	Amend Planning Map 30 to rezone Part Lot 1 DP 86925 being the land on the corner of Queen Street and Arapaepae Road, Levin with a special zoning to provide for vehicle service stations, food preparation and sales, visitor accommodation and local produce stores as a permitted activity. Alternatively amend the permitted activities for underlying zone of the site to include vehicle service stations, food preparation and sales, visitor accommodation and local produce stores on this site.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
55.00	Kiwi Rail	26 Definitions – Noise Sensitive Activity	Support	Submitter supports the definition of Noise Sensitive Activity as providing a definition of ‘noise sensitive activities’ recognises that sensitive receiving environments exist and need to be treated to achieve a reasonable level of internal acoustic amenity. The definition is part of a strategy to ensure that new development internalises the adverse effects of locating close to existing and proposed high noise environments.	Retain the definition of Noise Sensitive Activities as notified.
55.01	KiwiRail	28.2.4	Support	Submitter supports the need to consider reverse sensitivity as a criteria requiring assessment when considering subdivision design.	Retain Assessment of Effects for Subdivision Application criteria ‘k’ – Any effect of reverse sensitivity.
55.02	KiwiRail	S1-D1	In-Part	Submitter supports the inclusion of the Railway designation D1. However the Schedule does not reference the entire set of Planning Maps the show the location of the railway designation.	Amend the Schedule of Designations by adding references to all the Planning Maps which show the railway designation In-Part or in detail being Maps 3, 5, 7, 8, 10, <u>16,21,21A, 25, 27, 27B, 28, 28A, 28B, 29, 34, 35, and 37</u> And Add a column to the schedule identifying that the underlying zonings applying to the railway corridor are “ <u>various</u> ”.
55.03	KiwiRail	Planning Maps	Support	Submitter supports the recording of D1 designation within the respective Planning Maps.	Retain the railway designation D1 as shown on Planning Maps 3, 5, 7, 8, 10, 16, 21, 21A, 25, 27, 27B, 28, 28A, 28B, 29, 34, 35 and 37.
55.04	KiwiRail	Planning Maps	In-Part	Submitter seeks amendments as the land underlying the railway designation	Amend the Schedule of designations 1 by adding a new clause 1.6 which

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
	KiwiRail			<p>throughout the district is not provided with an alternative zone to which it might be put (should the designation ever be uplifted). The Maps appear to give a default 'rural' underlying zoning to the entire railway corridor. This is clearly either unintended, or if intended is unreasonable given the corridor stretches across the district and lies adjacent to other zones.</p> <p>The submitter is keen to ensure that it has a reasonable alternative zoning should any parts of the corridor not be required for operational use.</p>	<p>reads:</p> <p><u>The provisions of the Plan shall apply in relation to any land that is subject to a designation only to the extent that the land is used for a purpose other than the designated purpose. The Planning Maps show the underlying zoning for land subject to a designation. Where a designation runs across a number of zonings the underlying zoning will be the same as the land immediately adjacent and/or predominant in that locality or area (or similar wording to achieve the stated relief)</u></p> <p>And; Amend Planning Maps 3, 5, 7, 8, 10, 16, 21, 21A, 25, 27, 27B, 28, 28A, 28B, 29, 34, 35, and 37 to show the adjacent zoning hatching with Designation D1 heavily outlined.</p>
55.05	KiwiRail	25.3.4 Assessment Criteria	In-Part	Submitter seeks amendment to Assessment Criteria 25.3.4(b) to extend the consideration of reverse sensitivity effects to the operation of land transport networks including railways.	<p>Amend Assessment Criteria 25.3.4(b) as follows:</p> <p>Whether the proposed activity will have reverse sensitivity effects on adjacent activities or zones; <u>including on the operation of land transport networks, including railways.</u></p>
55.06	KiwiRail	25.7.1(b) Assessment Criteria	In-Part	Submitter seeks amendment to Assessment Criteria 25.7.1(b) extend the consideration of reverse sensitivity effects to the operation of land transport networks including railways.	<p>Amend Assessment Criteria 25.7.1(b) to read as follows:</p> <p>The proposed methods for avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse</p>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				Noise sensitive receivers can compromise the operation of established land use such as the region's significant land transport networks. It is therefore important that newly establishing sensitive receivers are encouraged to internalise effects to achieve a reasonable level of internal acoustic amenity.	effects including <u>reverse sensitivity effects</u> from locations adjacent to <u>major infrastructure such as transport networks, including railway corridors</u> the design of the building or structure, the use of materials, design, installation and maintenance of landscaping.
55.07	KiwiRail	25.3.9(c) Assessment Criteria	In-Part	Submitter seeks amendment to Assessment Criteria 25.3.9(c) as the poor location of land uses including structures, vegetation and signage can obstruct the required safety sightlines for railway level crossings. It is important that level crossings sightlines are free from obstructions to enable road users approaching a level crossing to check for trains.	Amend Assessment Criteria 25.3.9(c) as follows: c) Whether the height and design of the fence would be perceived to have a negative impact on vehicle or pedestrian safety including <u>on level crossing sightlines</u> and applying the principle of passive surveillance of the street (applying Crime Prevention Through Environment Design (CPTED) principles).
55.08	KiwiRail	25.2.4(a) Assessment Criteria	In-Part	Submitter seeks amendment to Assessment Criteria 25.2.4(a) as the poor location of land uses including structures, vegetation and signage can obstruct the required safety sightlines for railway level crossings. It is important that level crossings sightlines are free from obstructions to enable road users approaching a level crossing to check for trains. Of particular concern is plantation planting and shelter belts – the latter of which tend to be fast growing and obscure sightlines.	Amend clause Assessment Criteria 25.2.4(a) by adding the following: a) The proximity to and potential effects on residential dwellings, roads, and/or utilities from established trees in terms of tree debris, shading and icing of roads, <u>level crossing sightlines maintenance</u> and residential and rural amenity.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
55.09	KiwiRail	25.7.2(a) Assessment Criteria	In-Part	Submitter seeks amendment to Assessment Criteria 25.7.2(a) as this provision allows the consideration of applications involving the need for acoustic treatment. It currently only applies to residential activities and should be altered to apply to all noise sensitive activities. The control should be altered to cover all noise sensitive activities.	Amend Assessment Criteria 25.7.2(a) as follows: Noise Insulation for <u>Noise sensitive activities</u> (a) The degree of noise attenuation achieved by the <u>noise sensitive activity</u>
55.10	KiwiRail	25.7.3 Assessment Criteria	In-Part	Submitter seeks amendment to Assessment Criteria 25.7.3 as the provision applies to consents for all zones in the District and recognises the vibration caused by an activity, but it does not provide assessment criteria for the consideration of vibration effects generated from existing or planned infrastructure activities. The provision should be amended to reflect this consideration.	Amend Assessment Criteria 25.7.3 by adding the following additional clause; <u>(c) the degree to which the proposal addresses the reverse sensitivity effects caused by vibration from adjacent zones and/or activities,</u> or similar to achieve the stated relief.
55.11	KiwiRail	25.7.8(c) Assessment Criteria	In-Part	Submitter seeks amendment to Assessment Criteria 25.7.8(c) as the poor location of land uses including structures, vegetation and signage can obstruct the required safety sightlines for railway level crossings. It is important that level crossings sightlines are free from obstructions to enable road users approaching a level crossing to check for trains. This new criteria will assist in ensuring that applicants adequately address road safety.	Amend Assessment Criteria 25.7.8(c) as follows: (c) Safe design and sightlines, <u>including level crossing sightlines</u> and add a further new criteria ; <u>The extent to which the proposal has given regard to:</u> i. <u>Visibility and sight distances particularly the extent to which vehicles entering or exiting the level crossing are able to see</u>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
					<u>trains</u> ii. <u>The extent to which failure to provide adequate level crossing sightlines will give rise to level crossing safety risks.</u>
55.12	KiwiRail	25.7.15(e) Assessment Criteria	In-Part	Submitter seeks amendment to Assessment Criteria 25.7.15(e) to facilitate essential safety work near the railway corridor. At times works will be required to Notable trees to clear level crossing sightlines. The poor location of land uses including structures, vegetation and signage can obstruct the required safety sightlines for railway level crossings. It is important that level crossings sightlines are free from obstructions to enable road users approaching a level crossing to check for trains.	Amend Assessment Criteria 25.7.15(e) as follows: e) The extent to which work on or near a Notable Tree is necessary to preserve or maintain the efficiency or safety of any public work, network utility or road <u>or railway.</u>
55.13	KiwiRail	5.1.6 Policy	Support	Submitter supports Policy 5.1.6 In-Particular the recognition of the functional need for location within the Coastal Environment.	Retain Policy 5.1.6
55.14	KiwiRail	6.1.17 Policy	Support	Submitter supports Policy 6.1.17 as the policy assists in addressing the need to provide for the continuance of rural activities and for well planned, well integrated infrastructure development.	Retain Policy 6.1.17
55.15	KiwiRail	10.1.1 Objective	Support	Submitter supports the intent of Objective 10.1.1 as the railway network is comparable to the state highway network in that it provides a through function for the transport of freight and passengers. The immediate and long term protection of existing and proposed	Retain Objective 10.1.1

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				land transport networks is a key resource management issue.	
55.16	KiwiRail	10.1.9 Policy	Support	Submitter supports Policy 10.1.9 as the railway network is comparable to the state highway network in that it provides a through function for the transport of freight and passengers. The policy seeks to achieve good levels of road user safety and avoiding new level crossings will assist that.	Retain Policy 10.1.9
55.17	KiwiRail	10.1.10 Policy	Support	Submitter supports Policy 10.1.10 as the railway network is comparable to the state highway network in that it provides a through function for the transport of freight and passengers. The policy seeks to achieve good levels of road user safety and avoiding new level crossings will assist that.	Retain Policy 10.1.10
55.18	KiwiRail	10.1 Methods	Support	Submitter supports bullet point 3 of the method as designations protect the on-going operation of railway corridors and their inclusion in the Proposed Plan is necessary to ensure the integration of land use activities and transport networks.	Retain bullet point 3 of Methods 10.1.
55.19	KiwiRail	10.3 Issue	Support	Submitter supports Issue 10.3 as the maintenance of safe sight lines at rail level crossings is a particular issue that needs to be provided for. It is also important to ensure that obstructions do not block the visibility of level crossing signs or alarms to approaching drivers. It is expected that some developments will fall within the generic sight	Retain Issue 10.3

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				triangles, but will not have a material impact on visibility.	
55.20	KiwiRail	10.3.4 Policy	Support	Submitter supports Policy 10.3.4 as one of the key factors in maintaining safety is to ensure vehicle drivers are presented with sufficient visibility along the rail tracks. It is necessary to keep these 'sight triangles' free of physical obstructions (erected, placed or grown). It is also important to ensure that obstructions do not block the visibility of level crossing signs or alarms to approaching drivers.	Retain Policy 10.3.4
55.21	KiwiRail	10.3.11 Policy	In-Part	Submitter generally supports this Policy but seeks that it is amended to also refer directly to avoiding any glare, discharges etc directly onto the railway corridor – as it has for roads.	Amend Policy 10.3.11 as follows: Adverse effects include glare, inappropriate lighting, smoke, or discharges onto the road <u>or railway corridor</u>
55.22	KiwiRail	10.3.12 Policy	Support	Submitter supports Policy 10.3.12 as it supports the rules sought to address reverse sensitivity effects in the Proposed Plan.	Retain Policy 10.3.12
55.23	KiwiRail	10.3.X New Policy	Support	Submitter seeks a new policy as proposed policy 10.3.12 partially addresses the issue of reverse sensitivity, but it doesn't specifically address the issue of the need address the internal acoustic amenity of noise sensitive development adjacent to land transport corridors, including the railway, throughout the district. The submitter considers that developers who wish to build noise sensitive development less than 30 metres from the railway designation boundary should	Include a further policy to Chapter 10 under Objective 10.3.1 which states: <u>Ensure that land use activities, subdivision and development adjoining land transport networks including; the North Island Main Trunk Railway, avoid, remedy or mitigate any adverse effects by protecting themselves from the reverse sensitivity effects from noise and vibration; particularly in bedrooms and other noise sensitive</u>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				demonstrate that they can achieve the following internal noise standards: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 35 $L_{Aeq(1\text{ hr})}$ in bedrooms • 40 $L_{Aeq(1\text{ hr})}$ in other habitable spaces. 	<u>rooms.</u>
55.24	KiwiRail	10.3 Methods	Support	Submitter supports bullet point 2 of the method as the poor location of buildings, fences and other land uses similarly affects both road intersections and railway level crossing sightlines. The safe and efficient operation of railway level crossings form an integral part of the District's road safety system.	Retain bullet point 2 of Methods 10.3.
55.25	KiwiRail	10.3 Methods	In-Part	Submitter seeks to amend bullet point 3 of Methods 10.3 to include KiwiRail as a statutory consultee where proposals affect the railway corridor similarly to that required for through-routes like as State Highways.	Amend bullet point 3 of Methods 10.3 as follows: Where resource consent applications involve access onto the State Highway network <u>or across a railway corridor, Council will forward copies of applications to NZTA and KiwiRail respectively, as affected parties.</u>
55.26	KiwiRail	15.6.24 Rule	Support	Submitter supports Rule 15.6.24 as the poor location of buildings, fences and other land uses similarly affects both road intersections and railway level crossing sightlines. The safe and efficient operation of railway level crossings form an integral part of the District's road safety system.	Retain Rule 15.6.24.
55.27	KiwiRail	15.7.5 Rule	Support	Submitter supports Rule 15.7.5(a)(iii) which is a condition of Rule 15.2(e) as this rule will ensure that any access over rail corridors is	Retain Rule 15.2(e). Inferred: Retain Rule 15.7.5(a)(iii)

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				adequately assessed at the time a subdivision is proposed.	
55.28	KiwiRail	16.6.16 Rule	Support	Submitter supports Rule 16.6.16 as the poor location of buildings, fences and other land uses similarly affects both road intersections and railway level crossing sightlines. The safe and efficient operation of railway level crossings form an integral part of the District's road safety system.	Retain Rule 16.6.16.
55.29	KiwiRail	17.6.18 Rule	Support	Submitter supports Rule 17.6.18 as the poor location of buildings, fences and other land uses similarly affects both road intersections and railway level crossing sightlines. The safe and efficient operation of railway level crossings form an integral part of the District's road safety system.	Retain Rule 17.6.18.
55.30	KiwiRail	19.6.6 Rule	Support	Submitter supports the inclusion of the reverse sensitivity acoustic performance standard in the Rural zone, but Noise sensitive activities are likely to raise similar reverse sensitivity effects regardless of where they might be located in the District. The submitter considers that this should be a district wide rule. Adopting a district wide control is more efficient. As noise sensitive activities located adjacent to transport networks have a similar affect throughout the District, it is appropriate that Council adopt a district wide approach for managing reverse sensitivity. Applying a district wide approach to managing reverse sensitivity will also	Retain Rule 19.6.6 unless replaced with a district wide rule (as sought by Submission point 55.31)

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				enable Council to achieve a more consistent approach to managing the location of noise sensitive activities and encourage better urban design solutions to achieve reasonable levels of internal amenity for noise sensitive receivers.	
55.31	KiwiRail	General Matters 55	In-Part	<p>Submitter seeks a new district wide rule to apply to all zones as noise sensitive activities raise similar reverse sensitivity effects regardless of where they might be located in the District.</p> <p>As noise sensitive activities located adjacent to transport networks potentially have a same adverse effect throughout the District, it is appropriate that Council adopt a district wide approach for managing the reverse sensitivity. Applying a district wide approach to managing reverse sensitivity will also assist in managing the location of noise sensitive activities, and encourage better urban design solutions to achieve reasonable levels of internal amenity for noise sensitive receivers.</p>	<p>Include a new rule to all and each of the following zones ;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Chapter 15 Residential</u> • <u>Chapter 16 Industrial</u> • <u>Chapter 17 Commercial</u> • <u>Chapter 18 Greenbelt residential</u> • <u>Chapter 20 Open Space</u> <p>which states:</p> <p><u>Any habitable room in a new noise sensitive activity or any alteration(s) to an existing noise sensitive activity constructed within 30 metres (measured from the nearest edge of the rail corridor) of the North Island Main Trunk Railway shall be designed, constructed and maintained to meet an internal noise level of:</u></p> <p><u>(i) 35dBA LAeq (1 hour) inside bedrooms.</u></p> <p><u>(ii) 40dBA LAeq (1 hour) inside other habitable rooms.</u></p> <p><u>(iii) Compliance with this Rule XXXX shall be achieved by, prior to the</u></p>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
					<u>construction of any noise sensitive activity, an acoustic design certificate from a suitably qualified acoustic engineer is to be provided to Council demonstrating that the above internal sound levels will be achieved ;</u> <u>or</u> Locate this rule in one location in the plan where it will have district-wide applicability (i.e. to all zones).
55.32	KiwiRail	19.6.23 Rule	Support	Submitter supports Rule 19.6.23 as the poor location of buildings, fences and other land uses similarly affects both road intersections and railway level crossing sightlines. The safe and efficient operation of railway level crossings form an integral part of the District's road safety system.	Retain Rule 19.6.23.
55.33	KiwiRail	20.6.X New Rule	In-Part	Submitter seeks to add a new rule to permitted activities in the Open Space zone which provides for level crossing safety sightlines similar to that which applies in all other zones. The change includes the change sought in submission point 55.35 referring to a new diagram '2' in rule 21.1.6(c)	Include a new rule (20.6.X) to the conditions for permitted activities as follows: <u>No building or structure shall be erected, no materials shall be deposited, or vegetation planted that would obscure the sight distances from any road and rail intersection as shown in Diagram 2 (Chapter 21 - Traffic Sight Lines at Road and Rail Intersections).</u>
55.34	KiwiRail	21.1.1 Rule	In-Part	Submitter seeks a new rule be added to avoid conflicts at level crossings and promote road safety. Conflicts at level crossings can lead to the misuse of level crossings, and affect other	Include a new rule to 21.1.1 as follows: <u>Rule –Vehicle entrance separation from railway level crossings</u>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				road users. To facilitate good integrated planning KiwiRail seeks a new rule which requires developers to provide a minimum of 30 metres separation between new vehicle access ways and railway level crossings.	<u>New vehicle access ways shall be located a minimum of 30 metres from a railway level crossing.</u>
55.35	KiwiRail	21.1.6(c) Rule	In-Part	<p>Submitter seeks that a new rule be added to 21.1.6(c) as the poor location of land uses including structures, vegetation and signage can obstruct the required safety sightlines for railway level crossings. It is important that level crossings sightlines are free from obstructions to enable road users approaching a level crossing to check for trains.</p> <p>KiwiRail's level crossing assessment criteria is based on Part 9: Level Crossings of the New Zealand Transport Agency's Traffic Control Devices Manual. The submitter has recently amended its policy and is seeking its inclusion in the plan as a new "Diagram 2" in section Rule 21.1.6(c). Road and rail sightlines are subtly different and separating will ensure that road safety is more appropriately promoted.</p>	<p>Include a new rule 21.1.6(c)(iii) as follows:</p> <p><u>(iii) No structure or materials shall be placed, or trees planted that would obscure the sight distances from any road to a road intersection or rail level crossing as shown in Diagram 2 – Traffic Sight Lines at Road and Rail Intersections (Page 21-15).</u></p>
56.00	Rod Halliday	19.6.4(a)(viii) Rule	In-Part	Although the submitter supports the separation distance provisions, the submitter is concerned that the exception for allotments of less than 5000m ² under Rule 19.6.4(a)(viii) is too small and does not	<p>Amend Rule 19.6.4(a)(viii) in one of the two following way:</p> <p>Increase the exemption to include allotments less than 1 ha.</p> <p>Or</p>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				adequately capture the majority of the lifestyle allotments (typically 4000m ² – 8000m ²). A property of 5500m ² property would be treated the same as a large property of 30 hectares in terms of building setback. The proposed setback rule disadvantages those existing allotments yet to be developed, that are between 5001m ² – 1ha.	Introduce an 'intermediate' category for allotments of between 5,001m ² – 1 ha with a setback of 5m from any other boundary.
56.01	Rod Halliday	19.6.4(i) Rule	In-Part	Submitter supports in principle the provisions relating to separation distances between dwellings and sensitive uses. The rules however do not adequately protect existing vacant lifestyle situations which could be compromised by a sensitive use being permitted to establish prior to the dwelling being built. It is important to protect the legitimate expectations of property owners such as constructing a dwelling.	Amend Rule 19.6.4(i) as follows: ...300m from any residential dwelling unit <u>(or existing allotment less than 1ha that is capable of containing a dwelling)</u> and other sensitive activities on any other site.
56.02	Rod Halliday	19.6.4(b) Rule	In-Part	Submitter supports in principle the provisions relating to separation distances between dwellings and sensitive uses. The rules however do not adequately protect existing vacant lifestyle situations which could be compromised by a sensitive use being permitted to establish prior to the dwelling being built. It is important to protect the legitimate expectations of property owners such as constructing a dwelling.	Amend Rule 19.6.4(b) to include an exception to the rule as follows: <u>Exception where the title of the allotment predates the establishment of an activity listed above, the above rules shall not apply.</u>
57.00	Friends of Strathnaver	19.4.7 Rule	Oppose	Submitter opposes Rule 19.4.7 as this rule should only relate to the Hazard zone and not	Amend the Rule 19.4.7 by removing the reference to the Coastal Natural

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				the Coastal Natural Character zone. The hazard area should only relate to the dunes by the foreshore. In the Waikawa Beach rural zone, both Strathnaver and Reay MacKay Grove area have already been subject to subdivision which has shaped and developed the area into a residential lifestyle subdivision.	Character Zone and making associated amendments to the Planning Maps (see submission point 57.01) to distinguish between the Coastal Natural Character and Hazard area and limit the Hazard area in the location south of the Waikawa Village to the dunes immediately adjacent to the foreshore.
57.01	Friends of Strathnaver	Planning Map 10	Oppose	Submitter opposes Planning map 10 as it joins the Coastal Natural Character area and Hazard zone together as if they are the same thing. It is an area of Coastal Natural Character. Submitter opposes the area being called a Hazard zone. The Hazard zone should relate to the dunes by the foreshore.	Amend Planning Map 10 by distinguishing between the Coastal Natural Character zone and the Hazard zone and identify as two separate areas. The Hazard area should be limited in the location south of the Waikawa Village to the dunes immediately adjacent to the foreshore.
57.02	Friends of Strathnaver	19.6.4(a)(viii) Rule	Oppose	Submitter opposes Rule 19.6.4 as there are many lots in Waikawa area that have an area of less than 5000m ² . The separation distance between dwellings is important. Such a rule could affect some of the existing dwellings that have already been established. Dwellings were constructed on a first in first served basis which could lead to neighbouring properties needing to get permission from the existing dwelling owner when they came to build. Some protection needs to be provided to people who have already built.	Amend Rule 19.6.4(a)(viii) by replacing it with a requirement that all new dwellings shall be 20 metres from any established dwelling. This would make it consistent with 16.6.4(a)(iii).
58.00	JS & MJ Campbell	19.4.7 Rule	Oppose	Submitter opposes Rule 19.4.7 as this rule should only relate to the Hazard zone and not	Amend the Rule 19.4.7 by removing the reference to the Coastal Natural

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				the Coastal Natural Character area.	Character Zone and making associated amendments to the Planning Maps (see submission point 58.01) to distinguish between the Coastal Natural Character and Hazard area and limit the Hazard area to the dunes immediately adjacent to the foreshore.
58.01	JS & MJ Campbell	Planning Map 10	Oppose	Submitter opposes Planning map 10 as it lumps the Coastal Natural Character area and Hazard zone together as if they are the same thing. The coastline in this location is accreting so these zones should be shown separately. The Hazard zone should be reduced to the dune area adjacent to the foreshore.	Amend Planning Map 10 by distinguishing between the Coastal Natural Character zone and the Hazard zone and identify as two separate areas. The Hazard zone should be reduced to the dune area adjacent to the foreshore.
58.02	JS & MJ Campbell	19.6.4(a)(viii) Rule	In-Part	Submitter seeks that Council amend Rule 19.6.4 to protect existing rural dwelling from having another dwelling erected 3 metres from the boundary all rural lots. The rule should be amended with a 20 metre separation distance between dwellings on lots smaller than 5000m ² . There needs to be protection of existing dwellings who constructed their dwelling knowing that there was a 30 metre separation requirement in place.	Amend Rule 19.6.4(a)(viii) by replacing it with a 20 metres separation distance between dwellings on lots smaller than 5000m ² .
59.00	Peter & Susan Webb	Planning Map 7	Oppose	Submitter opposes the Planning Map 7 In-Particular the identification of the Ohau River Flood Plain (Flood Hazard Area) which is inaccurately displayed. The plain is shown to affect the submitter's property at 354	Amend Planning Map 7 so that boundary of the flood plain (Flood Hazard Area) insofar as it affects 354 Muhunoa East Road, Ohau, follows the contours of the escarpment alongside

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				Muhunoa East Road including an area which is some 60 feet above the river and is incapable of being flooded.	the river rather than the current straight line which encompasses part of the land that is incapable of being flooded.
60.00	Muaupoko Co-operative Society	General Matters 60	Oppose	<p>Submitter opposes the Proposed Plan. The behaviour of the Council has been offensive, divisive and totally inconsistent with achieving the objectives identified in the operative plan, nor are they consistent with achieving the objectives identified in sections 6 and 7 of the Local Government Act.</p> <p>The Muaupoko Co-operative Society, being an Iwi Authority representing the interests of Muaupoko, and also participants in the preparation of the Operative Horowhenua District Plan 1999 (the operative plan), requested inclusion in the processes of the preparation of the proposed plan, however the Council stated that they would only deal with the Muaupoko Tribal Authority (the MTA), this despite being informed that the MTA does not have the mandate to represent the interests of the Muaupoko Co-operative Society.</p> <p>The tangata whenua of Muaupoko, who may be affected by the proposed plan, have not been consulted either directly by the Council, or indirectly through the Muaupoko Tribal Authority to identify and define exactly what the matters of importance are to tangata whenua in relation to their taonga and waahi</p>	That the Proposed Plan be declined until such time as the matters raised by the submitter have been properly and appropriately provided for and that the Council agree to the preparation of a proposed variation to the Proposed Plan to enable these matters to be included.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				<p>tapu.</p> <p>Furthermore there has been no consultation with the tangata whenua of Muaupoko, to determine what rules or regulations need to be included in the proposed plan to ensure the protection of the taonga and waahi tapu from inappropriate use and development, and to also ensure the sustainability of the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga, to meet the needs of nga tamariki, mokopuna, the future generations. Tangata whenua believe that rules regulations are desperately needed in relation to the protection and sustainability of their taonga, including Lake Horowhenua, and also believe that without such protection mechanisms, the taonga will suffer further deterioration to where the tangata whenua will eventually lose their relationship with them altogether, this is not an outcome consistent with the purpose or intentions of the RMA.</p>	
60.01	Muaupoko Co-operative Society	General Matters 60	Oppose	<p>Submitter seeks amendments to the Plan so that appropriate provisions are included to address the re-instatement of Lake Horowhenua into Chapter 13-3 of Horizons Regional Council's One Plan. There is an urgent need to prevent the ongoing discharge of stormwater, waste water and run off</p>	<p>No specific relief requested.</p> <p>Inferred: That rules or regulations need to be included in the District Plan to prevent the ongoing discharge of stormwater, waste water and run off entering Lake Horowhenua.</p>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				entering lake Horowhenua.	
60.02	Muaupoko Co-operative Society	1 General Matters	Oppose	Submitter contends that statements supposedly made by Muaupoko at the beginning of Part B – Chapter 1 are incorrect and should be removed from the Proposed Plan.	No specific relief requested. Inferred: That the inaccurate statements within Chapter 1 be deleted.
60.03	Muaupoko Co-operative Society	1 General Matters	Oppose	<p>Submitter opposes Chapter 1. Chapter 1 is not considered consistent with the purpose or intentions of the RMA In-Particular section 6(e), 7(a) and 8. It would appear that the Council is committed to consulting with the tangata whenua of the District, however this is not quite the case.</p> <p>Reference to the Council consulting with Iwi Authorities is common throughout Part B – Chapter 1, however the RMA only refers specifically to “consultation with the tangata whenua of the area who may so be affected through Iwi Authorities” in Clause 3(1)(b) of the First Schedule in relation to the preparation of proposed policy statements or plans. This does not apply to Sections 6(e), 7(a) and 8 of the RMA, and there is no provision within the RMA that gives authority to either the Council or an Iwi Authority to circumvent the mana of the tangata whenua or to remove their right to participate in the matters discussed in Chapter 1, which is what will occur if the proposed plan is adopted in its current state. The provision to consult through an Iwi Authority totally undermines</p>	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Delete Chapter 1 in its entirety.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				all of the objectives stated in Chapter 1.	
60.04	Muaupoko Co-operative Society	S1-D114	Oppose	Submitter opposes the designation of the area for the Levin Waste-Water Treatment Plant due to the serious cultural effects related to the activities carried out in this area.	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Delete Designation D114
60.05	Muaupoko Co-operative Society	S1-D119	Oppose	Submitter opposes the designation of the area for the “the Pot” due to the serious cultural effects related to the activities carried out in this area.	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Delete Designation D119
60.06	Muaupoko Co-operative Society	S1-D122	Oppose	Submitter opposes the designation of the area for the Levin Landfill due to the serious cultural effects related to the activities carried out in this area.	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Delete Designation D122
60.07	Muaupoko Co-operative Society	2 General Matters	In-Part	The submitter relies on the submission made by Philip Taueki for the following matters. Any rural activities that are likely to adversely affect the ecological values of Lake Horowhenua, Lake Papaitonga and the rural environment in general must be referred to Tangata Whenua for consultation.	No specific relief requested.
60.08	Muaupoko Co-operative Society	2 General Matters	In-Part	The submitter relies on the submission made by Philip Taueki for the following matters. As there are a number of urupa and other sites of cultural significance throughout the rural environment due to the generations of Mua-Upoko who have maintained ahi kaa in the Horowhenua provisions must be in place to avoid disturbing any human remains or taonga while undertaking any activity within	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Include provisions to avoid the disturbance of human remains and taonga in the rural environment.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				the rural environment.	
60.09	Muaupoko Co-operative Society	Planning Maps 7, 24, 26 and 27	In-Part	The submitter relies on the submission made by Philip Taueki for the following matters. The 800m buffer zone is culturally offensive and should be deleted.	Delete the 800m buffer zone from Planning Maps 7, 24, 26 and 27.
60.10	Muaupoko Co-operative Society	2.5.21 Policy	Oppose	The submitter relies on the submission made by Philip Taueki for the following matters. It is culturally offensive to recognise the existence of the Levin Wastewater Treatment Plant in Mako Mako Road as a legitimate activity adjoining the Rural Zone and protect it from the effects of reverse sensitivity.	No specific relief requested.
60.11	Muaupoko Co-operative Society	3 General Matters	Support	The submitter relies on the submission made by Philip Taueki for the following matters. Support the sentiments expressed in this Chapter.	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Retain and implement the objectives and policies in Chapter 3.
60.12	Muaupoko Co-operative Society	4 Introduction	Oppose	The submitter relies on the submission made by Philip Taueki for the following matters. There are no provisions in place to manage contaminants entering Lake Horowhenua and therefore the statement that flows can be managed using low impact urban design development techniques before water enters the District's rivers, lakes and other water bodies is incorrect.	Include provisions restricting all development within the vicinity of Lake Horowhenua to prevent further contamination of this taonga.
60.13	Muaupoko Co-operative Society	4 Introduction	Oppose	The submitter relies on the submission made by Philip Taueki for the following matters. It is a serious violation of the Treaty of Waitangi to prepare plans suggesting the development of a pathway around Lake Horowhenua which is privately owned Maori freehold land. Due	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Amend Chapter 4 Introduction to clarify the ownership of Lake Horowhenua and restrict rather than provide access to and around the lake.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				to the settlement of Mua-Upoko around the lake several centuries ago, there are a number of sites of cultural significance around the perimeter of the lake and therefore it is highly offensive for the Council to suggest that the public should have right of access around the lake.	
60.14	Muaupoko Co-operative Society	4.2.2 Objective	In-Part	The submitter relies on the submission made by Philip Taueki for the following matters. There is no reference to the cultural significance of waterways and In-Particular Lake Horowhenua. This is a serious oversight.	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Amend Objective 4.2.2 to recognise and reference the cultural significance of waterways.
60.15	Muaupoko Co-operative Society	4.2.3 Policy	Oppose	The submitter relies on the submission made by Philip Taueki for the following matters. The provision to require esplanade reserves or strips along the coasts and identified rivers, lakes and streams that are considered of significant value in the District is a complete repudiation of the values espoused in Chapter 1.	No specific relief requested.
60.16	Muaupoko Co-operative Society	4 General Matters	In-Part	The submitter relies on the submission made by Philip Taueki for the following matters. There is no reference to the sites of cultural significance on the periphery of Lake Horowhenua, Lake Papaitonga and other water bodies that would preclude public access without causing cultural offense.	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Include a list/schedule of cultural sites of significance in Chapter 4 where public access would to water bodies would not be appropriate.
60.17	Muaupoko Co-operative Society	5 Introduction	In-Part	The submitter relies on the submission made by Philip Taueki for the following matters. There is no reference to customary rights in relation to Hokio Beach. All that is stated in	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Reference customary rights in relation to Hokio Beach in the Introduction of Chapter 5 and

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				the Introduction is that the coastal landscape contains a significant number of archaeological sites and sites of particular value to Iwi resulting from the historical pattern of settlement in the area. There are no provisions to mitigate the risk of disturbing traditional burial sites.	recognise and mitigate the risk of disturbance of cultural sites of significance.
60.18	Muaupoko Co-operative Society	6 General Matters	In-Part	The submitter relies on the submission made by Philip Taueki for the following matters. There is no reference to Hokio Beach originally being established as a Maori township, and the distinctive issues that arise from its status.	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Acknowledge and reference Hokio Beach as a former Maori township and the issues associated with this.
60.19	Muaupoko Co-operative Society	8 General Matters	In-Part	The submitter relies on the submission made by Philip Taueki for the following matters. There is no reference to Lake Horowhenua becoming a natural hazard due to the toxic algal bloom that appears during the summer months, and which places at risk small children and animals.	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Reference the algal bloom in Lake Horowhenua as a natural hazard in Chapter 8.
60.20	Muaupoko Co-operative Society	S1 – New Designation	In-Part	The submitter relies on the submission made by Philip Taueki for the following matters. The Kimberley site, the Kohitere site and the Horticulture Research site should be designated so they can continue to be used for special purposes other than rural or marae-based activities. This would provide greater flexibility regarding future usage and would not compromise the landscape, soil usage or even traffic management.	Designate the Kimberley site, the Kohitere site and the Horticulture Research site for special purposes and rural and marae-based activities.
60.21	Muaupoko	8 General Matters	In-Part	The submitter relies on the submission made	No specific relief requested.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
	Co-operative Society			by Philip Taueki for the following matters. There is no reference to the liquefaction areas within the coastal environment.	Inferred: Reference the liquefaction areas within the coastal environment in Chapter 8.
60.22	Muaupoko Co-operative Society	Planning Map 27B	In-Part	The submitter relies on the submission made by Philip Taueki for the following matters. The submitter seeks the rezoning of Pt Sec 28 Levin Suburban (the former Levin School site) from Residential to Commercial. This would provide for greater consistency in zoning along SH1.	Amend Planning Map 27B to include Pt Sec 28 Levin Suburban within the Commercial Zone.
60.23	Muaupoko Co-operative Society	10.1 Issue Discussion	In-Part	The submitter relies on the submission made by Philip Taueki for the following matters. There is no provision for consultation with Tangata Whenua at any early phase of development in order to bypass sites that are culturally sensitive.	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Amend Chapter 10 to include provision for consultation with Tangata Whenua at any early phase of development in order to bypass sites that are culturally sensitive.
60.24	Muaupoko Co-operative Society	13.1 Methods	In-Part	The submitter relies on the submission made by Philip Taueki for the following matters. The survey should apply a thematic approach to the identification of prospective historic heritage buildings and sites to be undertaken in consultation with Iwi, local historical societies, the NZHPT and potentially affected landowners.	No specific relief requested.
60.25	Muaupoko Co-operative Society	US 60	Oppose	The submitter relies on the submission made by Philip Taueki for the following matters. Oppose the approach taken by Council in response to the vandalism at the Rowing Club. The activities occurring at Lake Horowhenua are compromising those values of importance to Tangata Whenua and giving	No specific relief requested.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				rise to conflicts.	
60.26	Muaupoko Co-operative Society	Planning Map 7	In-Part	The submitter relies on the submission made by Philip Taueki for the following matters. The Kimberley site, the Kohitere site and the Horticulture Research site should be identified as designations allowing the facilities to be utilised as of right.	Amend Planning Map 7 to show the following sites as designations: the Kimberley site, the Kohitere site and the Horticulture Research site for special purposes and rural and marae-based activities.
60.27	Muaupoko Co-operative Society	9 General Matters	In-Part	The submitter relies on the submission made by Philip Taueki for the following matters. There should be a complete ban on the storage, use and disposal of hazardous substances within a chain strip of any waterway, including Lake Horowhenua.	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Amend Chapter 9 to restrict the storage, use and disposal of hazardous substances within a chain strip of any waterway, including Lake Horowhenua.
61.00	Richard Tingey	General Matters 61	In-Part	The submitter seeks the inclusion of an encroachment policy. This includes permanent encroachments where long term fencing is given ad hoc license without a formal application process and public register of encroachments at present. There is need for a clear policy on there being a 3m wide walking strip either side of rural roads	Amend Proposed Plan to provide for the following: (a) culverts need to extend at least 3m from the road edge for the fence above the culver to be 3m from the edge too; (b) a full and thorough policy on encroachments over road reserves to guarantee walking and cycling on paper roads plus 3m of walking space either side of rural roads in use; (c) the encroachment policy to include a public register of such encroachments for full public inspection and that no retrospective encroachment licences will be granted; (d) 7 day grazing encroachments for horses and cattle only with very light weight electric fencing to be 2m from

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
					tarseal; (e) pampas grass eradicated on road reserves; (f) street trees to give 3m of walk strip both sides of the of road reserve.
62.00	Kathleen Bills	Planning Map 5	Support	Support the rezoning of the Makerua Pool site as Open Space zone because it is a highly valuable community facility (Pt Lot 39 DP 408 being 178-188 Makerua Road SH57).	Retain the rezoning of the Makerua Pool Site (Pt Lot 39 DP 408 at 178-188 Makerua Road SH57) from Rural to Open Space on Planning Map 5.
62.01	Kathleen Bills	S1-D155	Oppose	Oppose the designation of Lot 1 DP 20312 for the designating purpose of Okonui Hall Domain.	Delete designation D155.
63.00	Taupunga Farming Company	Planning Map 5	Oppose	Oppose the rezoning of the Okunui Hall site, Okuku Road, Shannon (Lot 1 DP 20312) from Rural Zone to Open Space Zone.	Amend Planning Map 5 to include Lot 1 DP 20312 Okuku Road, Shannon within the Rural Zone.
63.01	Taupunga Farming Company	S1-D155	Oppose	Oppose the designation of the Okonui Hall Domain site (Lot 1 DP 20312).	Delete designation D155.
64.00	Derek Watt	19.4.7 Rule	Oppose	Oppose the rule which seeks to control buildings, structures and subdivisions in the Coastal Natural Character and Hazard Overlay Area as a discretionary activity. The most sensitive areas along the coast are already covered by the restrictions on ONFL and need not apply to the coastal Natural Character and Hazard Overlay Area. This affects the freedom of property owners to do what they wish on their property and also devalues properties significantly due to the uncertainty and costs associated with building a house.	Delete Rule 19.4.7.
64.01	Derek Watt	19.6.4(a)(iii) Rule	Oppose	The rural setbacks for buildings are excessive given all other restrictions in place such as	Amend Rule 19.6.4(a)(iii) to reduce the site boundary setback for buildings in

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				minimum areas for subdivision.	the Rural Zone.
65.00	Horowhenua Farmers' Ratepayer Group	2.1.20 Policy	Support	Support the recognition of the countryside as a rural production landscape.	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Retain Policy 2.1.20.
65.01	Horowhenua Farmers' Ratepayer Group	2.5 Issue	In-Part	Support the list of activities which are an essential part of a rural productive environment however seek the inclusion of aerial topdressing and spraying.	Amend Issue 2.5 to include aerial topdressing and spraying in the list of possible effects.
65.02	Horowhenua Farmers' Ratepayer Group	2.1.21 Policy	In-Part	If a landowner wishes to create esplanade areas and other open space connections, that should be their right not a requirement imposed by Council. This requirement could impact on privacy and operational requirements of the adjoining landowner and the saleability of subdivided land. There may be dangers involved with public access near pest control areas and there will be the costs for maintaining esplanade areas.	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Amend Policy 2.1.21 to provide the opportunity for creating esplanade strips/reserves through subdivision not a requirement.
65.03	Horowhenua Farmers' Ratepayer Group	19.6.1 Rule	In-Part	A farming business often requires more houses/dwellings for on-farm employees, retired parents or farming family members. A farming situation differs from a lifestyle property.	Amend Rule 19.6.1 so that the number of permitted dwellings is related to the size of the property.
65.04	Horowhenua Farmers' Ratepayer Group	19.6.15 Rule	In-Part	A plantation forest can cause major shading, restrict views and create mess	Amend Rule 19.6.15 as follows: (a) No plantation forest shall be planted within 10 <u>20</u> metres from any site boundary <u>unless that boundary is already adjacent to plantation forestry, in which case the distance must be greater than 10 metres.</u> (b) No plantation forest shall be

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
					planted within 100 metres from any existing residential dwelling unit <u>which is located on a separately owned property.</u>
65.05	Horowhenua Farmers' Ratepayer Group	19.6.19 Rule	In-Part	In times of high rainfall events it is unrealistic to expect landowners to have total control over the containment and flow of water which enters their property either from the sky or over land. It is not clear which upstream landowner will be held accountable for flooding on properties downstream.	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Amend Rule 19.6.19 for clarification.
65.06	Horowhenua Farmers' Ratepayer Group	Planning Maps	In-Part	There are some areas identified within the proposed Flood Hazard Area Overlay that are incorrect.	Amend Planning Maps to accurately identify flood hazard areas in conjunction with landowners.
65.07	Horowhenua Farmers' Ratepayer Group	Planning Maps	In-Part	The Highly Versatile Land supplied by the Regional Council is not accurate and should not be used. If Council regulates activities according to land use capability, the maps should be updated.	Amend Planning Maps to accurately identify areas of class 1 and 2 soils.
65.08	Horowhenua Farmers' Ratepayer Group	Planning Maps	Oppose	In the 'Decisions of Hearing Panel' for Plan Change 22 the commissioners recommend that Council need to further consider the 100m contour line as a Hill Country Domain in a future District Plan Review. It is suggested this should be tied to slope.	Amend the extent of the Hill Country Domain so that the western boundary for the Hill Country Domain is where land rises sharply and continuously at the base of the foothills at a slope of 40 degrees.
65.09	Horowhenua Farmers' Ratepayer Group	26 Definitions - Earthworks	In-Part	In the 'Decisions of Hearing Panel' for Plan Change 22 the commissioners suggest changing the definition of earthworks. The submitter supports Federated Farmers' stance that the definition excludes normal farming earthworks.	Amend the definition for earthworks to align with Federated Farmers' request OR Amend the definition for earthworks to specify a threshold of 2.5 metres to allow normal farming activities such as

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
					tracking and fencelines.
65.10	Horowhenua Farmers' Ratepayer Group	General Matters 66	In-Part	Large areas of land, especially in the coastal area have been identified as high liquefaction risk areas. Rising sea levels are also a threat to development along the coast.	Amend Proposed Plan to take into account risk of liquefaction and sea level rise when considering subdivision in coastal areas and areas susceptible to flooding.
65.11	Horowhenua Farmers' Ratepayer Group	General Matters 65	In-Part	The submitter contends that property rights are taken away from individuals because of public opinion and new Council policies and rules which impose extra costs. As a result of the loss of property rights, affected property owners should be compensated for the extra costs imposed on them. This includes owners of historic buildings, heritage sites, areas of ecological significance and areas of significant visual aesthetic appeal.	Amend Proposed Plan to provide a fund for the recompense purpose for the loss of property rights.
66.00	Bruce & Christine Mitchell	2.1.20 Policy	Support	Support the recognition of the countryside as a rural production landscape.	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Retain Policy 2.1.20.
66.01	Bruce & Christine Mitchell	2.5 Issue	In-Part	Support the list of activities which are an essential part of a rural productive environment however seek the inclusion of aerial topdressing and spraying.	Amend Issue 2.5 to include aerial topdressing and spraying in the list of possible effects.
66.02	Bruce & Christine Mitchell	2.1.21 Policy	In-Part	If a landowner wishes to create esplanade areas and other open space connections, that should be their right not a requirement imposed by Council. This requirement could impact on privacy and operational requirements of the adjoining landowner and the saleability of subdivided land. There may be dangers involved with public access near pest control areas and there will be the costs	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Amend Policy 2.1.21 to provide the opportunity for creating esplanade strips/reserves through subdivision not a requirement.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				for maintaining esplanade areas.	
66.03	Bruce & Christine Mitchell	19.6.1 Rule	In-Part	A farming business often requires more houses/dwellings for on-farm employees, retired parents or farming family members. A farming situation differs from a lifestyle property.	Amend Rule 19.6.1 so that the number of permitted dwellings is related to the size of the property.
66.04	Bruce & Christine Mitchell	19.6.15 Rule	In-Part	A plantation forest can cause major shading, restrict views and create mess	Amend Rule 19.6.15 as follows: (a) No plantation forest shall be planted within 10 <u>20</u> metres from any site boundary <u>unless that boundary is already adjacent to plantation forestry, in which case the distance must be greater than 10 metres.</u> (b) No plantation forest shall be planted within 100 metres from any existing residential dwelling unit <u>which is located on a separately owned property.</u>
66.05	Bruce & Christine Mitchell	19.6.19 Rule	In-Part	In times of high rainfall events it is unrealistic to expect landowners to have total control over the containment and flow of water which enters their property either from the sky or over land. It is not clear which upstream landowner will be held accountable for flooding on properties downstream.	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Amend Rule 19.6.19 for clarification.
66.06	Bruce & Christine Mitchell	Planning Maps	In-Part	There are some areas identified within the proposed Flood Hazard Area Overlay that are incorrect.	Amend Planning Maps to accurately identify flood hazard areas in conjunction with landowners.
66.07	Bruce & Christine Mitchell	Planning Maps	In-Part	The Highly Versatile Land supplied by the Regional Council is not accurate and should not be used. If Council regulates activities	Amend Planning Maps to accurately identify areas of class 1 and 2 soils.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				according to land use capability, the maps should be updated.	
66.08	Bruce & Christine Mitchell	Planning Maps	Oppose	In the 'Decisions of Hearing Panel' for Plan Change 22 the commissioners recommend that Council need to further consider the 100m contour line as a Hill Country Domain in a future District Plan Review. It is suggested this should be tied to slope.	Amend the extent of the Hill Country Domain so that the western boundary for the Hill Country Domain is where land rises sharply and continuously at the base of the foothills at a slope of 40 degrees.
66.09	Bruce & Christine Mitchell	26 Definitions - Earthworks		In the 'Decisions of Hearing Panel' for Plan Change 22 the commissioners suggest changing the definition of earthworks. The submitter supports Federated Farmers' stance that the definition excludes normal farming earthworks.	Amend the definition for Earthworks to align with Federated Farmers' request OR Amend the definition for earthworks to specify a threshold of 2.5 metres to allow normal farming activities such as tracking and fencelines.
66.10	Bruce & Christine Mitchell	General Matters 66	In-Part	Large areas of land, especially in the coastal area have been identified as high liquefaction risk areas. Rising sea levels are also a threat to development along the coast.	Amend Proposed Plan to take into account risk of liquefaction and sea level rise when considering subdivision in coastal areas and areas susceptible to flooding.
66.11	Bruce & Christine Mitchell	General Matters 66	In-Part	The submitter contends that property rights are taken away from individuals because of public opinion and new Council policies and rules which impose extra costs. As a result of the loss of property rights, affected property owners should be compensated for the extra costs imposed on them. This includes owners of historic buildings, heritage sites, areas of ecological significance and areas of significant visual aesthetic appeal.	Amend Proposed Plan to provide a fund for the recompense purpose for the loss of property rights.
67.00	Taiao Raukawa	General Matters 67	In-Part	Ensure macrons are correct.	Amend entire Plan to ensure correct

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
	Environmental Resource Unit				use of macrons (e.g. replace all Maori with Māori, Ngati with Ngāti and Ohau with Ōhau).
67.01	Taiao Raukawa Environmental Resource Unit	1 Introduction	In-Part	The submitter seeks amendment to the Statement of Ngāti Raukawa.	<p>Amend the Statement of Ngāti Raukawa as follows:</p> <p>Paragraph 1: Amend to read as “Ngāti Raukawa and affiliates (like Kauwhata (<u>Feilding</u>), Tukorehu (Kuku)...”</p> <p>Paragraph 1: Include a new sentence at the end of Paragraph 1 as follows: <u>The legacies set down by ancestral Māori land tenure activities during Te Rauparaha and his allies' time for Ngāti Raukawa and affiliates, continue to this day.</u></p> <p>Paragraph 5: Include new bullet point to list (as first bullet point) as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Tuku Whenua - Gifting land; ...</u> <p>Paragraph 6: Amend third sentence as follows: Embedded cultural markers, whether urupā, burial grounds, cemeteries ; <u>wāhi tapu</u>, pā sites, former papa kainga; <u>wāhi tūpuna...</u></p> <p>Paragraph 6: Include new bullet point list of marae after second sentence as follows (listed from north to south):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Te Au, Himatangi;</u>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
	Taiao Raukawa Environmental Resource Unit				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Paranui, Himatangi;</u> • <u>Motuiti, Himatangi;</u> • <u>Whakawehi, Shannon;</u> • <u>Kereru, Kōptāraoa;</u> • <u>Matau, Kōptāraoa;</u> • <u>Huia, Poroutawhao;</u> • <u>Ngātokowaru; Hōkio</u> • <u>Kikopiri, Muhunoa;</u> • <u>Tukorehe, Kuku;</u> • <u>Wehiwehi, Manakau...</u>
67.02	Taiao Raukawa Environmental Resource Unit	1 Introduction	In-Part	The submitter seeks amendment to Chapter 1 Introduction.	Amend Chapter 1 Introduction to Include a new heading above paragraph 3 on page 1-6 (below dissecting line) to read as follows ' <u>Statutory Duties and Responsibilities under the RMA</u> '
67.03	Taiao Raukawa Environmental Resource Unit	1(g) Anticipated Environmental Result	In-Part	The submitter seeks amendment of Anticipated Environmental Result 1(g).	Amend Anticipated Environmental Result 1(g) as follows: Greater public awareness of Tāngata Whenua and their customary rights and relationships with taonga, <u>including lands, coastlines, waterways, foothills and mountain ranges, etc.</u>
67.04	Taiao Raukawa Environmental Resource Unit	13.3 Methods	In-Part	The submitter seeks the amendment of 13.3 Methods District Plan to give a better coverage of ancestral landscape significance to Māori, rather than a 'dots on map perspective'.	Amend 13.3 Method to include the following in the final bullet: ...heritage buildings, <u>areas of interrelated significance</u> and sites...

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
67.05	Taiao Raukawa Environmental Resource Unit	2.3 Issue Discussion	In-Part	The submitter seeks amendment to Issue Discussion 2.3.	Amend Issue Discussion 2.3 3 rd paragraph, first sentence as follows: Reverse sensitivity <u>is a term used that explains</u> describes the effect that <u>new</u> development ...
67.06	Taiao Raukawa Environmental Resource Unit	2.4.1 Explanation & Principal Reasons	In-Part	The submitter seeks clarification around the explanation and principle reasons for Issue 2.4.	Amend Explanation & Principal Reasons 2.4.1 as follows: Control through the District Plan, is not expected to the <u>only</u> means of achieving sustainable land management, with other agencies having a role, <u>too</u> .
67.07	Taiao Raukawa Environmental Resource Unit	2 General Matters	In-Part	The submitter considers the inclusion of a Planning Map of Kuku as an appendix.	Amend Chapter 2 to include a Planning Map of Kuku.
67.08	Taiao Raukawa Environmental Resource Unit	3 Introduction	In-Part	The submitter seeks the amendment of Chapter 3 Introduction.	Amend Chapter 3 Introduction to read 'kaitiaki is to preserve the spirit <u>spirit</u> of the land'.
67.09	Taiao Raukawa Environmental Resource Unit	4 General Matters	In-Part	The submitter notes that iwi, hapū and whanau as tangata whenua to certain areas of the marine and coastal region of Horowhenua have until March 2017 to seek customary marine title or claims to the common marine and coastal area. This can be done through specific negotiations with the Crown or through an application to the High Court. Taiao Raukawa advocates for hapū tinorangatiratanga and co-management opportunities for certain areas of coastline according to kawa or protocols set down by ancestral customary interests that continue	No specific relief requested.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				today. For example, some key areas include Kuku, Ōhau estuary to sea, other trusts and Māori farming incorporations south towards Waikawa, especially where Māori land bounds the sea	
67.10	Taiao Raukawa Environmental Resource Unit	1 Introduction	Oppose	Oppose the statement by Ngāti Apa on Omarupapako/Round Bush Reserve.	Amend the Statement of Ngāti Raukawa to include the following text after paragraph 6: <u>...natural systems in Horowhenua. In particular, Council needs to note that customary interests in certain areas such as Omarupapako, Round Bush Reserve will be referred back to Crown for further consideration, and if need be, for amendment of the Ngāti Apa legislation. The Ngāti Raukawa Treaty Claims team flag with Council that the Ngāti Apa claim will be challenged before the Waitangi Tribunal. Council need note too that Ngāti Raukawa and affiliates are determining their customary interests and mana tuku iho, exercised by iwi, hapū and whanau as tangata whenua to certain areas of the marine and coastal region of Horowhenua. Whanau, hapū or iwi groups have until March 2017 to seek customary marine title or claims to the common marine and coastal area. This can be done through specific negotiations with the Crown or</u>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
					<u>through an application to the High Court.</u>
67.11	Taiao Raukawa Environmental Resource Unit	2.5.21 Policy	In-Part	The submitter questions Policy 2.5.21 to protect Levin Wastewater Treatment Plant in Mako Mako Road from effects of reverse sensitivity. Seeks that Council work on ensuring best solutions for best practice to ensure that the treatment plant works to the best environmental standards.	No specific relief requested.
67.12	Taiao Raukawa Environmental Resource Unit	4.1.4 Policy	In-Part	Must take consideration of claims to customary marine title or claims to the common marine and coastal area. This is not to preclude the public but if granted will help restrict damaging behaviours to sensitive coastal regions, rare plant and bird life. These areas need protection for the benefit of the whole community, but it shall be recognised that management and determination of their positive and enhanced futures, shall be led by Iwi and hapū.	Amend Policy 4.1.4 to reflect the following considerations: i) Claims to customary marine title or claims to common marine & coastal areas; and ii) Recognise management and determination of areas of rare plant and bird life and sensitive coastal regions to be led by Iwi and hapu.
67.13	Taiao Raukawa Environmental Resource Unit	4.2 Issue	In-Part	The submitter seeks more discussion on ongoing Māori relationships to access to Water Bodies, so that particular Māori customary rights to water bodies are recognised and maintained in relation to the procedures to be completed under the Marine and Coastal Areas (Takutai Moana) Act 2011. Refer latest reports that relate to Horowhenua coastal areas and water health	Amend Issue 4.2 to include more discussion on ongoing Maori relationships to access water bodies so that particular Māori customary rights to water bodies are recognised and maintained.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				in key waterways of region (refer submission for list of reports).	
67.14	Taiao Raukawa Environmental Resource Unit	5 Introduction	In-Part	The submitter seeks more discussion on ongoing Māori relationships to access to water bodies, so that particular Māori customary rights to water bodies are recognised and maintained in relation to the procedures to be completed under the Marine and Coastal Areas (Takutai Moana) Act 2011.	Amend Introduction of Chapter 5 include more discussion on ongoing Maori relationships to access water bodies so that particular Māori customary rights to water bodies are recognised and maintained..
67.15	Taiao Raukawa Environmental Resource Unit	8.1.1 Explanation & Principal Reasons	In-Part	The submitter suggests that the top 10 hazards for the region are added and that Council undertake coastal processes research over the years and compile recent reports about coastal processes, seismic hazards\liquefaction risk for the Horowhenua coastline and make them more explicit for the community. Refer to submission for reference list of research reports.	Amend 8.1.1 Explanation & Principal Reasons by including list of top 10 hazards for the top 10 hazards for the greater Horizons Regional Council region are: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Earthquake 2. Locally generated tsunami 3. Human pandemic 4. Volcanic activity at Mt Ruapehu 5. Sea level rise 6. Volcanic activity at Mt Egmont/Taranaki 7. Beach erosion and flooding 8. Flooding 9. Agricultural drought 10. Cyclones (tropical cyclones). And that make more explicit reference is made of coastal processes research for the community.
67.16	Taiao Raukawa	8(d) Anticipated	Support	Support Anticipated Environmental Result	No specific relief requested.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
	Environmental Resource Unit	Environmental Result		8(d)and provides a list of references to provide in the Proposed Plan.	
67.17	Taiao Raukawa Environmental Resource Unit	11.1 Issue Discussion	In-Part	The submitter seeks the amendment of Issue Discussion 11.1.	Amend Issue Discussion 11.1 by including a new sentence at the end of paragraph 5 as follows: <u>Other areas of Māori land in the district have Ngā Whenua Rahui kawenata or covenants under the Reserves and Conservation Acts.</u>
67.18	Taiao Raukawa Environmental Resource Unit	13.1.2 Policy	In-Part	Place Māori cultural values as number one bullet point as they are the longest term human values in region, followed by archaeological values, then rest of values as follows.	Amend Policy 13.1.2 to re-order the bullet points to place 'Māori cultural values' first, followed by 'Archaeological values' second, and then rest of values as currently listed.
67.19	Taiao Raukawa Environmental Resource Unit	13.1 Methods	In-Part	The submitter seeks the amendment of 13.1 Methods District Plan.	Amend 13.1 Method to include the following in bullet two: ...including sites <u>and interrelated areas</u> of significance to Māori <u>including wāhi tapu, wāhi tūpuna</u> and archaeological, within 12 months...
68.00	Te Taitoa Maori o Te Awahou	Planning Map 15A	In-Part	The submitter seeks the rezoning of the property adjacent to the Whare Manaaki building on Harbour Street, Foxton from Residential to a zoning more appropriate for a future carpark to service Te Awahou-Nieuwe Stroom, Foxton.	Amend Planning Map 15A to rezone the property adjacent to the Whare Manaaki building on Harbour Street, Foxton from Residential to as a more appropriate zone for a carpark/service area.
69.00	Michelle Walls-Bennett & Steven Bailey	19.4.7 Rule	Oppose	Oppose Rule 19.4.7 as it should apply only to the hazard zone. The Coastal Natural Character and Hazard Area covers an area which is now a developed subdivision and the hazard should only relate to the foreshore	Amend Rule 19.4.7 so that it only applies to hazard areas.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				dunes.	
69.01	Michelle Walls-Bennett & Steven Bailey	Planning Map 10	In-Part	Oppose the Coastal Natural Character and Hazard Area on Planning Map 10. The area defined as Coastal Natural Character and Hazard Area is now a developed subdivision and the hazard should only relate to the dunes by the foreshore. This area is not applicable as it combines Coastal Natural Character and Hazard Zone.	Amend Planning Map 10 to distinguish between Coastal Natural Character Area and Hazard Area. AND Retain Hazard Area in the foreshore dunes; Delete Coastal Natural Character Zone from Lot 8 Uxbridge Terrace, Waikawa Beach.
70.00	Future Map Limited, Future Map (No2) Ltd and Future Map (No 3) Ltd	S5	Oppose	<p>The Tararua Growth Area Structure Plan (TGASP) encompasses a 38ha site and includes a mix of industrial and residential activities. The TGASP includes provision for and extension of Residential zoned land from that existing on Kinross Street and Strathmore Avenue. There is provision Industrial land that connects to the existing Industrial land. There is no connection to Arapaepae Road (SH57). There is provision for landscape noise buffers on Arapaepae Road and on the road frontage to Tararua Road. The TGASP sets the guidelines for how the site is intended to be developed.</p> <p>A Zoning Master Plan has been prepared by Pocock Design:Environment and takes into consideration the unique characteristics of the site as set out in the TGASP design guide. The Pocock Zoning Master Plan encompasses an area of 54ha and includes no provision for</p>	<p>Delete the proposed Tararua Growth Area Structure Plan.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Include the Tararua Road Development -Zoning Master Plan.</p>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				<p>residential land but does include a significant reserve/stormwater area as a buffer to the existing residential zone and a “stepped” industrial zoning.</p> <p>The balance of the details continued within the TGASP design guide could all be applied to the Pocock Zoning Master Plan.</p> <p>The Pocock Zoning Master Plan has been developed in accordance with the submitter’s requirements to work with the TGASP in terms of develop a future growth area but remove the provision for residential development within this site.</p> <p>Oppose the proposed Tararua Growth Area Structure Plan.</p>	
70.01	Future Map Limited, Future Map (No2) Ltd and Future Map (No 3) Ltd	S5	Oppose	<p>The Design Guide is an integral part of the Tararua Growth Area Structure Plan. Most of what is contained in the document is relevant for the Pocock Zoning Master Plan. However some amendments are sought including setbacks, diagrams, the inclusion of a stormwater reserve and associated landscape plantings, the introduction of a low impact industrial area and removal of the residential area.</p> <p>The submitter will undertake to make the required amendments/changes and present a revised Design Guide at a future hearing.</p>	Amend Tararua Road Growth Area Design Guide as presented by submitted at future hearing.
70.02	Future Map Limited,	Planning Maps 29	In-Part	The submitter seeks to rezone the Tararua	Amend Planning Maps 29 and 30 to

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
	Future Map (No2) Ltd and Future Map (No 3) Ltd	and 30		<p>Road Growth Area so the entire area is Industrial. Currently this Tararua Road Growth Area is split over Residential and Industrial Zones. In addition to rezoning the current extent of the Tararua Road Growth Area, the submitter seeks to extend this southern industrial area to Arapaepae Road and Tararua Road by rezoning the south-east area from Rural to Industrial Zone. The extension increases the area of the Tararua Road Growth Area land from 34ha to approximately 54ha.</p> <p>The intent of the submitter is to rezone the land now as opposed to seeking a deferred zoning for the sites.</p> <p>In terms of a future Industrial zoning, the submitter considered provision for this zone can be achieved by provision for some additional rules in the Industrial zone.</p> <p>The following sites and adjoining other land are zoned a mix of both Residential and Industrial:</p> <p>Lot 1 and 2 DP 45916, Lot 2 DP 341015, Lot 1 DP 30627, Pt Lot 1 DP 9882, Lot 1 DP 341015, Lot 1 and Lot 191 DP 52352, Lot 2 and 3 DP 30627. The submitter seeks all the land specified above to be rezoned Industrial and Future Industrial in accordance with the Tararua Road Development - Zoning Master Plan.</p>	<p>rezone the following parcels of land and adjoining properties from Industrial and Residential to Industrial and future Industrial, as shown on the Zoning Master Plan attached to the submission and includes the following properties:</p> <p>Lot 1 and 2 DP 45916, Lot 2 DP 341015, Lot 1 DP 30627, Pt Lot 1 DP 9882, Lot 1 DP 341015, Lot 1 and Lot 191 DP 52352, Lot 2 and 3 DP 30627</p>
70.03	Future Map Limited,	16.2(g) Rule	In-Part	The submitter seeks the inclusion of	Amend Rule 16.2(g) as follows:

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
	Future Map (No2) Ltd and Future Map (No 3) Ltd			additional rules to the conditions for permitted activities. Including a new height limits that would relate to a Low Impact Industrial area which is shown on the attached Pocock Zoning Master Plan.	Within the Tararua Road Growth Area Overlay, all activities identified in Rule 16.1 shall be controlled activities subject to complying with the conditions in Rule 16.6 (apart from Rule 16.6.2(a)(ii) and Rule 16.7.7(b)(iii)) and complying with conditions in Rule 16.7.7. (Refer Rule 16.7.7).
70.04	Future Map Limited, Future Map (No2) Ltd and Future Map (No 3) Ltd	16.6.1 Rule	In-Part	The submitter seeks the inclusion of additional rules to the conditions for permitted activities. Including a new height limits that would relate to a Low Impact Industrial area which is shown on the attached Pocock Zoning Master Plan. The submitter seeks amendment to Rule 16.6.1.	Amend Rule 16.6.1 as follows: (a) No part of any building shall exceed a height of 18 metres. <u>(b) Any building within the Low Impact industrial area of the Tararua Growth Area Structure Plan shall not exceed a height of 10 metres.</u>
70.05	Future Map Limited, Future Map (No2) Ltd and Future Map (No 3) Ltd	16.7.7 Rule	In-Part	The Pocock Zoning Master Plan and Wider Connections Diagram shows proposed road linkages and future provision for access to Arapaepae Road (SH57) with two potential linkages within the Future Industrial Zone. It is considered that with appropriate layout and treatments provision for access to and from SH 57 may be a possibility. With the inclusion of the additional rural land to the southeast of the site (with frontage to both Tararua Roads and Arapaepae Roads) landscape buffers are provided for. The submitter seeks amendment to Rule 16.7.7.	Amend Rule 16.7.7 as follows: (b) Conditions (ii) Any building fronting onto Tararua Road, or adjoining or facing across a road from the Tararua Road Growth Area Overlay residential area shall be set back from the boundary by not less than: · 10 metres from Tararua Road. Submission on Proposed 11 HDC District Plan · 8 metres from Tararua Road Growth Area Residential Area.
70.06	Future Map Limited,	16.7.7(b) Rule	In-Part	The Industrial Zone rules of the Proposed	Include new subclauses to Rule

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
	Future Map (No2) Ltd and Future Map (No 3) Ltd			District Plan would continue to apply to the Tararua Road Growth Area Structure Plan. However, some consequential changes are required to give effect to the rezoning. The submitter seeks the inclusion of a new Rule 16.7.7(b)(iii)	16.7.7(b) as follows: <u>...16.7.7(b) (iii)</u> <u>Any building located within the Low Impact Industrial Area overlay within the Tararua Growth Area shall be limited to offices, commercial activities and service activities including warehousing, storage and distribution activities but excluding the maintenance and refuelling of vehicles.</u> <u>16.7.7(b) (iv)</u> <u>All development undertaken within the Tararua Growth Area Structure Plan shall be in accordance with Design Guide contained in Schedule 5 of the Proposed Horowhenua District Plan.</u>
70.07	Future Map Limited, Future Map (No2) Ltd and Future Map (No 3) Ltd	15.2(e), 15.3(d), 15.5(a), 15.6.4(c), 15.8.3(v), 15.8.7, 15.8.8 Rule	Oppose	The submitter seeks the deletion of the following rules: 15.2(e), 15.3(d), 15.5(a), 15.6.4(c), 15.8.3(v), 15.8.7, 15.8.8.	Delete Rules 15.2(e), 15.3(d), 15.5(a), 15.6.4(c), 15.8.3(v), 15.8.7, 15.8.8.
70.08	Future Map Limited, Future Map (No2) Ltd and Future Map (No 3) Ltd	16.8.4 Rule	Support	Rule 16.8.4 sets out the matters of discretionary and conditions for Restricted Discretionary Activities in relation to activities within the Tararua Road Growth Area Overlay. The submitter supports this provision and seeks the retention of it.	Retain Rule 16.8.4.
70.09	Future Map Limited, Future Map (No2) and Future Map (no 3) Ltd	16.8.5 Rule	Support	Rule 16.8.5 sets out the matters of discretionary and conditions for Restricted Discretionary Activities in relation to subdivision within the Tararua Road Growth	Retain Rule 16.8.5.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				Area Overlay. The submitter supports this provision and seeks the retention of it.	
71.00	Progressive Enterprises Limited	17.4(c) Rule	Oppose	Oppose the 3000m ² floor area as it is arbitrary. Rule 17.4(c) should be deleted. New generation Countdown supermarkets throughout New Zealand are generally 4200m ² in gross floor area and have car parking for 210 cars. Supermarkets are typically classified as a restricted discretionary activity largely because of their high traffic generating characteristics.	Delete Rule 17.4(c).
71.01	Progressive Enterprises Limited	17.3 Rule	In-Part	The submitter seeks amended to Rule 17.3.	Amend Rule 17.3 as follows: Insert <u>...(g) Supermarkets within a Large Format Retail Overlay Area.</u>
71.02	Progressive Enterprises Limited	17.6.1(c) Rule	In-Part	New generation supermarket buildings are 9m in high at the roof apex exclusive of plant platforms which range in height from 700-900mm but only normally occupy less than 5% of the overall roof area. A height limit of 8.5m is insufficient and should be changed to 9m with an exemption for plant platforms and associated screening. Notes that the height limit in the Residential Zone is 8.5m and it is normal planning practice to provide higher limits in Industrial and Commercial Zones.	Amend Rule 17.6.1(c) as follows: Outside of the Pedestrian Overlay Area in all towns, no part of any building shall exceed a height of 8m <u>9m</u> <u>provided that supermarket platforms to a height of 9.8m shall be permitted where such platforms occupy less than 10% of the overall roof area.</u>
71.03	Progressive Enterprises Limited	17.6.2(b) Rule	In-Part	The limitation on the extent of blank walls fails to recognise the functional and operational requirements of supermarkets, where sunlight penetration has to be	Amend Rule 17.6.2(b) as follows: Insert <u>(iv) No blank wall maximum length limits shall apply to walls that otherwise do not front or face a street.</u>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				minimised to limit sun damage to produce lines.	
71.04	Progressive Enterprises Limited	17.6.3(a), 17.6.3(b) Rule	Support	Support the current wording of Rules 17.6.3 (a) and (b).	Retain Rules 17.6.3(a) and 17.6.3(b).
71.05	Progressive Enterprises Limited	17.6.6(a) Rule	In-Part	The proposed requirements for signs are supported in part, in particular the lack of restrictions on wall signage face areas. However, oppose that there is no rule addressing free standing pylon signage.	Amend Rule 17.6.6(a) as follows: Insert <u>(vi) Pylon stands to a maximum height of 9m and a width of 3.3m with a maximum face area of 58m² (two faces) within a Large Format Retail Overlay Area.</u>
71.06	Progressive Enterprises Limited	17.6.17(a)(iv) Rule	In-Part	This rule fails to recognise the functional and operational needs of supermarkets in the Large Format Retail Overlay Area. The provision is incorrectly numbered.	Amend Rule 17.6.17(a)(iv) as follows: 17.6.17(a)(iv)(ii) Any surface or ground level parking area shall not exceed a maximum width of 10m along the site road frontage or 40% of the site frontage whichever is the lesser... OR 17.6.17(a)(iv)(ii) Any surface or ground level parking area shall not exceed a maximum width of 10m along the site road frontage or 40% of the site frontage whichever is the lesser <u>provided that such a requirement shall not apply to a Large Format Retail Overlay Area.</u>
71.07	Progressive Enterprises Limited	25.1.1 Assessment Criteria	In-Part	The General Assessment Criteria should be amended to recognise the functional and operational requirements of supermarkets.	Amend 25.5.1 as follows: Insert <u>...(o) The extent to which the functional and operational requirements of supermarkets, including but not limited to the</u>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
					<u>following:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Visibility of the store and related parking;</u> • <u>Relationship of the site to the placement of the supermarket, building, customer parking area and store entry;</u> • <u>Adequate and easily accessible heavy goods servicing; and</u> • <u>The necessary restrictions on the extent of exterior glazing;</u> <u>Have been taken into account when assessing compliance with criteria (a) to (n) of section 25.5.1.</u>
71.08	Progressive Enterprises Limited	25.5.2, 25.5.3, 25.5.4 Assessment Criteria	Support	Support providing 25.5.1 is amended as above.	Retain 25.5.2, 25.5.3, 25.5.4 provided criterion (o), clause (g) is adapted.
71.09	Progressive Enterprises Limited	25.5.6(a)(vii) Assessment Criteria	In-Part	Supermarkets should be exempt from such a requirement.	Amend 25.5.6(a)(vii) as follows: ...The extent to which verandahs have been incorporated as an integral part of the design, to establish a strong relationship with pedestrians and so that the shop fronts appear obvious and accessible <u>provided that such criterion shall not apply to supermarkets....</u>
71.10	Progressive Enterprises Limited	25.7.11 Assessment Criteria	Support	Support providing 25.1.1 is amended as above.	Retain 25.7.11.
71.11	Progressive Enterprises Limited	26 Definitions – New definition		A definition for supermarket should be provided.	Include definition for “Supermarket” as follows:

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
		"Supermarket"			<u>Supermarket means a retail shop where a comprehensive range of predominately domestic supplies and convenience goods and services are sold for consumption or use off-premise, and includes lotto shops and pharmacies located within such premises.</u>
71.12	Progressive Enterprises Limited	S9	In-Part	Appropriate recognition of the functional and operational requirements of supermarkets should be added.	Amend Section 4.1 as follows: Insert <u>7. Notwithstanding the foregoing guidelines, where practicable such provisions shall not generally apply to supermarkets because of their functional and operational characteristics.</u>
72.00	Poultry Industry Association of New Zealand & Egg Producers Federation of New Zealand	2.4.1 Objective	Support	The submitter supports the direction taken in the Proposed District Plan, specifically in relation to the establishment and operation of new and existing primary production activities. The recognition of the importance of intensive farming activities in the district is supported. Objective 2.4.1 and associated policies seek to ensure the sustainable management of rural soils for rural uses. The submitter supports Objective 2.4.1.	Retain Objective 2.4.1.
72.01	Poultry Industry Association of New Zealand & Egg Producers Federation of New	2.5.1 Objective	Support	Objective 2.5.1 and associated policies specifically ensure primary production activities such as intensive farming can operate efficiently and effectively. The submitter supports Objective 2.5.1.	Retain Objective 2.5.1.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
	Zealand				
72.02	Poultry Industry Association of New Zealand & Egg Producers Federation of New Zealand	2.5.2 Policy	Support	Policy 2.5.2 explicitly recognises the dependence that primary production activities have on rural land. The submitter supports Policy 2.5.2.	Retain Policy 2.5.2.
72.03	Poultry Industry Association of New Zealand & Egg Producers Federation of New Zealand	2.5.4 Policy	Support	The submitter supports Policy 2.5.4, which seeks to avoid reverse sensitivity effects.	Retain Policy 2.5.4.
72.04	Poultry Industry Association of New Zealand & Egg Producers Federation of New Zealand	19.1(a) Rule	Support	Primary Production activities are classified as permitted activities under Rule 19.1, subject to compliance with relevant performance criteria. The submitter supports Rule 19.1(a).	Retain Rule 19.1(a).
72.05	Poultry Industry Association of New Zealand & Egg Producers Federation of New Zealand	19.6.4(c) Rule	Support	The submitter supports Rule 19.6.4(c). The proposed setback of 300m is reflective of the odour minimisation practices that poultry farms use and is a reasonable distance.	Retain Rule 19.6.4(c).
72.06	Poultry Industry Association of New Zealand & Egg Producers Federation of New Zealand	19.6.4(b) Rule	Support	The submitter supports Rule 19.6.4(b). This rule will help ensure existing lawfully established intensive farms will not be compromised by encroaching rural residential development in rural areas.	Retain Rule 19.6.4(b).

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
72.07	Poultry Industry Association of New Zealand & Egg Producers Federation of New Zealand	19.6.4 Rule	Support	The submitter supports Rule 19.6.4. This rule acknowledges that it is not only dwelling which can cause reverse sensitivity effects. This rule provides protection for intensive farms from non-traditional rural activities that could compromise their operation.	Retain Rule 19.6.4.
72.08	Poultry Industry Association of New Zealand & Egg Producers Federation of New Zealand	19.6.17 Rule	Support	The submitter supports Rule 19.6.17 which has removed the effluent disposal controls and refers the reader to the One Plan.	Retain Rule 19.6.17.
73.00	McDonalds Restaurants (New Zealand) Limited	17.1 Rule	In-Part	The submitter considers that their business is best covered by a term or category being 'Drive-Through Restaurant'. No specific provision is made for drive-through restaurants, restaurants or cafes. Rather, these activities appear to be covered under the broad heading of 'retail'. It is considered more appropriate to specifically provide for the aforementioned activities, as this will provide greater certainty and clarity for future users of the Proposed Plan.	Amend Rule 17.1 to include 'Drive-Through Restaurant' as a permitted activity.
73.01	McDonalds Restaurants (New Zealand) Limited	26 Definitions –New definition “Drive-Through Restaurant”	In-Part	The submitter considers that their business is best covered by a term or category being 'Drive-Through Restaurant'. No specific definition is made for drive-through restaurants. Rather, this activity appears to be covered under the broad heading of 'retail'. It is considered more appropriate to specifically define drive-	Include definition for “Drive-Through Restaurant” as follows: <u>Drive-Through Restaurant means any land and/or building with a drive-through service on or in which food and beverages are prepared, served and sold to the public for consumption on or off the premises and may include</u>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				through restaurants, as this will provide greater certainty and clarity for future users of the Proposed Plan.	<u>an ancillary café and /or playground area.</u>
73.02	McDonalds Restaurants (New Zealand) Limited	Planning Map 28A	In-Part	<p>The McDonald's site is shown on Planning Map 28A as being part of a 'Proposed Pedestrian Area'. This is considered to be inappropriate.</p> <p>This notation does not appear to be based on a detailed assessment of the existing environment. For example, the site has frontage to Oxford Street with this street acknowledged as being a road of primary importance for the movement of vehicles. Further, the block of land shown with the proposed notation is dominated by at-grade car parking. These two factors alone mean that the site is inappropriate for a pedestrian area notation.</p> <p>The consequence of the 'Pedestrian Area' notation is the related urban design controls that result. These include, among other things, requirements for buildings to front sites, a glazing requirement for building frontages and the provision of a verandah. Such controls have no cognisance of the existing environment or the operational characteristics of the existing McDonald's activity.</p>	Amend Planning Map 28A to remove the 'Proposed Pedestrian Area' notation from the McDonald's site.
74.00	Ernslaw One Limited	2.4 Methods	Support	The forestry industry leads the way in the primary production sector within New Zealand through its adoption of good practice	Retain Method 2.4 Education and Information.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				and industry training guides, engineering and environmental standards. Ernslaw One forestry operations are planned and undertaken in accordance with the Environmental Code of Practice for Plantation Forestry (ECOP) 2007. The new ECOP has kept pace with changing environmental expectations and provides a valuable resource developed by industry experts. Ernslaw One has an Environmental Management System and in house Environmental Standards. The standards are regularly reviewed and updated to keep pace with changing environmental expectations and increased awareness within the forestry industry.	
74.01	Ernslaw One Limited	2.5.11 Policy	Support	Plantation forestry often faces reverse sensitivity issues as the rural area becomes more fragmented with the encroachment of urbanisation. Individuals often believe that the rural area is a quiet environment, it is important that the rural area is recognised as a working landscape and that production activities, namely plantation forestry, should not be adversely effected by the policy setting appropriate separation distances.	Retain Policy 2.5.11.
74.02	Ernslaw One Limited	2.5.12 Policy	Oppose	The statement 'reduction in rural amenity caused by tree shelterbelts or plantation forestry on adjacent and adjoining properties' is inappropriate in a District Plan policy. Industries should not be singled out as	Amend Policy 2.5.12 as follows: Avoid, remedy or mitigate any adverse environmental effects of shading of roads and reduction in rural amenity caused by tree shelterbelts or

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				<p>reducing or having any less than a positive effect on rural amenity (as indicated in your reverse sensitivity policy; this statement is highly subjective and inequitable between land uses.</p> <p>The policy should be specific to the effects that all vegetation has on the shading of sealed roads only.</p> <p>Removal of forestry from previously planted areas by restrictive land rules will also force commercial duress in regards to ETS. Liability for deforestation may become a reality for either party, Council as the rule maker, or the forest owner as the grower.</p>	<p>plantation forestry on adjacent and adjoining properties on sealed roads caused by planted vegetation.</p> <p>Or words to such effect.</p>
74.03	Ernslaw One Limited	10.3 Methods	In-Part	See Submission 74.02.	<p>Amend Method 10.3 bullet 1 as follows:</p> <p>...or mitigate adverse effects of activities including their effects on transport routes (such as glare, night lighting, setback distances for <u>plantation forestry of any planted vegetation</u>).</p> <p>Or words to such effect.</p>
74.04	Ernslaw One Limited	19.1(a) Rule	Support	Support the permitted activity status of primary production activities in the Horowhenua District provided the definition of Primary production activities is as submitted in Submission 74.05.	<p>Retain Rule 19.1(a) subject to the satisfaction of Submission 74.05.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Amend Rule 19.1 to include Plantation Forestry as a permitted activity.</p>
74.05	Ernslaw One Limited	26 Definitions - Primary Production Activity	In-Part	Oppose the proposed wording of the definition for Primary Production Activity.	Amend definition for Primary Production Activity as follows: Primary Production Activity includes

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
					any agricultural, horticultural, floricultural, arboricultural, <u>plantation</u> forestry or intensive farming activity but does not include mineral extraction or mineral processing or the harvesting clearance or modification of indigenous vegetation.
74.06	Ernslaw One Limited	19 Rules	In-Part	<p>In the process of harvesting plantation forests there is incidental clearance of indigenous vegetation that has grown under the canopy of a plantation forest and Scattered trees, shrubs and scrub amongst production forestry land. A rule should reflect that this is the reality of production forestry within the Rural Zone.</p> <p>Upon satisfaction of Submissions 74.04 and 74.05 to clarify plantation forestry as a permitted activity, the submitter seeks the incorporation of an exemption similar to 18.6.21 into the Rural Zone Chapter.</p>	Amend the Rural Chapter to include an exemption rule similar to the bullet points that are part of the Greenbelt Residential Zone Rule 18.6.21(a).
74.07	Ernslaw One Limited	19.6.15(a) Rule	In-Part	<p>Support the proposed setback distance of 10 metres from site boundaries. However, this should be for new forest plantings only and not for existing forests. Compulsory setbacks on existing plantation forests would result in significant economic losses as land is taken out of production and maintenance costs associated with weed infestation increase. Removal of forestry from previously planted areas by restrictive land rules will also force</p>	<p>Amend Rule 19.6.15(a) as follows:</p> <p>No <u>new</u> plantation forest shall be planted within 10 metres from any site boundary.</p> <p>Or words to such effect.</p>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				commercial duress in regards to ETS. Liability for deforestation may become a reality for either party, Council as the rule maker, or the forest owner as the grower.	
74.08	Ernslaw One Limited	19.6.15(b) Rule	In-Part	<p>Support the proposed setback if it is applied to new planting only not replanting of existing forested areas.</p> <p>Plantation forestry is often troubled with reverse sensitivity issues as the rural area becomes more fragmented with the encroachment of urbanisation. It is important that the rural area is recognised as a working landscape and that production activities, namely plantation forestry, should not be adversely affected by policy setting appropriate separation distances.</p> <p>The submitters seeks that the rule is applied fairly to other land uses within proximity of Plantation Forests and that no new residential dwelling should be permitted to be located within 50 metres adjacent to any existing plantation forest.</p>	<p>Amend Rule 19.6.15(b) as follows: No <u>new</u> plantation forest shall be planted within 25 metres from any existing residential dwelling unit OR A alternative rule clause states that: No new residential dwelling unit shall be located within 50 metres adjacent to any existing plantation forest in the rural zone. Or words to such effect.</p>
74.09	Ernslaw One Limited	19.6.15(c) Rule	In-Part	Ernslaw One supports the proposed setback. However, this should be for new plantings only and not for existing forests. Compulsory setbacks on existing plantation forests would result in significant economic losses as land is taken out of production and maintenance costs associated with weed infestation increase.	<p>Amend Rule 19.6.15(c) as follows: <u>New</u> vegetation planted to form a shelterbelt for more than 20 meters in length shall not exceed 6 meters in height from the ground level within 10 meters horizontal distance from any site boundary. Or words to such effect</p>
74.10	Ernslaw One Limited	19.6.15(d) Rule	In-Part	Rule 19.6.15(d) is not clearly, nor fairly,	Amend Rule 19.6.15(d) as follows:

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
	Ernslaw One Limited			<p>worded and places a burden on landowners without justification for the rule.</p> <p>1) Plantation Forests are not the only vegetation which may shade roads causing the ice effects that this rule is written to mitigate. There is no evidence to state that Plantation Forests shade roads more than other vegetation and no accident statistics to validate a rule that single out plantation forests as a cause of icing.</p> <p>2) It is unclear if this rule applies to existing plantation forests. If the rule does apply to existing plantation forests the submitter would strongly oppose this rule. Compulsory setbacks on existing plantation forests would result in significant economic losses as land is taken out of production and maintenance costs associated with weed infestation increase.</p> <p>3) Ernslaw One acknowledges the rules intent of reducing the risk of ice on roads. However, this rule should be specific to sealed roads only. The rule needs to be amended to reflect this</p>	<p>No plantation forest or shelterbelt <u>new vegetation</u> shall be planted or allowed to grow in any position which could result in any icing of any <u>sealed</u> public road carriageway as a result of shading of the road between 10:00am and 2:00pm on the shortest day.</p> <p>Or words to such effect</p>
74.11	Ernslaw One Limited	19.6.16 Rule	Oppose	<p>The Rule is incongruous with the role of the District Council.</p> <p>No Issues, Policies or Objectives have recognised that delayed revegetation of plantation forest harvesting areas is a problem. It is a 'policy orphan', and it is unclear the effects the rule is trying to</p>	Delete Rule 19.6.16.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				manage. It therefore should be removed. The rule is poorly worded, unspecific and rules out natural revegetation as an option.	
74.12	Ernslaw One Limited	2.4.1 Objective	Support	Support Objective 2.4.1.	Retain Objective 2.4.1.
74.13	Ernslaw One Limited	2.4.2 Policy	Support	Support Policy 2.4.2.	Retain Policy 2.4.2.
74.14	Ernslaw One Limited	2.4.3 Policy	Support	Support Policy 2.4.3.	Retain Policy 2.4.3.
75.00	Stuart & Jean Marshall	Planning Map 15	Oppose	Oppose the rezoning of part of 36 Johnson Street, Foxton from Industrial to Residential. The site was formerly a BP service station and there is a significant area of contamination and it is not suitable for residential zoning or use.	Amend Planning Map 15 to identify 36 Johnson Street, Foxton as within the Commercial Zone, without a Pedestrian Area Overlay.
75.01	Stuart & Jean Marshall	Planning Map 15	Oppose	Oppose the identification of 36 Johnson Street, Foxton as within the Foxton Town Centre Character Heritage Overlay Area.	Amend Planning Map 15 to remove 36 Johnson Street, Foxton from within the Foxton Town Centre Character Heritage Overlay Area.
76.00	Ann Percy	2.5.10 Policy	In-Part	Reasoning is linked to Rule 19.6.4 (10m rural set back). Not an effective method to maintain and enhance rural character.	No relief requested for Policy 2.5.10.
76.01	Ann Percy	19.4.7 Rule	Oppose	Opposes Rule 19.4.7 as the process is not transparent, not fair and equitable and too adversarial. This will lead to an increase in uncertainty and stress, which will in turn result in escalating housing affordability and increased council overheads. This change will decrease land values, reduce development of communities in coastal areas and place the control of coastal planning in the hands of a limited number of people.	Delete Rule 19.4.7. If it is not possible to remove the rule, comprehensive guidelines will need to be in place as well as a consent process in which costs are not passed to the land owner. This should be informed by community consultation.
76.02	Ann Percy	19.6.4 Rule	Oppose	Opposes the requirement of a 10 metre building set back from boundaries.	Amend Rule 19.6.4 as follows:

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				<p>A 10 metre building set back will negatively affect the ability of rural landowners to undertake farming activities.</p> <p>A 10 metre building set back will have a negative environmental impact as it prevents the utilisation of naturally occurring building sites (which will result in an increase in potential earthworks). Many rural subdivisions have existing building platforms that are yet to be built on; these may be within 10m from boundaries.</p> <p>Requiring a 10 metre setback will have a negative visual impact.</p>	19.6.4 (a) (iii) 10 3 metres from any other site boundary;
77.00	Higgins Group Holdings Ltd	26 Definitions – New definition “Aggregate Extraction”	In-Part	Having “Aggregate Extraction” separately defined enables the District Plan to specifically provide for the activity. Given its acknowledged importance to the District, it is submitted that specific provision for “Aggregate Extraction” is essential to ensure an unhindered supply for future uses.	<p>Include definition for Aggregate Extraction as follows:</p> <p><u>“Aggregate Extraction means the use of land, buildings and plant for the primary purpose of extraction, winning, quarrying, excavation, taking and associated crushing and processing of mineral deposits such as, but not limited to, rock, gravel, and sand”.</u></p>
77.01	Higgins Group Holdings Ltd	26 Definitions – Earthworks	In-Part	The definition for Earthworks needs to be amended so that it excludes “Aggregate Extraction”. This is required so that Aggregate Extraction activities are not captured by existing or future rules in the District Plan that aim to control effects of earthworks.	<p>Amend definition of Earthworks as follows:</p> <p>Earthworks means any alteration to the existing natural ground level including re-shaping, re-contouring, excavation, backfilling, compaction, stripping of vegetation and top soil and depositing of clean fill. <u>Earthworks does not</u></p>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
					<u>include Aggregate Extraction.</u>
77.02	Higgins Group Holdings Ltd	19.2.X New Rule	In-Part	The effects of Aggregate Extraction activates are well known and are confined to certain matters such as noise, vibration, dust, traffic and visual amenity effects. Almost all aggregate extraction takes place in the Rural Zone. Therefore, it is submitted that Aggregate Extraction should be a controlled activity in the Rural Zone.	Amend Rule 19.2 with consequential changes to Rule 19.7 (Matters of Control and Conditions) as follows: Rule 19.2 Controlled Activities (a) Any subdivision of land (Refer Rule 19.7.1 and 19.7.2). <u>(X) Aggregate Extraction.</u>
77.03	Higgins Group Holdings Ltd	19.7.X New Rule	In-Part	The effects of Aggregate Extraction activates are well known and are confined to certain matters such as noise, vibration, dust, traffic and visual amenity effects. Almost all aggregate extraction takes place in the Rural Zone. Therefore, it is submitted that Aggregate Extraction should be a controlled activity in the Rural Zone.	Amend Rule 19.7 by including; <u>Rule 19.7.X Matters of Control and Conditions for Controlled Activities</u> a) <u>Matters of Control</u> i) <u>The management of noise and vibration</u> ii) <u>The management of heavy vehicle movements on local roads</u> iii) <u>Management of dust, erosion and sediment discharges beyond the site</u> iv) <u>The effects of modifications to the landscape character and particularly on the amenity values of any outstanding natural</u>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
					<u>feature of landscape.</u>
77.04	Higgins Group Holdings Ltd	2.5 Issue Discussion	In-Part	Would like to see recognition of Aggregate Extraction be made within the discussion of Issue 2.5.	<p>Amend Issue 2.5 Issue Discussion as follows:</p> <p>Paragraph 1: ... processing sheds, fertiliser deposits and rural contractors. <u>Other industrial-type activities also occur in the rural environment, such as aggregate extraction, which is critical to the functioning of the District.</u> There are other non-primary...</p> <p>Paragraph 3: Given the nature and scale of some primary production activities and <u>aggregate extraction activities</u> in the rural environment, ...</p>
77.05	Higgins Group Holdings Ltd	2.5.1 Objective	In-Part	That recognition of Aggregate Extraction within Objective 2.5.1 is essential to ensure that reverse sensitivity are fully considered in any resource consent applications for activities intending to establish near Aggregate Extraction.	<p>Amend Objective 2.5.1 as follows:</p> <p>To enable primary production activities, and other associated rural based land uses <u>and Aggregate Extraction activities</u> to function efficiently, and effectively in the Rural Zone...</p>
77.06	Higgins Group Holdings Ltd	2.5.X New Policy	In-Part	That the insertion of a specific policy is essential to ensure that reverse sensitivity are fully considered in any resource consent applications for activities intending to establish near Aggregate Extraction	<p>Include the following Policy:</p> <p><u>Policy 2.5.X</u> <u>Ensure the effects (including reverse sensitivity) on Aggregate Extraction sites and activities are considered</u></p>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
					<u>when planning for and making decisions for the establishment of new activities, particularly sensitive activities, on land in the Rural Zone near existing or proposed Aggregate Extraction sites.</u>
77.07	Higgins Group Holdings Limited	19.6.11 Rule	Oppose	Oppose Rule 19.6.11 as it unnecessarily restricts potential Aggregate Extraction activities from land near rivers and streams, which is where the majority of such activities are currently located and are likely to be located in the foreseeable future. Aggregate Extraction activities within the bed of a river require resource consent from Manawatu-Wanganui Regional Council where the effects on flood hazards are assessed.	Delete Rule 19.6.11 If not deleted, request to amend Rule 19.6.11 [Exception] as follows: (a).... (b).... Except, the above two standards (a) and (b) do not apply to any soil conservation and river/flood control works carried out by or on behalf of Horizons Regional Council <u>or to any Aggregate Extraction activities.</u>
77.08	Higgins Group Holdings Limited	19.6.4 Rule	In-Part	Submitter seeks a new condition for permitted activities be inserted under Rule 19.6.4 that limits the establishment of dwellings and other noise sensitive activities within 500 metres of the boundaries of any lawfully established aggregate extraction site or the Ohau river bed.	Amend Rule 19.6.4 by including; ... b) All residential dwelling units and sensitive activities shall comply with the following additional setbacks and separation distances: ... <u>(iv) 500 metres from any Aggregate Extraction site or the Ohau River Bed.</u>
77.09	Higgins Group Holdings Ltd	19.8 Rule	In-Part	Would like to see a new condition for permitted activities be inserted under 19.8 that limits the establishment of dwellings and other noise sensitive activities within 500 metres of the boundaries of any lawfully	Amend Rule 19.8 by including: <u>19.8.X Separation Distances from Aggregate Extraction Sites.</u> <u>(a) Matters of Discretion</u> <u>(i) Reverse sensitivity effects including</u>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				established aggregate extraction site or the Ohau River bed.	<u>those created by, but not limited to, noise, vibration, dust, heavy traffic and visual amenity.</u>
78.00	Telecom New Zealand Ltd	12.1.1 Objective	Support	Supports Objective 12.1.1 as it provides a good balance of recognising the importance of utilities to the community and their locational and technical requirement, whilst ensuring that the adverse effects are managed.	Retain intent of Objective 12.1.1
78.01	Telecom New Zealand Ltd	12.1.2 Policy	Support	Supports Policy 12.1.2 as it provides a good balance of recognising the importance of utilities to the community and their locational and technical requirement, whilst ensuring that the adverse effects are managed.	Retain intent of Policy 12.1.2
78.02	Telecom New Zealand Ltd	12.1.3 Policy	Support	Supports Policy 12.1.3 as it provides a good balance of recognising the importance of utilities to the community and their locational and technical requirement, whilst ensuring that the adverse effects are managed.	Retain intent of Policy 12.1.3
78.03	Telecom New Zealand Ltd	12.1.6 Policy	Support	Supports Policy 12.1.6 as it provides a good balance of recognising the importance of utilities to the community and their locational and technical requirement, whilst ensuring that the adverse effects are managed.	Retain intent of Policy 12.1.6
78.04	Telecom New Zealand Ltd	12.1.9 Policy	Support	Supports Policy 12.1.9 as it provides a good balance of recognising the importance of utilities to the community and their locational and technical requirement, whilst ensuring that the adverse effects are managed.	Retain intent of Policy 12.1.9
78.05	Telecom New Zealand Ltd	12.1.8 Policy	Support	Supports the provision for co-location as set out in Policy 12.1.8.	Retain intent of Policy 12.1.8

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
78.06	Telecom New Zealand Ltd	12.1.4 Policy	Oppose	Opposes Policy 12.1.4 as the additional protection afforded to 'open space' in this policy is unclear in terms of what constitutes open space, and it is unnecessary and inconsistent with the provision of permitted network utilities in the Open Space Zone. Placement of network utilities in open space areas is often an appropriate environmental response to deploying infrastructure with minimum impact on communities.	Amend Policy 12.1.4 as follows: Provide additional protection for sensitive areas such as Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes, heritage and cultural sites and buildings, Notable Trees, coasts, lakes, river and other waterways, and open space from the adverse effects of network utilities.
78.07	Telecom New Zealand Ltd	15 General - Network utility rules throughout Chapter	Oppose	That all rules for network utilities be contained in a standalone chapter, to enable a 'one stop shop' approach and allow for greater confidence in determining how a proposal fits the district plan provisions. This approach also recognises that the particular operation and functional requirements of network utilities, the general provisions that apply to other activities and buildings within a zone may not be appropriate for telecommunication facilities.	Delete all Network Utility Rules and Standards within the Residential Chapter, other than specific cross referencing to particular standards in the zone chapters where relevant and reasonably applicable to network utilities.
78.08	Telecom New Zealand Ltd	16 General - Network utility rules throughout Chapter	Oppose	That all rules for network utilities be contained in a standalone chapter, to enable a 'one stop shop' approach and allow for greater confidence in determining how a proposal fits the district plan provisions. This approach also recognises that the particular operation and functional requirements of network utilities, the general provisions that apply to other activities and buildings within a zone may not be appropriate for	Delete all Network Utility Rules and Standards within the Industrial Chapter, other than specific cross referencing to particular standards in the zone chapters where relevant and reasonably applicable to network utilities.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				telecommunication facilities.	
78.09	Telecom New Zealand Ltd	17 General - Network utility rules throughout Chapter	Oppose	That all rules for network utilities be contained in a standalone chapter, to enable a 'one stop shop' approach and allow for greater confidence in determining how a proposal fits the district plan provisions. This approach also recognises that the particular operation and functional requirements of network utilities, the general provisions that apply to other activities and buildings within a zone may not be appropriate for telecommunication facilities.	Delete all Network Utility Rules and Standards within the Commercial Chapter, other than specific cross referencing to particular standards in the zone chapters where relevant and reasonably applicable to network utilities.
78.10	Telecom New Zealand Ltd	19 General - Network utility rules throughout Chapter	Oppose	That all rules for network utilities be contained in a standalone chapter, to enable a 'one stop shop' approach and allow for greater confidence in determining how a proposal fits the district plan provisions. This approach also recognises that the particular operation and functional requirements of network utilities, the general provisions that apply to other activities and buildings within a zone may not be appropriate for telecommunication facilities.	Delete all Network Utility Rules and Standards within the Rural Chapter, other than specific cross referencing to particular standards in the zone chapters where relevant and reasonably applicable to network utilities.
78.11	Telecom New Zealand Ltd	20 General - Network utility rules throughout Chapter	Oppose	That all rules for network utilities be contained in a standalone chapter, to enable a 'one stop shop' approach and allow for greater confidence in determining how a proposal fits the district plan provisions. This approach also recognises that the particular operation and functional requirements of network utilities, the general provisions that	Delete all Network Utility Rules and Standards within the Open Space Chapter, other than specific cross referencing to particular standards in the zone chapters where relevant and reasonably applicable to network utilities.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				apply to other activities and buildings within a zone may not be appropriate for telecommunication facilities.	
78.12	Telecom New Zealand Ltd	22 General - Network utility rules throughout Chapter	Oppose	That all rules for network utilities be contained in a standalone chapter, to enable a 'one stop shop' approach and allow for greater confidence in determining how a proposal fits the district plan provisions. This approach also recognises that the particular operation and functional requirements of network utilities, the general provisions that apply to other activities and buildings within a zone may not be appropriate for telecommunication facilities.	Delete all Network Utility Rules and Standards within the Utilities and Energy Chapter. Add a new standalone network utilities chapter.
78.13	Telecom New Zealand Ltd	22.1.4(a) Rule	In-Part	Opposes Rule 22.1.4(a), as rather than applying the height rules for the adjoining zone, it is more appropriate to apply the residential height in relation to boundary (daylight) and set back controls.	Amend Rule 22.1.4(a) as follows : (a) Notwithstanding any other conditions, where it is proposed to locate any network utility structure on a site adjoining the Residential Zone, the performance conditions of the adjoining Residential Zone shall apply in relation to the height and location of any network utility structure.
78.14	Telecom New Zealand Ltd	22.1.8 Rule	In-Part	Oppose Rule 22.1.8 and the definition of 'Building' in Chapter 26. Small lightning rods are not excluded from the from the maximum height requirements for network utilities in Rule 22.1.8, or through the exemption provided for in the definition of "building".	Amend Rule 22.1.8 by exempting lightning rods from the maximum height limit. Refer to Submission Point 78.15 for relief sought to Chapter 26 and the definition of 'building'.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				Due to the small size and negligible environmental effect of lightning rods, they should be expressly excluded from the maximum height limit for utility structure to which they are attached. In addition be an exemption for in the definition of building (Refer to Chapter 26 for this relief).	
78.15	Telecom New Zealand Ltd	26 Definitions - Building	Oppose	<p>Oppose Rule 22.1.8 and the definition of "Building" in Chapter 26.</p> <p>Small lightning rods are not excluded from the from the maximum height requirements for network utilities in Rule 22.1.8, or through the exemption provided for in the definition of "Building".</p> <p>Due to the small size and negligible environmental effect of lightning rods, they should be expressly excluded from the maximum height limit for utility structure to which they are attached.</p>	Amend the definition of Building by exempting lightning rods.
78.16	Telecom New Zealand Ltd	22.1.8 Rule	Oppose	<p>In general the permitted height limits for masts and attached antennas are reasonable. However, the heights are considered unnecessarily restrictive in the Commercial Zone (outside the pedestrian overlay area) and the Industrial Zone. Where practicable, Telecom prefers to deploy infrastructure in commercial and industrial zones within urban areas where larger building typologies are enabled and larger scale structures are better able to be absorbed.</p>	<p>Amend Rule 22.1.8 as follows:</p> <p>(a) All masts, pylons, towers, support structure, aerials, antennas and other structures associated with network utilities and domestic scale renewable energy device shall not exceed the following maximum height requirements:</p> <p>(i) 13.5 metres in the Residential Zone and Open Space Zone.</p> <p>(ii) 13.5 15 metres in the Commercial Zone, except in the Pedestrian Area</p>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
					Overlay in Levin. (iii) 20 metres in the Commercial Zone in the Pedestrian Area Overlay in Levin. (iv) 20 <u>25</u> metres in the Industrial Zone.
78.17	Telecom New Zealand Ltd	22.1.X New Rule	In-Part	Telecom supports use of co-location solutions where this is feasible. To encourage co-location solutions that minimise the required bulk of structures to support more than one network, the rules (in selected zones) need to provide for an additional height allowance to incentive such solutions.	Include a new permitted activity standard in Rule 22.1 Conditions for Permitted Activities, that provides for masts and attached antennas to exceed the permitted height limits in Rule 22.1.8 by an additional 5m in Commercial, Industrial and Rural Zones, where the antennas of more than one network utility operator are co-located on the same mast.
78.18	Telecom New Zealand Ltd	22.1.X New Rule	In-Part	Antennas mounted on buildings are a common means of deploying antennas and avoids the need to build standalone masts. Currently, the only provision dealing with antennas on buildings is an exemption from the definitions of 'Height' for antennas, masts and other support structures that do not measure more than 2m in a horizontal plane, or more than 1.5m above the height of the building. It is preferable to provide for allowance for antennas on buildings within the rules section rather than a definition, where the allowances for antennas and associated equipment above building can be varied depending on zone sensitivity. A 1.5m allowance is considered to be	Include a new permitted activity standard in Rule 22.1 Conditions for Permitted Activities, that provides for antennas and ancillary support structures and equipment mounted on buildings as permitted activities provided they do not exceed the height of the part of the building to which they are attached by more than the following limits: Residential and Open Space Zones: 3m All Other Zones: 5m

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				unrealistic for networks that use vertically orientated panel antennas. 3m allowance in the Residential and Open Space Zones, and 5m in other zones is requested.	
78.19	Telecom New Zealand Ltd	15.6.14 Rule	In-Part	As currently drafted the permitted activity conditions for flood hazard overlay areas would not provide for the linear utilities or small telecommunication cabinets as permitted activities. Telecom requests permitted activity status under the applicable permitted activity condition in each zone for lines (above and below ground), including any ancillary earthworks such as trenching, as well as network utility masts and building/cabinets not exceeding 5m ² in floor area.	Amend Rule 15.6.14 so that the following are provided for as a permitted activity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Underground lines • Above ground lines including support poles • Network utility masts • Network utility cabinets/buildings not exceeding 5m² GFA; • Ancillary earthworks to any of the above activities.
78.20	Telecom New Zealand Ltd	16.6.19 Rule	In-Part	As currently drafted the permitted activity conditions for flood hazard overlay areas would not provide for the linear utilities or small telecommunication cabinets as permitted activities. Telecom requests permitted activity status under the applicable permitted activity condition in each zone for lines (above and below ground), including any ancillary earthworks such as trenching, as well as network utility masts and building/cabinets not exceeding 5m ² in floor area.	Amend Rule 16.6.19 so that the following are provided for as a permitted activity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Underground lines • Above ground lines including support poles • Network utility masts • Network utility cabinets/buildings not exceeding 5m² GFA; • Ancillary earthworks to any of the above activities.
78.21	Telecom New	17.6.21 Rule	In-Part	As currently drafted the permitted activity	Amend Rule 17.6.21 so that the

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
	Zealand Ltd			conditions for flood hazard overlay areas would not provide for the linear utilities or small telecommunication cabinets as permitted activities. Telecom requests permitted activity status under the applicable permitted activity condition in each zone for lines (above and below ground), including any ancillary earthworks such as trenching, as well as network utility masts and building/cabinets not exceeding 5m ² in floor area.	following are provided for as a permitted activity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Underground lines • Above ground lines including support poles • Network utility masts • Network utility cabinets/buildings not exceeding 5m² GFA; • Ancillary earthworks to any of the above activities.
78.22	Telecom New Zealand Ltd	19.6.11 Rule	In-Part	As currently drafted the permitted activity conditions for flood hazard overlay areas would not provide for the linear utilities or small telecommunication cabinets as permitted activities. Telecom requests permitted activity status under the applicable permitted activity condition in each zone for lines (above and below ground), including any ancillary earthworks such as trenching, as well as network utility masts and building/cabinets not exceeding 5m ² in floor area.	Amend Rule 19.6.11 so that the following are provided for as a permitted activity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Underground lines • Above ground lines including support poles • Network utility masts • Network utility cabinets/buildings not exceeding 5m² GFA; • Ancillary earthworks to any of the above activities.
78.23	Telecom New Zealand Ltd	20.6.11 Rule	In-Part	As currently drafted the permitted activity conditions for flood hazard overlay areas would not provide for the linear utilities or small telecommunication cabinets as permitted activities. Telecom requests permitted activity status under the applicable permitted activity	Amend Rule 20.6.11 so that the following are provided for as a permitted activity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Underground lines • Above ground lines including support poles • Network utility masts

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				condition in each zone for lines (above and below ground), including any ancillary earthworks such as trenching, as well as network utility masts and building/cabinets not exceeding 5m ² in floor area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Network utility cabinets/buildings not exceeding 5m² GFA; • Ancillary earthworks to any of the above activities.
78.24	Telecom New Zealand Ltd	21.1.8 Rule	In-Part	The parking rules for each zone apply to all activities except network utilities on sites of less than 200m ² . However, there is no parking limit specified for network utilities in Chapter 21. Network utilities are often located either in a road reserve or on a small lease area on a larger property where it may also be uncertain to determine whether this constitutes a network utility being located on a site of less than 200m ² .	Amend the Proposed Plan as necessary such that network utilities are not subject to car parking requirements.
79.00	Chorus New Zealand Limited	12.1.1 Objective	Support	Supports Objective 12.1.1 as it provides a good balance of recognising the importance of utilities to the community and their locational and technical requirement, whilst ensuring that the adverse effects are managed.	Retain intent of Objective 12.1.1
79.01	Chorus New Zealand Ltd	12.1.2 Policy	Support	Supports Policy 12.1.2 as it provides a good balance of recognising the importance of utilities to the community and their locational and technical requirement, whilst ensuring that the adverse effects are managed.	Retain intent of Policy 12.1.2
79.02	Chorus New Zealand Ltd	12.1.3 Policy	Support	Supports Policy 12.1.3 as it provides a good balance of recognising the importance of utilities to the community and their locational and technical requirement, whilst ensuring that the adverse effects are managed.	Retain intent of Policy 12.1.3

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
79.03	Chorus New Zealand Ltd	12.1.6 Policy	Support	Supports Policy 12.1.6 as it provides a good balance of recognising the importance of utilities to the community and their locational and technical requirement, whilst ensuring that the adverse effects are managed.	Retain intent of Policy 12.1.6
79.04	Chorus New Zealand Ltd	12.1.9 Policy	Support	Supports Policy 12.1.9 as it provides a good balance of recognising the importance of utilities to the community and their locational and technical requirement, whilst ensuring that the adverse effects are managed.	Retain intent of Policy 12.1.9
79.05	Chorus New Zealand Ltd	12.1.8 Policy	Support	Supports the provision for co-location as set out in Policy 12.1.8.	Retain intent of Policy 12.1.8
79.06	Chorus New Zealand Ltd	12.1.4 Policy	Oppose	Opposes Policy 12.1.4 as the additional protection afforded to 'open space' in this policy is unclear in terms of what constitutes open space, and it is unnecessary and inconsistent with the provision of permitted network utilities in the Open Space Zone. Placement of network utilities in open space areas is often an appropriate environmental response to deploying infrastructure with minimum impact on communities.	Amend Policy 12.1.4 as follows: Provide additional protection for sensitive areas such as Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes, heritage and cultural sites and buildings, Notable Trees, coasts, lakes, river and other waterways, and open space from the adverse effects of network utilities.
79.07	Chorus New Zealand Ltd	15 General - Network utility rules throughout Chapter	Oppose	That all rules for network utilities be contained in a standalone chapter, to enable a 'one stop shop' approach and allow for greater confidence in determining how a proposal fits the district plan provisions. This approach also recognises that the particular operation and functional requirements of network utilities, the general provisions that apply to other activities and buildings within a	Delete all Network Utility Rules and Standards within the Residential Chapter, other than specific cross referencing to particular standards in the zone chapters where relevant and reasonably applicable to network utilities.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				zone may not be appropriate for telecommunication facilities.	
79.08	Chorus New Zealand Ltd	16 General - Network utility rules throughout Chapter	Oppose	That all rules for network utilities be contained in a standalone chapter, to enable a 'one stop shop' approach and allow for greater confidence in determining how a proposal fits the district plan provisions. This approach also recognises that the particular operation and functional requirements of network utilities, the general provisions that apply to other activities and buildings within a zone may not be appropriate for telecommunication facilities.	Delete all Network Utility Rules and Standards within the Industrial Chapter, other than specific cross referencing to particular standards in the zone chapters where relevant and reasonably applicable to network utilities.
79.09	Chorus New Zealand Ltd	17 General - Network utility rules throughout Chapter	Oppose	That all rules for network utilities be contained in a standalone chapter, to enable a 'one stop shop' approach and allow for greater confidence in determining how a proposal fits the district plan provisions. This approach also recognises that the particular operation and functional requirements of network utilities, the general provisions that apply to other activities and buildings within a zone may not be appropriate for telecommunication facilities.	Delete all Network Utility Rules and Standards within the Commercial Chapter.
79.10	Chorus New Zealand Ltd	19 General - Network utility rules throughout Chapter	Oppose	That all rules for network utilities be contained in a standalone chapter, to enable a 'one stop shop' approach and allow for greater confidence in determining how a proposal fits the district plan provisions. This approach also recognises that the particular operation and functional requirements of	Delete all Network Utility Rules and Standards within the Rural Chapter.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				network utilities, the general provisions that apply to other activities and buildings within a zone may not be appropriate for telecommunication facilities.	
79.11	Chorus New Zealand Ltd	20 General - Network utility rules throughout Chapter	Oppose	That all rules for network utilities be contained in a standalone chapter, to enable a 'one stop shop' approach and allow for greater confidence in determining how a proposal fits the district plan provisions. This approach also recognises that the particular operation and functional requirements of network utilities, the general provisions that apply to other activities and buildings within a zone may not be appropriate for telecommunication facilities.	Delete all Network Utility Rules and Standards within the Open Space Chapter, other than specific cross referencing to particular standards in the zone chapters where relevant and reasonably applicable to network utilities.
79.12	Chorus New Zealand Ltd	22 General - Network utility rules throughout Chapter	Oppose	That all rules for network utilities be contained in a standalone chapter, to enable a 'one stop shop' approach and allow for greater confidence in determining how a proposal fits the district plan provisions. This approach also recognises that the particular operation and functional requirements of network utilities, the general provisions that apply to other activities and buildings within a zone may not be appropriate for telecommunication facilities.	Delete all Network Utility Rules and Standards within the Utilities and Energy Chapter. Add a new standalone network utilities chapter.
79.13	Chorus New Zealand Ltd	22.1.4(a) Rule	In-Part	Opposes Rule 22.1.4(a), as rather than applying the height rules for the adjoining zone, it is more appropriate to apply the residential height in relation to boundary (daylight) and set back controls.	Amend Rule 22.1.4(a) as follows : (a) Notwithstanding any other conditions, where it is proposed to locate any network utility structure on a site adjoining the Residential Zone,

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
					the performance conditions of the adjoining Residential Zone shall apply in relation to the height and location of any network utility structure.
79.14	Chorus New Zealand Ltd	22.1.8 Rule	In-Part	<p>Oppose Rule 22.1.8 and the definition of 'Building' in Chapter 26.</p> <p>Small lightning rods are not excluded from the from the maximum height requirements for network utilities in Rule 22.1.8, or through the exemption provided for in the definition of "building".</p> <p>Due to the small size and negligible environmental effect of lightning rods, they should be expressly excluded from the maximum height limit for utility structure to which they are attached. In addition be an exemption for in the definition of building (Refer to Chapter 26 for this relief).</p>	<p>Amend Rule 22.1.8 by exempting lightning rods from the maximum height limit.</p> <p>Refer to Submission Point 78.15 for relief sought to Chapter 26 and the definition of 'building'.</p>
79.15	Chorus New Zealand Ltd	26 Definitions Building	Oppose	<p>Oppose Rule 22.1.8 and the definition of "Building" in Chapter 26.</p> <p>Small lightning rods are not excluded from the from the maximum height requirements for network utilities in Rule 22.1.8, or through the exemption provided for in the definition of "Building".</p> <p>Due to the small size and negligible environmental effect of lightning rods, they should be expressly excluded from the maximum height limit for utility structure to which they are attached.</p>	Amend the definition of Building by exempting lightning rods.
79.16	Chorus New Zealand	22.1.8 Rule	Oppose	In general the permitted height limits for	Amend Rule 22.1.8 as follows:

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
	Ltd			masts and attached antennas are reasonable. However, the heights are considered unnecessarily restrictive in the Commercial Zone (outside the pedestrian overlay area) and the Industrial Zone. Where practicable, Telecom prefers to deploy infrastructure in commercial and industrial zones within urban areas where larger building typologies are enabled and larger scale structures are better able to be absorbed.	(a) All masts, pylons, towers, support structure, aerials, antennas and other structures associated with network utilities and domestic scale renewable energy device shall not exceed the following maximum height requirements: (i) 13.5 metres in the Residential Zone and Open Space Zone. (ii) 13.5 <u>15</u> metres in the Commercial Zone, except in the Pedestrian Area Overlay in Levin. (iii) 20 metres in the Commercial Zone in the Pedestrian Area Overlay in Levin. (iv) 20 <u>25</u> metres in the Industrial Zone.
79.17	Chorus New Zealand Ltd	22.1.X New Rule	In-Part	Chorus supports use of co-location solutions where this is feasible. To encourage co-location solutions that minimise the required bulk of structures to support more than one network, the rules (in selected zones) need to provide for an additional height allowance to incentive such solutions.	Include a new permitted activity standard in Rule 22.1 Conditions for Permitted Activities, that provides for masts and attached antennas to exceed the permitted height limits in Rule 22.1.8 by an additional 5m in Commercial, Industrial and Rural Zones, where the antennas of more than one network utility operator are co-located on the same mast.
79.18	Chorus New Zealand Ltd	22.1.X New Rule	In-Part	Antennas mounted on buildings are a common means of deploying antennas and avoids the need to build standalone masts. Currently, the only provision dealing with antennas on buildings is an exemption from	Include a new permitted activity standard in Rule 22.1 Conditions for Permitted Activities, that provides for antennas and ancillary support structures and equipment mounted on

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				<p>the definitions of 'Height' for antennas, masts and other support structures that do not measure more than 2m in a horizontal plane, or more than 1.5m above the height of the building.</p> <p>It is preferable to provide for allowance for antennas on buildings within the rules section rather than a definition, where the allowances for antennas and associated equipment above building can be varied depending on zone sensitivity.</p> <p>A 1.5m allowance is considered to be unrealistic for networks that use vertically orientated panel antennas.</p> <p>3m allowance in the Residential and Open Space Zones, and 5m in other zones is requested.</p>	<p>buildings as permitted activities provided they do not exceed the height of the part of the building to which they are attached by more than the following limits:</p> <p>Residential and Open Space Zones: 3m All Other Zones: 5m</p>
79.19	Chorus New Zealand Ltd	15.6.14 Rule	In-Part	<p>As currently drafted the permitted activity conditions for flood hazard overlay areas would not provide for the linear utilities or small telecommunication cabinets as permitted activities.</p> <p>Chorus requests permitted activity status under the applicable permitted activity condition in each zone for lines (above and below ground), including any ancillary earthworks such as trenching, as well as network utility masts and building/cabinets not exceeding 5m² in floor area.</p>	<p>Amend Rule 15.6.14 so that the following are provided for as a permitted activity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Underground lines • Above ground lines including support poles • Network utility masts • Network utility cabinets/buildings not exceeding 5m² GFA; • Ancillary earthworks to any of the above activities.
79.20	Chorus New Zealand Ltd	16.6.19 Rule	In-Part	<p>As currently drafted the permitted activity conditions for flood hazard overlay areas</p>	<p>Amend Rule 16.6.19 so that the following are provided for as a</p>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				would not provide for the linear utilities or small telecommunication cabinets as permitted activities. Chorus requests permitted activity status under the applicable permitted activity condition in each zone for lines (above and below ground), including any ancillary earthworks such as trenching, as well as network utility masts and building/cabinets not exceeding 5m ² in floor area.	permitted activity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Underground lines • Above ground lines including support poles • Network utility masts • Network utility cabinets/buildings not exceeding 5m² GFA; • Ancillary earthworks to any of the above activities.
79.21	Chorus New Zealand Ltd	17.6.21 Rule	In-Part	As currently drafted the permitted activity conditions for flood hazard overlay areas would not provide for the linear utilities or small telecommunication cabinets as permitted activities. Chorus requests permitted activity status under the applicable permitted activity condition in each zone for lines (above and below ground), including any ancillary earthworks such as trenching, as well as network utility masts and building/cabinets not exceeding 5m ² in floor area.	Amend Rule 17.6.21 so that the following are provided for as a permitted activity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Underground lines • Above ground lines including support poles • Network utility masts • Network utility cabinets/buildings not exceeding 5m² GFA; • Ancillary earthworks to any of the above activities.
79.22	Chorus New Zealand Ltd	19.6.11 Rule	In-Part	As currently drafted the permitted activity conditions for flood hazard overlay areas would not provide for the linear utilities or small telecommunication cabinets as permitted activities. Chorus requests permitted activity status under the applicable permitted activity condition in each zone for lines (above and	Amend Rule 19.6.11 so that the following are provided for as a permitted activity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Underground lines • Above ground lines including support poles • Network utility masts • Network utility

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				below ground), including any ancillary earthworks such as trenching, as well as network utility masts and building/cabinets not exceeding 5m ² in floor area.	cabinets/buildings not exceeding 5m ² GFA; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ancillary earthworks to any of the above activities.
79.23	Chorus New Zealand Ltd	20.6.11 Rule	In-Part	As currently drafted the permitted activity conditions for flood hazard overlay areas would not provide for the linear utilities or small telecommunication cabinets as permitted activities. Chorus requests permitted activity status under the applicable permitted activity condition in each zone for lines (above and below ground), including any ancillary earthworks such as trenching, as well as network utility masts and building/cabinets not exceeding 5m ² in floor area.	Amend Rule 20.6.11 so that the following are provided for as a permitted activity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Underground lines Above ground lines including support poles Network utility masts Network utility cabinets/buildings not exceeding 5m² GFA; Ancillary earthworks to any of the above activities.
79.24	Chorus New Zealand Ltd	21.1.8 Rule	Oppose	The parking rules for each zone apply to all activities except network utilities on sites of less than 200m ² . However, there is no parking limit specified for network utilities in Chapter 21. Network utilities are often located either in a road reserve or on a small lease area on a larger property where it may also be uncertain to determine whether this constitutes a network utility being located on a site of less than 200m ² .	Amend the Proposed Plan as necessary such that network utilities are not subject to car parking requirements.
80.00	Todd Energy Ltd	A Introduction	In-Part	The submitter supports the intent of the introduction and explanation provided by Part A but considers it should be expanded in relation to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The purpose of scheduling rivers and 	Amend Part A: Introduction, Part F Schedules and Planning Maps with the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add a description of the purpose of Schedule 12; and

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				<p>streams; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reference to High Amenity Landscapes (HAL) and the implications of being in a HAL. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add a discussion of the HAL (and the ONFL) and the implications.
80.01	Todd Energy Ltd	2 General Matters	In-Part	<p>The submitter opposes In-Part the objectives and policies (in-particular Policy 2.1) in relation to landscape as they are set out in Chapter 2 as they do not provide clarity and certainty.</p> <p>The 'grey-out' text is accepted. However the relationship between the plan changes (future outcomes through appeals) and the proposed district plan remains uncertain.</p> <p>All Chapters and provisions are inter-related and there are constraints on viewing the chapters in isolation from the "grey-out" areas, subject to PC20 -22. Consideration of objectives and policies cannot be approached in an integrated manner.</p> <p>The decision of the Commissioners on PC 22 refers to several matters that are to be considered in the plan review, including the area in the HAL above 100m contour boundary and the fit between the network utilities and Chapter 19/22, as well as renewable energy and streams and rivers. Not all of these appear to have been addressed in the plan review.</p>	<p>Amend [and potentially] Include provisions that achieve the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To take into account that full consideration of the implications of the proposed district plan is difficult when having to view it in isolation from the outcome of PC 20 – 22 and that the relationship between the rural environment, utilities and landscape policy framework needs to be integrated and clear. Review of the 100m contour boundary in line with the Commissioners' comments in the decision on Plan Change 22.
80.02	Todd Energy Ltd	2.X New Policy	In-Part	<p>The submitter identifies that "infrastructure" is referred to in the Issue Discussion and Explanation and Principal Reasons. However</p>	<p>Include a policy in Chapter 2 that makes it clear that infrastructure is a legitimate rural land use activity and is</p>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				the Objectives and Policies do not provide any policy guidance in relation to infrastructure. Infrastructure can be as limited in its location by physical resources as primary production is, and this should be recognised.	subject to constraints on location in relation to physical resources.
80.03	Todd Energy Ltd	3.3.2 Policy	In-Part	There is no clear policy link to the two different groups of Priority Water Bodies identified in Schedule 12. This policy states that priority water bodies will be identified but it does not identify the purpose of the priority or how it will be applied.	Amend Policy 3.3.2. provide clear policy direction and to clarify the purpose and application of Schedule 12 and the two groups of priority water bodies. The resultant wording should not constrain the further development of the Mangahao Power Station and renewable electricity generation projects.
80.04	Todd Energy Ltd	S-12	Oppose	Oppose Schedule 12 and the inclusion of the Mangaore Stream in Group 2 of Schedule 12. The implications of the inclusion are not clear and therefore the potential for it to impact on or limit the operation of the Mangahao Power Station cannot be determined accurately.	Delete Schedule 12 OR Amend Chapter 3 as requested in Submission points 92.03, 92.21-92.17 to clarify the purpose and application of Schedule 12.
80.05	Todd Energy Ltd	12 General Matters	In-Part	The submitter opposes the lack of clarity in Chapter 12 in assessing and providing policy framework for utilities and energy. The Chapter discusses “energy” generically and does not provide a clear foundation for the issue discussion and objectives and policies that follow, particularly in relation to renewable energy and national energy policies.	Amend Chapter 12 to ensure that the introduction, objectives and policies reflect existing and proposed renewable electricity generation project more strongly and clearly.
80.06	Todd Energy Ltd	12.1.6 Policy	Support	The recognition that the location of utilities is	Retain Policy 12.1.6

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				often dedicated by operational requirements is strongly supported.	
80.07	Todd Energy Ltd	12.1.X New Policy	Support	There is no policy direction for utilities to be established in High Amenity Landscapes (HAL), although there is for ONFLs. The Explanation and Principal Reasons refer to HALS but policy is required to provide positive guidance in relation to utilities and High Amenity Landscapes.	Include a new Policy under Objective 12.1.1 to provide for positive guidance in relation to the establishment of utilities in High Amenity Landscapes.
80.08	Todd Energy Ltd	12.1 Methods	In-Part	Bullet points 3 and 4 in Methods (page 12-5) refer to the need for resource consent for network utilities with “variable effects of which may have adverse effects if located in some localities”. The meaning is not clear.	No specific relief requested: Inferred: Amend 21.1 Methods (bullet point 3 and 4) to describe when and why resource consents are required for assessing network utilities.
80.09	Todd Energy Ltd	12.2 Issue	In-Part	Issue 12.2 requires a stronger introductory statement given the national renewable energy policy.	Amend Issue 2.2 so that it reflects the national importance provide for in national renewable energy policy by the following: Generating electricity from renewable resources can have environmental benefits compared to utilising non-renewable energy resources.... OR similar wording to achieve relief sought.
80.10	Todd Energy Ltd	12.2 Issue Discussion	In-Part	The Issue Discussion deals with renewable energy generation and design for efficient	Amend 12.2 Issue Discussion to provide a focussed discussion on renewable

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				<p>use. These two subjects require separate discussion to set the ground for the policies that follows, as they are separate issues and considerations. This would provide the opportunity for a focussed discussion of renewable energy resource which would be more consistent with the nation policy direction.</p> <p>The commissioners on Plan Change 22 recommended a 'Renewable Energy' section of the proposed District Plan to give appropriate emphasis in accordance with national policy, Rewriting the Energy Issue Discussion would assist here.</p>	energy, and in doing so separate the discussion on design for efficient use.
80.11	Todd Energy Ltd	12.2.X New Policy	In-Part	<p>Clearer positive guidance could be given for considering wind energy facility development. The tension between suitable locations and their values is identified. While it is accepted that effects and responses need to be assessed on a case by case basis, further policy guidance to weighing up the factors would be provided.</p>	Include a new Policy under Objective 12.2.1 to provide for positive guidance in relation to the consideration of wind energy facility development and the tension between suitable locations and their values
80.12	Todd Energy Ltd	12.2.4 Policy	In-Part	<p>Policy 12.2.4 requires that consideration is given to “adverse effects” and this needs to be qualified to relate only to significant adverse effects.</p> <p>Adverse effects may occur that are minor and the policy would require that all adverse effects must be avoided, remedied or mitigated in relation to new renewable electricity generation facilities.</p>	Amend Policy 12.2.4 so that it focuses on “significant” adverse effects, not all adverse effects.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
80.13	Todd Energy Ltd	12.2.8 Policy	In-Part	Policy 12.2.8 is too restrictive and seems incomplete.	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Delete Policy 12.2.8
80.14	Todd Energy Ltd	12.1 Methods	In-Part	No explanation or provision to achieve Policies 12.2.9 and 12.2.10. It would be helpful to be able to respond to the proposed implementation of these policies.	Include Methods and any other provisions required to support Policies 12.2.9 and 12.2.10 and providing for the identification and assessment of potential sites for renewable energy generation (including wind energy facilities) and In-Particularly how they will be implemented.
80.15	Todd Energy Ltd	12.2.11 Policy	In-Part	Policy 12.2.11 is unclear, if the key focus of the policy is reverse sensitivity, this should be made more explicit.	Amend Policy 12.2.11 so that it clearly relates to reverse sensitivity. OR Inferred: Delete Policy 12.2.11
80.16	Todd Energy Ltd	19.1(k)(iv) Rule	In-Part	The intent of the rule is supported (although it is covered by existing use rights), the use of the word 'significant' is inappropriate for a permitted activity as it requires a judgement to be made in its interpretation. There will be occasions when a power station or associated facilities are upgraded and the footprint, height or scale may change or increase: it is not clear whether "external modifications" refers to cosmetic changes or would encompass and enable more substantial changes not altering the general scale of effects. A clear unambiguous wording is required.	Amend Rule 19.1(k)(iv) to provide certainty about the scope of upgrading by reference to increased footprint, height or other specific parameters.
80.17	Todd Energy Ltd	19.4.6(b) Rule	Support	Rule 19.4.6(b) provides for wind energy facilities as discretionary activities and is	Retain Rule 19.4.6(b) which provides for wind energy facilities as

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				supported.	discretionary activities in the Rural Zone.
80.18	Todd Energy Ltd	22 General Matters	In-Part	There is a lack of provision for “energy” in the Chapter. There is provision for utilities but not for “energy”.	No specific relief requested. The submitter seeks clarification of the intended purpose of Chapter 22 in relation to energy. Inferred: Amend Chapter 22 Utilities and Energy, or another Chapter in the District Plan so it better provides for energy activities.
80.19	Todd Energy Ltd	22.1.10 Rule	Support	The submitter supports Rule 22.1.10 (maintenance, replacement and upgrading of network utilities). However there is no apparent provision for energy activities. The intended purpose of the chapter is not clear in relation to energy activities.	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Retain Rule 22.10
80.20	Todd Energy Ltd	3.3 Issue	In-Part	There is no explanation or purpose provided of the difference between Group 1 and Group 2 Priority Water Bodies identified in Schedule 12. A clearer direction is necessary to enable the implications of priority water bodies to be determined.	Amend Issue 3.3 to clarify the purpose and application of Schedule 12 and the two groups or priority water bodies. The resultant wording should not constrain the further development of the Mangahao Power Station and renewable electricity generation projects.
80.21	Todd Energy Ltd	3.3.3 Policy	In-Part	There is no clear policy link to the two different groups of Priority Water Bodies identified in Schedule 12. Policy 3.3.3 is generic and does not link to priority water bodies.	Amend 3.3.3 to provide clear policy direction and to clarify the purpose and application of Schedule 12 and the two groups or priority water bodies. The resultant wording should not constrain the further development of

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
					the Mangahao Power Station and renewable electricity generation projects.
80.22	Todd Energy Ltd	3.3 Issue Discussion	In-Part	There is no explanation or purpose provided of the difference between Group 1 and Group 2 Priority Water Bodies identified in Schedule 12. A clearer direction is necessary to enable the implications of priority water bodies to be determined.	Amend Issue Discussion 3.3 to clarify the purpose and application of Schedule 12 and the two groups or priority water bodies. The resultant wording should not constrain the further development of the Mangahao Power Station and renewable electricity generation projects.
80.23	Todd Energy Ltd	3.3.4 Policy	In-Part	There is no clear policy link to the two different groups of Priority Water Bodies identified in Schedule 12. Policy 3.3.4 is generic and does not link to priority water bodies.	Amend 3.3.4 to provide clear policy direction and to clarify the purpose and application of Schedule 12 and the two groups or priority water bodies. The resultant wording should not constrain the further development of the Mangahao Power Station and renewable electricity generation projects.
80.24	Todd Energy Ltd	3.3.1 Objective	In-Part	There is no explanation or purpose provided of the difference between Group 1 and Group 2 Priority Water Bodies identified in Schedule 12. A clearer direction is necessary to enable the implications of priority water bodies to be determined.	Amend Objective 3.3.1 to clarify the purpose and application of Schedule 12 and the two groups or priority water bodies. The resultant wording should not constrain the further development of the Mangahao Power Station and renewable electricity generation projects.
80.25	Todd Energy Ltd	3.3 Methods	In-Part	There is no explanation or purpose provided	Amend Methods 3.3 to clarify the

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				of the difference between Group 1 and Group 2 Priority Water Bodies identified in Schedule 12. A clearer direction is necessary to enable the implications of priority water bodies to be determined.	purpose and application of Schedule 12 and the two groups or priority water bodies. The resultant wording should not constrain the further development of the Mangahao Power Station and renewable electricity generation projects.
80.26	Todd Energy Ltd	3.3.1 Explanation and Principle Reasons	In-Part	There is no explanation or purpose provided of the difference between Group 1 and Group 2 Priority Water Bodies identified in Schedule 12. A clearer direction is necessary to enable the implications of priority water bodies to be determined.	Amend Explanation and Principle Reasons 3.3.1 to clarify the purpose and application of Schedule 12 and the two groups or priority water bodies. The resultant wording should not constrain the further development of the Mangahao Power Station and renewable electricity generation projects.
80.27	Todd Energy Ltd	12.2.4 Policy	In-Part	This policy requires that consideration is given to 'adverse effects'. This needs to be qualified to relate only to significant adverse effects. Adverse effects may occur that are minor and the policy would require that all adverse effects must be avoided, remedied or mitigated in relation to renewable electricity generation.	Amend Policy 12.2.4 to qualify only significant adverse effects.
81.00	Phillip Lake	15.1(g) Rule	Oppose	Oppose Rule 15.1 (g) as it does not permit additions and alterations to existing community facilities. Existing facilities should be able to develop for the benefit of the community. See Rule 15.4(e)	Amend Rule 15.1(g) as follows: Use of existing community facilities (including education facilities and grounds) for community activities including services having a social, community, ceremonial, cultural,

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
					educational, recreational, worship, or spiritual purpose. i) <u>Allow for additions and alterations to existing community facilities.</u>
81.01	Phillip Lake	15.4 (e) Rule	Oppose	<p>Oppose Rule 15.4 (e) as it classes all additions and alterations to existing community facilities as discretionary activities. Existing facilities should be able to develop for the benefit of the community with minimal restrictions. Promotes the efficient development of existing facilities as a preference to ad hoc development of new community facilities within the Residential Zone.</p> <p>Developments of existing facilities would still need to comply with permitted activity standards (carparking, daylight envelope, nose limits etc.). Breaches would require land use consent as limited discretionary activity, retaining some control over potential future expansions of existing community facilities. Current rules are inefficient as every change (no matter how minor) would require a discretionary consent. Current rules are inefficient as every change (no matter how minor) would require a discretionary consent. Changes to existing facilities should only require land use consent as a restricted discretionary activity when any permitted activity standard is exceeded.</p>	<p>Amend Rule 15.4(e) as follows: New community facilities or additions and alterations to existing community facilities (including education facilities and grounds) for community activities including services having a social, community ceremonial, educational, recreational, worship, or spiritual purpose.</p>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
81.02	Phillip Lake	19.1(h) Rule	Oppose	Oppose Rule 19.1(h) as it does not permit additions and alterations to existing community facilities in the Rural Zone. Existing facilities should be able to develop for the benefit of the community. See Rule 19.4.4(a).	Amend Rule 19.1(h) to include additions and alterations to existing community facilities as permitted activities.
81.03	Phillip Lake	19.4.4(a) Rule	Oppose	Oppose Rule 19.4.4(a) as it classes all additions and alterations to existing community facilities as discretionary activities. Existing facilities should be able to develop for the benefit of the community with minimal restrictions. Promotes the efficient development of existing facilities as a preference to ad hoc development of new community facilities within the Residential Zone. Developments of existing facilities would still need to comply with permitted activity standards (carparking, daylight envelope, nose limits etc.). Breaches would require land use consent as limited discretionary activity, retaining some control over potential future expansions of existing community facilities. Current rules are inefficient as every change (no matter how minor) would require a discretionary consent. Changes to existing facilities should only require land use consent as a restricted discretionary activity when any permitted activity standard is exceeded.	Amend Rule 19.4.4(a) to remove reference to “additions and alterations to existing community facilities” as follows: New community facilities or external additions and alterations to existing community facilities (including education facilities and grounds) for community activities including services having a social, community, ceremonial, cultural, educational, recreational, worship, or spiritual purpose.
82.00	Kevin Doncliff	Planning Map 10	Oppose	The submitter opposes the extent and	Amend Planning Map 10 and

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
		(and 36) Refer to Rule 19.4.7		purpose of the Proposed Coastal Natural Character and Hazard Area Overlay. No evidence to justify the purpose of the overlay to manage coastal “hazard”. The overlay should not extend to include the approved Strathnaver subdivision, and should only include the dunes.	potentially Planning Map 36 by removing the reference to ‘Hazard’ in the Proposed Coastal Natural Character and Hazard Area Overlay. Amend the extent of the Proposed Coastal Natural Character and Hazard Area Overlay so it only includes the dunes and not the approved Strathnaver subdivision. Amend any consequential changes to Proposed District Plan text provisions.
82.01	Kevin Doncliff	19.4.7 Rule	In-Part	Submitter opposes the Proposed Coastal Natural Character and Hazard Area as it relates to the approved Strathnaver subdivision. The lifestyle development is established and it is highly modified, with servicing in place. Residents endeavour to preserve the natural coastal environment.	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Delete the word ‘hazard’ from Rule 19.4.7.
83.00	Ross Hood & Margaret Hood	1.1.1 Objective	In-Part	The policies and objectives outlined in this section are admirable. The same rules and understating should apply across the boards, as the barriers alluded to are the same for all citizens. The submitter considers property rights have been quietly eroded and that it is time for the Council to reassess its attitude towards the Property Rights of all its landowners. The submitter requests that HDC staff and Councillors give more, not less respect to property rights.	Amend and Include provisions in the Plan to provide for the following: A policy of protection of all landowners’ property rights must be the written policy of all future District Plans.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
83.01	Ross Hood & Margaret Hood	2.4 Issue	Oppose	Oppose provision which erode land owner's right in the region. Farmers are already farming sustainably and therefore there is no need to legislate for sustainable land management practices	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Delete Issue 2.4 and all associated provisions.
83.02	Ross Hood & Margaret Hood	2.5 Issue	In-Part	No more subdivision of productive rural land should occur. Only areas already subdivided should be able to be subdivided. We see cluster, close-density, settlements patterns to be the only choice. Farmland must be left in economic units so future generations can provide food for themselves and more. We believe it is possible that no subdivision at all, apart from re-subdivision may be the best and long terms sustainable option.	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Amend Issue 2.5 and corresponding objectives and policies so that: Productive rural land is protected from subdivision and any new subdivision is only allowed in areas already subdivided and the result of development is "cluster, close-density, settlement patterns and infrastructure such as roads, sewerage and power already exist. The policy should be to cluster small blocks together where they already are and leave the farming areas for farming.
83.03	Ross Hood & Margaret Hood	2.5.11 Policy	In-Part	The intent of Policy 2.5.11 is in reality flawed. Urban people re-locating into a rural environment cause a lot of conflict. Rather than 'manage' reverse sensitivity, the focus should be on 'prevent' as currently the HDC is trying to prevent conflict that has and is already occurring.	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Delete Policy 2.5.11
83.04	Ross Hood & Margaret Hood	2.5.16 Policy	In-Part	Acknowledge that Policy 2.5.16 has merit, but, should be a two-way process. Ratepayers should also be protected from adverse effects occurring due to the National Grid, the State	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Amend Policy 2.5.16 to acknowledge that ratepayers also need protection from the adverse effects

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				Highway Network and the North Island Main Trunk Railway Line.	occurring due to the National Grid, the State Highway Network and the North Island Main Trunk Railway Line.
83.05	Ross Hood & Margaret Hood	3.3.9 Policy	Oppose	<p>Oppose the statement in the Explanation and Principle Reasons of Policy 3.3.9 that... <i>recreational use and enjoyment of water bodies should continue to be made, as such activities do not create significant environmental issues.</i></p> <p>Human interaction with nature can have adverse effects. Giving people greater access to rivers is not warranted and in most cases not even wanted.</p> <p>You cannot preserve the natural character of stream/rivers if they are being fenced off or accessed by hoards of people.</p>	<p>No specific relief request.</p> <p>Inferred: Amend Policy 3.3.9 through acknowledging that recreational use and enjoyment of water bodies can have adverse effects on the environment.</p>
83.06	Ross Hood & Margaret Hood	4.2.4 Policy	Oppose	<p>Oppose Policy 4.2.4 as it is vital that HDC documents and publishes the name and location of any waterway they consider to have the potential to fall into this category of other water bodies. Just stating that there are potentially such waterways means that in future every waterway could all into these criteria. Be specific or delete this section entirely.</p>	<p>Delete Policy 4.2.4.</p> <p>Or;</p> <p>Amend Policy 4.2.4 by being specific about other water bodies considered to fall under criteria.</p>
83.07	Ross Hood & Margaret Hood	4.2 Explanation & Principal Reasons	In-Part	<p>The strategy needs to acknowledge that this loss of privacy is concern for rural dwellers also. The farm is our home, office, workshop and factory. Creating public access ways through farmland impinges on privacy as well as issues around health and safety.</p>	<p>No specific relief requested:</p> <p>Inferred: Amend Objectives and Policies in the Open Space Chapter which refer to the creation of public access/connections and acknowledge the effects of this access on rural</p>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
					dwellers and their farming operations can create privacy concerns.
83.08	Ross Hood & Margaret Hood	4 General Matters	Oppose	Any land taken by HDC must include monetary compensation for the landowner. Who determines the value of the land and who is going to pay for it, the ratepayer? Who is responsible for maintenance (weeding and rubbish) and at whose expense?	No specific relief requested: Inferred: Amend Objectives, Policies and Methods in the Open Space Chapter which refer to the taking of land for public access/connections and the implications on the cost of creating and maintaining these reserves and strips and calculating the value of the land taken.
83.09	Ross Hood & Margaret Hood	19.4.2(a) Rule	Oppose	Oppose Rule 19.4.2 (a) as it imposes restrictions on rural dwellers. If a farmer requires third house to be built, then it is because it is needed. There should be less restriction, not more.	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Delete Rule 19.4.2(a)
83.10	Ross Hood & Margaret Hood	24.2.5(h) Rule	Oppose	Oppose Rule 24.2.5 (h) as the costs of fencing the reserves is potentially hundreds of thousands of dollars.	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Delete Rule 24.2.5 (h)
83.11	Ross Hood & Margaret Hood	24.2.6(b) Rule	In-Part	Rule 24.2.6 (b) (mis-numbered in submissions as Rule 24.2.7(b)) is sets out situations when an access strip shall only be created where there is a demonstrated need for public access or protection conservation or recreational values. These situations are listed in the Rule as 'in respect of any unscheduled water body, heritage item or site or area of significant conservation values'. The submitter seeks that the all areas should be specifically named and documented so there can be no misunderstanding of which areas	Amend Rule 24.2.6(b) so that all areas are specifically named and documented so there can be no misunderstanding of which areas are involved.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				are involved.	
83.12	Ross Hood & Margaret Hood	19.6.14 Rule	Oppose	Acknowledge this rule and Rule 19.7.2(viii) are greyed-out and cannot be submitted upon. Therefore submit in relation to the Section 32 report, page 18 Utilities and Energy section. The submitter opposes the 32m buffer zone from the centre line of High Voltage Transmissions Lines. Reference is made to the Code of Practice for Electrical Safety Distances NZECP34.20001 which covers all Council requirements. The 32m buffer is in reality 64m of land taken. This is not an acceptable position for the HDC to take.	Delete all references to buffer zone from the centre line of High Voltage Transmissions Lines.
83.13	Ross Hood & Margaret Hood	2 General Matters	Oppose	Any land taken by HDC must include monetary compensation for the landowner. Who determines the value of the land and who is going to pay for it, the ratepayer? Who is responsible for maintenance (weeding and rubbish) and at whose expense?	No specific relief requested: Inferred: Amend Objectives, Policies and Methods in the Rural Chapter which refer to the taking of land for public access/connections and the implications on the cost of creating and maintaining these reserves and strips and calculating the value of the land taken.
84.00	Graeme & Joan Petersen	Planning Map 15A	Oppose	Oppose rezoning 34 Harbour Street, Foxton from Residential to Commercial.	Amend Planning Map 15A so that the existing Residential zoning of 34 Harbour Street, Foxton is retained. Do not proceed with the proposed Commercial zoning for this property.
85.00	Warren Millar	Planning Map 15A	Oppose	Oppose rezoning 104 Main Street< Foxton from Residential to Commercial. The current and ongoing use of the property	Amend Planning Map 15A so that the existing residential zoning 104 Main Street, Foxton is retained. Do not

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				and surrounding properties is residential. The property is adjacent to the Foxton over loop and protection of the existing historical residential sites should be paramount. Existing commercial sites along Harbour Street and Main Street remain vacant, no new commercial sites at this vicinity are required. Rezoning could affect existing land owners through noise, commercial waste, traffic, appearance, views and loss of sale opportunities.	proceed with the proposed Commercial zoning for this property.
86.00	Ivan Chambers	Planning Map 15A	Oppose	Oppose rezoning 69 Main Street, Foxton from Residential to Commercial.	Amend Planning Map 15A so that the existing Residential zoning of 69 Main Street, Foxton is retained. Do not proceed with the proposed Commercial zoning for this property.
87.00	Robin Hapi	Planning Map 15A	Oppose	Oppose rezoning 104A Main Street, Foxton from Residential to Commercial. The existing zoning is appropriate as properties on two sides are residential and very light commercial and town centre heritage.	Amend Planning Map 15A so that the existing Residential zoning of 104A Main Street, Foxton is retained. Do not proceed with the proposed Commercial zoning for this property.
88.00	Gail Chambers	Planning Map 15A	Oppose	Oppose rezoning 69 Main Street, Foxton from Residential to Commercial. The existing zoning is appropriate as properties on two sides are residential and very light commercial and town centre heritage.	Amend Planning Map 15A so that the existing Residential zoning of 69 Main Street, Foxton is retained. Do not proceed with the proposed Commercial zoning for this property.
89.00	Beverly Fowler	Planning Map 15A	Oppose	Oppose rezoning 67 Main Street, Foxton from Residential to Commercial. The existing zoning is appropriate as	Amend Planning Map 15A so that the existing Residential zoning of 67 Main Street, Foxton is retained. Do not

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				properties on two sides are residential and very light commercial and town centre heritage.	proceed with the proposed Commercial zoning for this property.
90.00	Foxton Community Board	Planning Maps 12, 13 and 15	Support	Support retention of Residential Zone for a number of existing commercial premises, particularly on State Highway 1 in Foxton and Foxton Beach. We understand these properties are already classed [zoned] as Residential despite their commercial use and that under the proposed District Plan they will retain all existing use rights. On that basis we are happy with logic involved and support these zonings.	Retain the Residential Zoning for properties along State Highway 1 and in Foxton Beach which have commercial premises, but can operate under existing use rights.
90.01	Foxton Community Board	Planning Map 15A	Support	Support rezoning section of Harbour Street, Foxton from Residential to Commercial to enable future tourism development in the town. This rezoning will not preclude existing residential sections being used as residential should the owners so wish.	Retain the rezoning of properties on Harbour Street, Foxton from Residential to Commercial on Planning Map 15A.
90.02	Foxton Community Board	Planning Map 15A	Oppose	Oppose the Residential Zoning of the Ihakara Gardens as they are both a public space and the site of graves.	Amend Planning Map 15A and rezone the Ihakara Gardens, Foxton, from Residential to Open Space Zone.
90.03	Foxton Community Board	Planning Map 13	In-Part	The submitter is neutral on the proposed rezoning from Residential to Commercial of the land at Seabury Avenue/Dawick Street and Hall Place. The submitter notes that part of the land is subject to an uncompleted property agreement between the Horowhenua District Council and another party.	No specific relief requested.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
90.04	Foxton Community Board	Planning Map 12	In-Part	The Open Space Area at the end of Marine Parade North and South is proposed Open Space Zone. It is recognised that this was a consequence of the Coastal Management Strategy, but the submitter believes small areas of this Open Space should be zoned Residential.	Amend Planning Map 13 and by rezoning the following areas from Open Space Zone to Residential Zone: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An extension of Marine Parade North with an extension of Cousins Avenue West; and • An extension of Marine Parade South with an extension of Barber Street and Chrystal Street.
91.00	Horowhenua District Council (Community Assets Department)	10.1 Issue	In-Part	Adopted structure plans provide linkages between existing and potential areas for future development and shall be considered and incorporated into future development.	Amend wording of Issue 10.1 under the heading: The Integration of New or Extended Infrastructure With Existing Networks, as follows: ... For Example, new or extended roads should be compatible with the District's long-term roading hierarchy <u>and structure plans.</u>
91.01	Horowhenua District Council (Community Assets Department)	12.1.7 Policy	In-Part	Greenbelt residential is urban in nature but provides larger areas of open space which should not be cluttered with overhead servicing.	Amend Policy 12.1.7 as follows: Require services where practicable, to be underground in new areas of development within Urban areas <u>and Greenbelt Residential areas.</u>
91.02	Horowhenua District Council (Community Assets Department)	12.1.1 Explanation & Principal Reasons	In-Part	Improving safety for road users has its benefits.	Amend wording of the fourth paragraph of 12.1.1 Explanation and Principal Reasons as follows: ... Services such as power and telecommunications have traditionally been provided throughout the District

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
					by way of overhead servicing. However, overhead lines and structures associated with services can detract from visual amenity <u>and be a crash hazard</u> , therefore provision of new reticulation is required to be by way of underground reticulation. ...
91.03	Horowhenua District Council (Community Assets Department)	21.1.5 Rule	In-Part	Simplify wording of Rule 21.1.5.	Delete Rule 21.1.5 and replace with; <u>Where a development or subdivision involves the creation of a vehicle crossing the formation and its use shall comply with Council's Subdivision and Development Principles and Requirements (2012) Appendix One- Vehicle Crossings.</u>
91.04	Horowhenua District Council (Community Assets Department)	21.1.6(a)(i) Rule	In-Part	Rural areas seldom have footpaths.	Amend Rule 21.1.6(a) as follows: i) As part of any new road <u>in urban and greenbelt residential areas</u> , pedestrian footpaths shall be provided.
91.05	Horowhenua District Council (Community Assets Department)	21.1.6(a)(iv) Rule	In-Part	Wrong interpretation using the word crossfall.	Amend Rule 21.1.6(a)(iv) as follows: iv) Footpath cross fall gradients and ramps shall <u>Footpath and ramp gradients shall</u> not exceed 1 in except where steps or other safety measures are provided.
91.06	Horowhenua District Council (Community Assets Department)	22.1.10(a) Rule	In-Part	There is no say on Council Utilities.	Amend Rule 22.1.10(a) to add a new subclause referring to Council network utilities. (a) The maintenance and replacement of the following utilities: (i) existing transformers and lines

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
					above ground for conveying electricity at all voltages and capacities. ... <u>(vii) Council Network Utilities.</u>
91.07	Horowhenua District Council (Community Assets Department)	26 Definitions – Waste Water Works	In-Part	Definition needs to be more consistent with designation description.	Amend definition of Waste Water Works as follows: Waste Water <u>Wastewater</u> Works (for the purpose of waste water <u>sewage and wastewater</u>
91.08	Horowhenua District Council (Community Assets Department)	28.2.4	In-Part	There is duplication in Council's Subdivision and Development Principles and Requirements. Some renumbering of other paragraphs in this section will be required along with modifications to Table 28-1.	Delete General Provision 28.2.4 and replace with; <u>a) Details as required by Council' Subdivision and Development Principles and Requirements.</u> <u>b) Features of a structure plan must be shown on a site which a structure plan is shown. The applicant must detail how the proposal is in accordance with the requirements of the structure plan.</u> <u>c) For subdivisions where no sewer connection is proposed to a Council reticulation then a building area and effluent disposal area and reserve disposal area must be shown in compliance with the specification detailed in Rule 19.7.2 (f).</u>
91.09	Horowhenua District Council (Community Assets Department)	S1-D117	In-Part	Land in private ownership if Council acquires can be revisited at that time.	Amend the legal description in Designation 117 by removing reference to Lot 5 DP1713 so it reads. Pt Lot 1 DP 1713, Pt Lot 3 DP1713, Lot

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
					2 DP1713, Lot 1 DP1713, Lot 5 DP1713, Lot 6 DP 1713.
91.10	Horowhenua District Council (Community Assets Department)	S1-D155	In-Part	Land maybe disposed of by Council.	Delete designation D155.
91.11	Horowhenua District Council (Community Assets Department)	Planning Map 5 (S1-D155)	In-Part	Land maybe disposed of by Council.	Delete Designation 155 (D155) and Open Space Zoning.
91.12	Horowhenua District Council (Community Assets Department)	General Matters 91	In-Part	Where the proposed plan references Council's Subdivision and Development Principles and Requirements (2012) and or associated Appendix's we support substantially In-Part the application of these documents but we requires various minor updates as submitted and a version control should be referenced in the final District Plan.	Amend all references to the Subdivision and Development Principles and Requirements 2012 and five appendices throughout the Proposed District Plan to provide for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Version control to be added, Version: 12 November 2012 and includes minor alteration s and submissions requested.
91.13	Horowhenua District Council (Community Assets Department)	US 91 Subdivision and Development, Engineering Appendix One: Vehicle Crossings, 2. Vehicle Crossing Places (page 2-10)	In-Part	Provides scope for variations to the standard	Amend (2) Vehicle Crossing Places and Include two subclauses after e) as follows: <p><u>f) Where vehicle crossings are subject to a "change in use", commercial or farm type crossings may be required to be formed.</u></p> <p><u>g) The width of vehicle crossing shown on the drawings may increase for commercial, industrial and crossing, where vehicles "passing" is required.</u></p>
91.14	Horowhenua District	US 91	In-Part	Provides details regarding maintenance	Amend (6) General and Include a

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
	Council (Community Assets Department)	Subdivision and Development, Engineering Appendix One: Vehicle Crossings, 6. General (page 4-10)		previously not covered.	subclauses after g) as follows: h) Ongoing maintenance of vehicle crossing places is the responsibility of the landowner(s). However, from time to time when Council have programmed works such as reseals or footpath renewals, vehicle crossings may be upgraded.
91.15	Horowhenua District Council (Community Assets Department)	US 91 Subdivision and Development, Engineering Appendix One: Vehicle Crossings, 6. General (page 4-10)	In-Part	Typically vehicle crossing construction has not required formal access to work in road reserve however recent legislation requires Council to manage all work in the roading corridor.	Include a new Heading and wording after (6) General as follows: <u>7. Work within Council Road Reserve</u> <u>For construction of all vehicle crossings within or on Council and NZTA roads, a Corridor Access Request (CAR) shall be applied for. These applications are separate to any other consents issued and a Work Access Permit (WAP) will be issued to work within the roading network if approved. For applications on State Highways, requests should be sent to NZTA.</u>
91.16	Horowhenua District Council (Community Assets Department)	US 91 Subdivision and Development, Engineering Appendix One: Vehicle Crossings,	In-Part	In residential areas better surfacing may be required to prevent chip/gravel runoff for pedestrians cyclists.	Amend the Notes of Diagram 1: Residential Crossings, Grass Berm, No Footpath (page 7-10) and add another note after subclause (d) as follows: <u>(e) For slopes greater than 1 in 15, concrete or asphalt surfacing may be</u>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
		Diagram 1: Residential Crossings, Grass Berm, No Footpath and Notes (page 7 - 10)			<u>required.</u>
91.17	Horowhenua District Council (Community Assets Department)	US 91 Subdivision and Development, Engineering 8. Earthworks And Geotechnical, 8.2 Performance Criteria	In-Part	There is no specific provision relating to control of filling in floodable areas. This can be a critical element of subdivision design – filling to achieve safe floor levels can transfer flooding onto adjacent land. Therefore an amendment is proposed.	Amend 8.2. Performance Criteria, as follows: Earthworks proposed for the development shall: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> control surface and ground water flows <u>and levels</u> both during and after construction.
91.18	Horowhenua District Council (Community Assets Department)	US 91 Subdivision and Development, Engineering 10. Stormwater 10.3 Performance Criteria	In-Part	There is no specific provision relating to control of filling in floodable areas. This can be a critical element of subdivision design – filling to achieve safe floor levels can transfer flooding onto adjacent land. Therefore an amendment is proposed.	Amend 10.3 Performance Criteria by inserting a new subclause after bullet 3 as follows: A stormwater system proposed for a development shall: ... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Achieve hydraulic neutrality so that peak flood levels are not increased as a result of filling in floodable areas for the 1 in 2 year, 1 in 5 year, 1 in 10 year, 1 in 50 year and 1 in 100 year design rainfall events. Levels shall not exceed the pre-development peak levels for the same design rainfall</u>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
					<u>events. This can be met by the provision of storage to offset or replace that volume lost to the footprint of the proposed works. Alternatively, this may also be achieved by over attenuation of runoff peaks flows.</u>
91.19	Horowhenua District Council (Community Assets Department)	US 91 Subdivision and Development, Engineering 10. Stormwater 10.4.2 Design Requirements	In-Part	<p>The term coverage as defined in these clauses is different to total impervious area on a site, where impervious area includes building coverage but also driveways, paths, decks etc. This latter characteristic is also fundamental in assessing and designing for stormwater under the Subdivision and Development, Principles and Requirements 2012, In-Particular Section 10. Stormwater. This requires amendment of the later to clarify.</p> <p>There is no specific provision relating to control of filling in floodable areas. This can be a critical element of subdivision design – filling to achieve safe floor levels can transfer flooding onto adjacent land. Therefore an amendment is proposed.</p>	<p>Amend 10.4 Design Requirements by adding a new subclause after the 4th bullet point and amending wording in bullet points 7 and 8 as follows: The design of a stormwater system shall include the following: ...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Design shall account for all types of surfacing on a site noting impervious area is made up of building coverage, sheds, driveways, footpaths, paths, decks etc.</u> • ... • Areas of private property may be able to become inundated (usually not exceeding 300mm <u>except in dedicated stormwater storage/attenuation/treatment areas</u>) provided they are not used as building sites and roads may be inundated up to

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
					<p>maximum height of 200mm at the centreline, in the 1% AEP storm event.....</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detention and/or storage devices/<u>areas</u> may be required as part of a development to mitigate stormwater effects on downstream catchments <u>and surrounding land</u>. Such devices shall make provision for grit and debris entrapment and be designed for ease of maintenance.
91.20	Horowhenua District Council (Community Assets Department)	<p>US 91 Subdivision and Development, Engineering</p> <p>Schedule 4: Altered Requirements to Section 4 NZS 4404:2010 Stormwater 19.7 Clause 4.3.7.9 – Soakage devices</p>	In-Part	There is reference to the use of small diameter outlets to control groundwater levels where soakpits are used. This is relatively non-specific, and may not give sufficient clarity of guidance to ensure the right outcomes are achieved, that is slow drain down after a storm event.	<p>Amend 19.7 Clause 4.3.7.9 Soakage Device, second bullet as follows ...</p> <p>Council requires on-site disposal through soak pits unless this may cause adverse effects and alternatives are approved.</p> <p>The Council may require small diameter outlets from soak pits to control groundwater levels.</p> <p><u>The Council may require measures such as small diameter outlets or subsoil drains from the soak pits to allow the slow drain down after a storm event when groundwater is high and inhibits natural drain-down.</u></p>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
91.21	Horowhenua District Council (Community Assets Department)	US 91 Subdivision and Development, Engineering Appendix Two: Stormwater Disposal to Soakpits 2. What Size Is My Soak Pit, 2.3 Assess the storm water catchment volume (Rc)	In-Part	Runoff volume is calculated taking into account “hard” surfaces only as noted in the introduction. However, reference is made to grassed areas in the worked example. This needs amendment to clarify the document.	Amend Section 2.3 and the definition of “A” as follows: A = catchment area in hectares <u>discharging to the soak pit</u> (to include buildings, <u>and</u> hard surfaces <u>and grassed areas</u>)
91.22	Horowhenua District Council (Community Assets Department)	US 91 Subdivision and Development, Engineering Appendix Two: Stormwater Disposal to Soakpits Diagram “Typical Soak Pit Layout for yard Sump’ on Page 6-6	In-Part	This figure is schematic and lacking detail, and could be interpreted incorrectly by designers, builders and home owners. There is insufficient detail for a sound design to be undertaken at an individual house level.	Amend Diagram ‘Typical Soak Pit Layout for yard Sump’, Page 6-6, and add a note as follows: <u>Details are schematic only. For more detailed drawings of soakage pits and pre-treatment measures refer other accepted industry guidelines such as Auckland Council’s Soakage Design Manual</u>
91.23	Horowhenua District Council (Community Assets Department)	US91 Subdivision and Development, Engineering Appendix Two:	In-Part	This figure is schematic and lacking detail, and could be interpreted incorrectly by designers, builders and home owners. There is insufficient detail for a sound design to be undertaken at an individual house level.	Amend Diagram ‘Typical Soak Pit’, Page 3-6, and add a note as follows: <u>Details are schematic only. For more detailed drawings of soakage pits and pre-treatment measures refer other</u>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
		Stormwater Disposal to Soakpits Diagram "Typical Soak Pit Layout" on Page 3-6			<u>accepted industry guidelines such as Auckland Council's Soakage Design Manual</u>
91.24	Horowhenua District Council (Community Assets Department)	US 91 Subdivision and Development, Engineering Appendix Two: Stormwater Disposal to Soakpits 1. Introduction to Soakpits	In-Part	This figure is schematic and lacking detail, and could be interpreted incorrectly by designers, builders and home owners. There is insufficient detail for a sound design to be undertaken at an individual house level.	Amend 1. Introduction by adding a new paragraph after the 5 th as follows: <u>There are other more comprehensive guidelines that are widely available that should also be referred to when investigating, designing and understanding maintenance requirements of soakpits (for example Auckland Council's Soakage Design Manual)</u>
91.25	Horowhenua District Council (Community Assets Department)	US 91 Proposed Plan references to Council's Subdivision and Development Principles and Requirements (2012), including Appendices: Engineering Appendix One Vehicle Crossings Engineering Appendix Two	In-Part	It is understood that changes made through the submission changes proposed will not take effect until such time wording has been confirmed or otherwise as part of this process. Version control may vary depending on final submissions.	Amend all Proposed Plan references to "Subdivision and Development Principles and Requirements 2012" with a version control date added. In addition, Include references to appendices as listed below including version control date: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engineering Appendix One Vehicle Crossings • Engineering Appendix Two Stormwater Disposal to Soakpits • Engineering Appendix Three Pumping Stations • Engineering Appendix Four Working in Roads and Trench

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
		Stormwater Disposal to Soakpits Engineering Appendix Three Pumping Stations Engineering Appendix Four Working in Roads and Trench Construction Engineering Appendix Five As-Built			Construction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engineering Appendix Five As-Built
91.26	Horowhenua District Council (Community Assets Department)	28.2.5	In-Part	There is duplication in Council's Subdivision and Development Principles and Requirements. Some renumbering of other paragraphs in this section will be required along with modifications to Table 28-1.	Delete General Provision 28.2.5 and replace with; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>a) Details as required by Council' Subdivision and Development Principles and Requirements.</u> <u>b) Features of a structure plan must be shown on a site which a structure plan is shown. The applicant must detail how the proposal is in accordance with the requirements of the structure plan.</u> <u>c) For subdivisions where no sewer connection is proposed to a Council reticulation then a building area and effluent disposal area and reserve disposal area must be shown in compliance with the specification detailed in Rule 19.7.2 (f).</u>
91.27	Horowhenua District	28.2.6	In-Part	There is duplication in Council's Subdivision	Delete General Provision 28.2.6 and

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
	Council (Community Assets Department)			and Development Principles and Requirements. Some renumbering of other paragraphs in this section will be required along with modifications to Table 28-1.	replace with; <u>a) Details as required by Council' Subdivision and Development Principles and Requirements.</u> <u>b) Features of a structure plan must be shown on a site which a structure plan is shown. The applicant must detail how the proposal is in accordance with the requirements of the structure plan.</u> <u>c) For subdivisions where no sewer connection is proposed to a Council reticulation then a building area and effluent disposal area and reserve disposal area must be shown in compliance with the specification detailed in Rule 19.7.2 (f).</u>
92.00	KCE Mangahao Ltd	A Introduction	In-Part	The submitter supports the intent of the introduction and explanation provided by Part A but considers it should be expanded in relation to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The purpose of scheduling rivers and streams; and • Reference to High Amenity Landscapes (HAL) and the implications of being in a HAL. 	Amend Part A: Introduction, Part F Schedules and Planning Maps with the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add a description of the purpose of Schedule 12; and • Add a discussion of the HAL (and the ONFL) and the implications.
92.01	KCE Mangahao Ltd	2 General Matters	In-Part	The submitter opposes In-Part the objectives and policies (in-particular Policy 2.1) in relation to landscape as they are set out in Chapter 2 as they do not provide clarity and certainty. The 'grey-out' text is accepted. However the	Amend [and potentially] Include provisions that achieve the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To take into account that full consideration of the implications of the proposed district plan is difficult when

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
	KCE Mangahao Ltd			relationship between the plan changes (future outcomes through appeals) and the proposed district plan remains uncertain. All Chapters and provisions are inter-related and there are constraints on viewing the chapters in isolation from the “grey-out” areas, subject to PC20 -22. Consideration of objectives and policies cannot be approached in an integrated manner. The decision of the Commissioners on PC 22 refers to several matters that are to be considered in the plan review, including the area in the HAL above 100m contour boundary and the fit between the network utilities and Chapter 19/22, as well as renewable energy and streams and rivers. Not all of these appear to have been addressed in the plan review.	having to view it in isolation from the outcome of PC 20 – 22 and that the relationship between the rural environment, utilities and landscape policy framework needs to be integrated and clear. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of the 100m contour boundary in line with the Commissioners’ comments in the decision on Plan Change 22.
92.02	KCE Mangahao Ltd	2.X New Policy	In-Part	The submitter identifies that “infrastructure” is referred to in the Issue Discussion and Explanation and Principal Reasons. However the Objectives and Policies do not provide any policy guidance in relation to infrastructure. Infrastructure can be as limited in its location by physical resources as primary production is, and this should be recognised.	Include a policy in Chapter 2 that makes it clear that infrastructure is a legitimate rural land use activity and is subject to constraints on location in relation to physical resources.
92.03	KCE Mangahao Ltd	3.3.2 Policy	In-Part	There is no clear policy link to the two different groups of Priority Water Bodies identified in Schedule 12. This policy states that priority water bodies will be identified but it does not identify the purpose of the	Amend Policy 3.3.2. provide clear policy direction and to clarify the purpose and application of Schedule 12 and the two groups of priority water bodies.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				priority or how it will be applied.	The resultant wording should not constrain the further development of the Mangahao Power Station and renewable electricity generation projects.
92.04	KCE Mangahao Ltd	S-12	Oppose	Oppose Schedule 12 and the inclusion of the Mangaore Stream in Group 2 of Schedule 12. The implications of the inclusion are not clear and therefore the potential for it to impact on or limit the operation of the Mangahao Power Station cannot be determined accurately.	Delete Schedule 12 OR Amend Chapter 3 as requested in Submission points 92.03, 92.21-92.17 to clarify the purpose and application of Schedule 12.
92.05	KCE Mangahao Ltd	12 General Matters	In-Part	The submitter opposes the lack of clarity in Chapter 12 in assessing and providing policy framework for utilities and energy. The Chapter discusses “energy” generically and does not provide a clear foundation for the issue discussion and objectives and policies that follow, particularly in relation to renewable energy and national energy policies.	Amend Chapter 12 to ensure that the introduction, objectives and policies reflect existing and proposed renewable electricity generation project more strongly and clearly.
92.06	KCE Mangahao Ltd	12.1.6 Policy	Support	The recognition that the location of utilities is often dedicated by operational requirements is strongly supported.	Retain Policy 12.1.6
92.07	KCE Mangahao Ltd	12.1.X New Policy	Support	There is no policy direction for utilities to be established in High Amenity Landscapes (HAL), although there is for ONFLs. The Explanation and Principal Reasons refer to HALS but policy is required to provide positive guidance in relation to utilities and High Amenity Landscapes.	Include a new Policy under Objective 12.1. to provide for positive guidance in relation to the establishment of utilities in High Amenity Landscapes.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
92.08	KCE Mangahao Ltd	12.1 Methods	In-Part	Bullet points 3 and 4 in Methods (page 12-5) refer to the need for resource consent for network utilities with “variable effects of which may have adverse effects if located in some localities”. The meaning is not clear.	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Amend 21.1 Methods (bullet point 3 and 4) to describe when and why resource consents are required for assessing network utilities.
92.09	KCE Mangahao Ltd	12.2 Issue	In-Part	Issue 12.2 requires a stronger introductory statement given the national renewable energy policy.	Amend Issue 2.2 so that it reflects the national importance provide for in national renewable energy policy by the following: Generating electricity from renewable resources can have environmental benefits compared to utilising non-renewable energy resources.... OR similar wording to achieve relief sought.
92.10	KCE Mangahao Ltd	12.2 Issue Discussion	In-Part	The Issue Discussion deals with renewable energy generation and design for efficient use. These two subjects require separate discussion to set the ground for the policies that follows, as they are separate issues and considerations. This would provide the opportunity for a focussed discussion of renewable energy resource which would be more consistent with the nation policy direction. The commissioners on Plan Change 22 recommended a 'Renewable Energy' section	Amend 12.2 Issue Discussion to provide a focussed discussion on renewable energy, and in doing so separate the discussion on design for efficient use.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				of the proposed District Plan to give appropriate emphasis in accordance with national policy, Rewriting the Energy Issue Discussion would assist here.	
92.11	KCE Mangahao Ltd	12.2.X New Policy	In-Part	Clearer positive guidance could be given for considering wind energy facility development. The tension between suitable locations and their values is identified. While it is accepted that effects and responses need to be assessed on a case by case basis, further policy guidance to weighing up the factors would be provided.	Include a new Policy under Objective 12.2.1 to provide for positive guidance in relation to the consideration of wind energy facility development and the tension between suitable locations and their values.
92.12	KCE Mangahao Ltd	12.2.4 Policy	In-Part	Policy 12.2.4 requires that consideration is given to “adverse effects” and this needs to be qualified to relate only to significant adverse effects. Adverse effects may occur that are minor and the policy would require that all adverse effects must be avoided, remedied or mitigated in relation to new renewable electricity generation facilities.	Amend Policy 12.2.4 so that it focuses on “significant” adverse effects, not all adverse effects.
92.13	KCE Mangahao Ltd	12.2.8 Policy	In-Part	Policy 12.2.8 is too restrictive and seems incomplete.	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Delete Policy 12.2.8
92.14	KCE Mangahao Ltd	12.1 Methods	In-Part	No explanation or provision to achieve Policies 12.2.9 and 12.2.10. It would be helpful to be able to respond to the proposed implementation of these policies.	Include Methods and any other provisions required to support Policies 12.2.9 and 12.2.10 and providing for the identification and assessment of potential sites for renewable energy generation (including wind energy facilities) and In-Particularly how they

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
					will be implemented.
92.15	KCE Mangahao Ltd	12.2.11 Policy	In-Part	Policy 12.2.11 is unclear, if the key focus of the policy is reverse sensitivity, this should be made more explicit.	Amend Policy 12.2.11 so that it clearly relates to reverse sensitivity. OR Inferred: Delete Policy 12.2.11
92.16	KCE Mangahao Ltd	19.1(k)(iv) Rule	In-Part	The intent of the rule is supported (although it is covered by existing use rights), the use of the word 'significant' is inappropriate for a permitted activity as it requires a judgement to be made in its interpretation. There will be occasions when a power station or associated facilities are upgraded and the footprint, height or scale may change or increase: it is not clear whether "external modifications" refers to cosmetic changes or would encompass and enable more substantial changes not altering the general scale of effects. A clear unambiguous wording is required.	Amend Rule 19.1(k)(iv) to provide certainty about the scope of upgrading by reference to increased footprint, height or other specific parameters.
92.17	KCE Mangahao Ltd	3.3.1 Explanation and Principle Reasons	In-Part	There is no explanation or purpose provided of the difference between Group 1 and Group 2 Priority Water Bodies identified in Schedule 12. A clearer direction is necessary to enable the implications of priority water bodies to be determined.	Amend Explanation and Principle Reasons 3.3.1 to clarify the purpose and application of Schedule 12 and the two groups or priority water bodies. The resultant wording should not constrain the further development of the Mangahao Power Station and renewable electricity generation projects.
92.18	KCE Mangahao Ltd	22 General Matters	In-Part	There is a lack of provision for "energy" in the Chapter. There is provision for utilities but not	No specific relief requested. The submitter seeks clarification of the

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				for “energy”.	intended purpose of Chapter 22 in relation to energy. Inferred: Amend Chapter 22 Utilities and Energy, or another Chapter in the District Plan so it better provides for energy activities.
92.19	KCE Mangahao Ltd	22.1.10 Rule	Support	The submitter supports Rule 22.1.10 (maintenance, replacement and upgrading of network utilities). However there is no apparent provision for energy activities. The intended purpose of the chapter is not clear in relation to energy activities.	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Retain Rule 22.10
92.20	KCE Mangahao Ltd	2.X New Policy	In-Part	The submitter identifies that potential reverse sensitivity issues are referred to in the Issue Discussion and Explanation and Principal Reasons. However the Objectives and Policies do not provide any policy guidance.	Include a policy in Chapter 2 to recognise the potential reverse sensitivity issues, such as in Policy 2.5.11 in the Rural Environment.
92.21	KCE Mangahao Ltd	3.3 Issue	In-Part	There is no explanation or purpose provided of the difference between Group 1 and Group 2 Priority Water Bodies identified in Schedule 12. A clearer direction is necessary to enable the implications of priority water bodies to be determined.	Amend Issue 3.3 to clarify the purpose and application of Schedule 12 and the two groups or priority water bodies. The resultant wording should not constrain the further development of the Mangahao Power Station and renewable electricity generation projects.
92.22	KCE Mangahao Ltd	3.3.3 Policy	In-Part	There is no clear policy link to the two different groups of Priority Water Bodies identified in Schedule 12. Policy 3.3.3 is generic and does not link to priority water bodies.	Amend 3.3.3 to provide clear policy direction and to clarify the purpose and application of Schedule 12 and the two groups or priority water bodies. The resultant wording should not

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
					constrain the further development of the Mangahao Power Station and renewable electricity generation projects.
92.23	KCE Mangahao Ltd	3.3.4 Policy	In-Part	There is no clear policy link to the two different groups of Priority Water Bodies identified in Schedule 12. Policy 3.3.4 is generic and does not link to priority water bodies.	Amend 3.3.4 to provide clear policy direction and to clarify the purpose and application of Schedule 12 and the two groups or priority water bodies. The resultant wording should not constrain the further development of the Mangahao Power Station and renewable electricity generation projects.
92.24	KCE Mangahao Ltd	3.3 Issue Discussion	In-Part	There is no explanation or purpose provided of the difference between Group 1 and Group 2 Priority Water Bodies identified in Schedule 12. A clearer direction is necessary to enable the implications of priority water bodies to be determined.	Amend Issue Discussion 3.3 to clarify the purpose and application of Schedule 12 and the two groups or priority water bodies. The resultant wording should not constrain the further development of the Mangahao Power Station and renewable electricity generation projects.
92.25	KCE Mangahao Ltd	3.3.1 Objective	In-Part	There is no explanation or purpose provided of the difference between Group 1 and Group 2 Priority Water Bodies identified in Schedule 12. A clearer direction is necessary to enable the implications of priority water bodies to be determined.	Amend Objective 3.3.1 to clarify the purpose and application of Schedule 12 and the two groups or priority water bodies. The resultant wording should not constrain the further development of the Mangahao Power Station and renewable electricity generation projects.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
92.26	KCE Mangahao Ltd	3.3 Methods	In-Part	There is no explanation or purpose provided of the difference between Group 1 and Group 2 Priority Water Bodies identified in Schedule 12. A clearer direction is necessary to enable the implications of priority water bodies to be determined.	Amend Methods 3.3 to clarify the purpose and application of Schedule 12 and the two groups or priority water bodies. The resultant wording should not constrain the further development of the Mangahao Power Station and renewable electricity generation projects.
92.27	KCE Mangahao Ltd	12.2.4 Policy	In-Part	This policy requires that consideration is given to 'adverse effects'. This needs to be qualified to relate only to significant adverse effects. Adverse effects may occur that are minor and the policy would require that all adverse effects must be avoided, remedied or mitigated in relation to renewable electricity generation.	Amend Policy 12.2.4 to qualify only significant adverse effects.
93.00	The Oil Companies	9.1 Issue	Support	Supports Issue 9.1.	Retain intent of Issue 9.1
93.01	The Oil Companies	9.1.1 Objective	Support	Supports Objective 9.1.1	Retain intent of Objective 9.1.1
93.02	The Oil Companies	9.1.2 Policy	Support	Support the general approach set out in Policy 9.1.2.	Retain intent of Policy 9.1.2
93.03	The Oil Companies	9.1.3 Policy	Support	Support the general approach set out in Policy 9.1.3.	Retain intent of Policy 9.1.3
93.04	The Oil Companies	9.1.4 Policy	Support	Support the general approach set out in Policy 9.1.4.	Retain intent of Policy 9.1.4
93.05	The Oil Companies	9.1.5 Policy	Support	Support the general approach set out in Policy 9.1.5.	Retain intent of Policy 9.1.5
93.06	The Oil Companies	9.1.6 Policy	Support	Support the general approach set out in Policy 9.1.6.	Retain intent of Policy 9.1.6
93.07	The Oil Companies	9.1.7 Policy	Support	Support the general approach set out in Policy 9.1.7.	Retain intent of Policy 9.1.7

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
93.08	The Oil Companies	9.1.8 Policy	In-Part	Support the intent of Policy 9.1.8 and seeks to avoid accidental spills through the implementation of best practice measure in accordance with industry standards. However, due the nature of such spills being accidental, complete avoidance is not possible. The wording of Policy 9.1.8 should be amended to recognise this.	Amend Policy 9.1.8 as follows: Appropriate facilities and systems are to be provided to <u>seek to</u> avoid accidental events involving hazardous substances (such as spills and gas escapes) that have the potential to create unacceptable risks to the environment and human health.
93.09	The Oil Companies	9.1.9 Policy	In-Part	The transport of hazardous substances is currently managed under the Transport Act, the Explosives Act and New Zealand standards, the Oil Companies do not consider it appropriate to control the transport of hazardous substances further through the District Plan. The explanation to Issue 9.1 clarifies that the Council does not intend to specifically control the transportation of hazardous substances through the consent process and provided this clarification is retained, the Oil Companies do not Oppose Policy 9.1.9	Retain intent of Policy 9.1.9 provided that the last two sentences of the Explanation and Principle Reasons are also retained as follows: ...Council does not consider that any consent is necessary specifically for transportation of hazardous substances at the District level. At present there are controls under the Transport Act, the Explosives Act, and New Zealand Standards.
93.10	The Oil Companies	9.1 Methods	Support	Support Methods for Issue 9.1 and Objective 9.1.1, particularly to the extent that they promote the use of good practice guidelines, industry standards and codes of practice.	Retain intent of Methods for Issue 9.1 and Objective 9.1.1 without modification.
93.11	The Oil Companies	9.2 Issue	In-Part	Supports the general intent of Issue 9.2. However, the Proposed Plan contains no definition of “remediation”, which increases the potential for uncertainty in administration. The Oil Companies would be concerned if remediation was to be narrowly	Amend Issue 9.2 as follows: The use and development of potentially contaminated land can lead to adverse effects on the environment and human health, when the necessary remediation <u>or management measures</u>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				defined in this context as only relating to the removal and reduction of the contaminant source. The Oil Companies wish to ensure that source removal, pathway control and institutional control are all considered equally by plans and that the terminology does not deliberately or inadvertently bias for, or against, any option. If read narrowly, the issue in its current form would require remediation i.e. removal or reduction of the containment source, to be applied to all contaminated land. In some cases it is not appropriate, practicable or possible to only deal with source control for all contaminated land. Remediation is, and should be seen and referred to, as a subset of the management of contaminated land.	works have not been undertaken prior to use.
93.12	The Oil Companies	9.1 Issue Discussion	Support	Support the issue discussion to the extent that it identifies the respective roles and responsibilities of the regional and district councils in managing contaminated land and the role of the NES in directing the requirement for consent or otherwise for activities on contaminated or potentially contaminated land.	Retain intent of Issue 9.1 Discussion.
93.13	The Oil Companies	9.2.1 Objective	In-Part	Support the general intent of Objective 9.2.1. While it is accepted that remediation can itself result in adverse effects that need to be managed, in this context remediation is one of the management responses available for avoiding or mitigating the adverse from the	Amend Objective 9.2.1 as follows: To avoid, or mitigate the risk of adverse effects from the <u>subdivision</u> , use, <u>or</u> redevelopment or remediation of contaminated and potentially contaminated land on human health

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				subdivision, use or redevelopment of contaminated land. The focus of Objective 9.2.1 should be changed to reflect this.	and the environment.
93.14	The Oil Companies	9.2.2 Policy	Support	Support Policy 9.2.2	Retain intent of Policy 9.2.2 without modification.
93.15	The Oil Companies	9.2.3 Policy	In-Part	Policy 9.2.3 assumes that the intended use of land will involve increased human use and effectively sets a defacto remediation standard for increased human use. Policy 9.2.3 needs to recognise that different levels of contamination may be acceptable depending on the intended end use of the land. The end use needs to be the driver for determining any remediation standard or contaminant mitigation strategy. Policy 9.2.3 should be amended to refer to “the intended exposure to humans”.	Amend Policy 9.2.3 as follows: Require development sites that have a history of land use that could have resulted in contamination of the soil to undertake a preliminary site investigation to confirm whether further investigation, remediation or management is required, to ensure that the land is suitable for increased <u>the intended</u> exposure to humans and the environment.
93.16	The Oil Companies	9.2.4 Policy	In-Part	Policy 9.2.4 should be amended to properly focus on the need for management of contaminated land (which may involve remediation) during subdivision, use or redevelopment in order to prevent or mitigate adverse effects. Policy 9.2.4 should be amended to refer to “unacceptable risk”. All contaminated land poses some level of risk but the key issue is whether or not this risk is acceptable for human health and the environment in accordance with industry guidelines.	Amend Policy 9.2.4 as follows: Ensure that all remediation, use, subdivision and redevelopment of <u>when land affected by soil contamination is used, subdivided, and/or redeveloped, it is managed or remediated in a way that</u> prevents or mitigates adverse effects and <u>unacceptable</u> risk on human health and the environment.
93.17	The Oil Companies	9.2.5 Policy	In-Part	Support the general intent of Policy 9.2.5 to the extent that it recognises the various	Amend Policy 9.2.5 as follows: Require management measures for

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				management options of remediation, containment and disposal. Changes are sought to the wording of Policy 9.2.5 to recognise these options are subsets of the management of contaminated land and to refer to the 'proposed' future use of land, rather than 'likely' future use of land, which may require consideration of a much broader range of possible uses, including more sensitive uses.	contaminated land, <u>which may include that provides for remediation, or</u> containment, or disposal of contaminated soil, <u>to ensure that any so the level of contamination is appropriate for the proposed any likely</u> future use of the land.
93.18	The Oil Companies	9.2.6 Policy	Support	Support Policy 9.2.6	Retain intent of Policy 9.2.6 without modification.
93.19	The Oil Companies	15 General - Cross reference to the National Environmental Standards in chapter	Support	Support cross referencing to national environmental standards in chapter.	Retain the cross reference to national environmental standards in Chapter 15.
93.20	The Oil Companies	16 General - Cross reference to the National Environmental Standards in chapter	Support	Support cross referencing to national environmental standards in chapter.	Retain the cross reference to National Environmental Standards in Chapter 16.
93.21	The Oil Companies	17 General - Cross reference to the National Environmental Standards in chapter	Support	Support cross referencing to national environmental standards in chapter.	Retain the cross reference to National Environmental Standards in Chapter 17.
93.22	The Oil Companies	18 General - Cross	Support	Support cross referencing to national	Retain the cross reference to National

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
		reference to the National Environmental Standards in chapter		environmental standards in chapter.	Environmental Standards in Chapter 18.
93.23	The Oil Companies	19 General - Cross reference to the National Environmental Standards in chapter	Support	Support cross referencing to national environmental standards in chapter.	Retain the cross reference to National Environmental Standards in Chapter 19.
93.24	The Oil Companies	20 General - Cross reference to the National Environmental Standards in chapter	Support	Support cross referencing to national environmental standards in chapter.	Retain the cross reference to National Environmental Standards in Chapter 20.
93.25	The Oil Companies	23.3.1 (a) Rule	Oppose	Oppose that Rule 23.3.1 (a) does not apply in the Rural and Industrial Zones. Underground storage of 100,000 litres of petrol would require a Discretionary activity consent in the Rural Zone and a Restricted Discretionary activity consent in the Industrial Zone. There is no effects based reason to apply a more restrictive activity status to the underground storage of petrol in the Rural and Industrial Zones, especially when the same Codes of Practice would apply.	Amend Rule 23.3.1(a) as follows: 23.3.1 The following activities shall be Controlled Activities: (a) The retail sale of fuel, up to a storage of 100,000 litres of petrol and up to 50,000 litres of diesel in all zones excluding the Rural Zone and the Industrial Zone , in underground storage tanks, provided it can be demonstrated that the following Codes of Practice are adhered to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Below Ground Stationary Container Systems for

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
					Petroleum - Design and Installation HSNOCOP 44, EPA, 2012. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Below Ground Stationary Container Systems for Petroleum – Operation HSNOCOP 45, EPA, 2012. ...
93.26	The Oil Companies	23.3.1(b) Rule	In-Part	Support the intent of Rule 23.3.1(b). However, as there is a move towards the use of 'swap a bottle' facilities at service stations, there is a requirement to store multiple individual (9kg) bottles within a locked 'cage' structure. The storage of 150 individual bottles, for example, would equate to some 1350kg of LPG storage. While this is well within the six tonne threshold, such a facility would not currently comply with the rule as it comprises multi vessel rather than single vessel storage.	Amend Rule 23.3.1(b) as follows: 23.3.1 The following activities shall be Controlled Activities: ... (b) The retail sale of LPG, with a storage of up to six tonnes (single <u>or</u> <u>multi</u> vessel storage) of LPG, provided it can be demonstrated that the following standard is adhered to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Australian and New Zealand Standard 1596:2008 Storage and Handling of LP Gas.
93.27	The Oil Companies	26 Definitions – Contaminated Land	Support	Support definition for Contaminated Land.	Retain definition of Contaminated Land without modification.
93.28	The Oil Companies	26 Definitions – Vehicle Service Station	Support	Support definition for Vehicle Service Station.	Support definition for Vehicle Service Station.
93.29	The Oil Companies	23.6 Rule	Support	Support the permitted activity conditions set out in Rule 23.6.	Retain Rule 23.6.
94.00	NZ Transport Agency	S1-D2	Support	Support Designation D2	Retain Designation D2 as notified.
94.01	NZ Transport Agency	S1-D3	Support	Support Designation D3	Retain Designation D3 as notified.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
94.02	NZ Transport Agency	S1-D4	Support	Support Designation D4	Retain Designation D4 as notified.
94.03	NZ Transport Agency	Planning Map 1	Support	Correct recording of D2	Retain Planning Map 1 as notified.
94.04	NZ Transport Agency	Planning Map 2	Support	Correct recording of D2 and D3	Retain Planning Map 2 as notified.
94.05	NZ Transport Agency	Planning Map 3	Support	Correct recording of D4	Retain Planning Map 3 as notified.
94.06	NZ Transport Agency	Planning Map 4	Support	Correct recording of D2	Retain Planning Map 4 as notified.
94.07	NZ Transport Agency	Planning Map 5	Support	Correct recording of D3 and D4	Retain Planning Map 5 as notified.
94.08	NZ Transport Agency	Planning Map 6	Support	Correct recording of D5	Retain Planning Map 6 as notified.
94.09	NZ Transport Agency	Planning Map 7	Support	Correct recording of D2 and D4	Retain Planning Map 7 as notified.
94.10	NZ Transport Agency	Planning Map 8	Support	Correct recording of D4	Retain Planning Map 8 as notified.
94.11	NZ Transport Agency	Planning Map 10	Support	Correct recording of D2	Retain Planning Map 10 as notified.
94.12	NZ Transport Agency	15.6.24 Rule	Support	Support Rule 15.6.24	Retain Rule 15.6.24 as notified.
94.13	NZ Transport Agency	16.6.16 Rule	Support	Support Rule 16.6.16	Retain Rule 16.6.16 as notified.
94.14	NZ Transport Agency	17.6.18 Rule	Support	Support Rule 17.6.18	Retain Rule 17.6.18 as notified.
94.15	NZ Transport Agency	19.6.23 Rule	Support	Support Rule 19.6.23	Retain Rule 19.6.23 as notified.
94.16	NZ Transport Agency	10.2 Issue	Support	Support Issue 10.2.	Retain Issue 10.2 as notified.
94.17	NZ Transport Agency	10.3 Issue	In-Part	Support Issue 10.3.	Retain Issue 10.3 as notified.
94.18	NZ Transport Agency	10.3 Methods	In-Part	Support In-Part, seeks minor change.	Amend Methods Advice Note as follows: ... The District Plan is... The NZTA has powers under the Land Transport Management Act <u>Government Rounding Powers Act 1989</u> ...Access Roads.
94.19	NZ Transport Agency	10.1 Issue	Support	Support Issue 10.1.	Retain Issue 10.1 as notified.
94.20	NZ Transport Agency	19.6.6 Rule	Support	Support Rule 19.6.6	Retain Rule 19.6.6 as notified
94.21	NZ Transport Agency	15.8.13 Rule	Support	Support Rule 15.8.13	Retain as notified
94.22	NZ Transport Agency	19.8.7 Rule	Support	Support Rule 19.8.7	Retain Rule 19.8.7 as notified
94.23	NZ Transport Agency	20.8.7(a)(iv) Rule	Support	Support Rule 20.8.7(a)(iv)	Retain Rule 20.8.7(a)(iv) as notified
94.24	NZ Transport Agency	15.5(a) Rule	Support	Support Rule 15.5(a)	Retain Rule 15.5(a) as notified.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
94.25	NZ Transport Agency	15.8.7(a)(v) Rule	Support	Support Rule 15.8.7(a)(v)	Retain Rule 15.8.7(a)(v) as notified.
94.26	NZ Transport Agency	15.8.8(a)(i) Rule	Support	Support Rule 15.8.8(a)(i) bullet point 3.	Retain Rule 15.8.8(a)(i) bullet point 3 as notified.
94.27	NZ Transport Agency	20.8.7(a)(v) Rule	Support	Support Rule 20.8.7(a)(v)	Retain Rule 20.8.7(a)(v) as notified
94.28	NZ Transport Agency	6.2.4 Policy	Support	Support Policy 6.2.4	Retain Policy 6.2.4 as notified.
94.29	NZ Transport Agency	6.3.38 Policy	Support	Support Policy 6.3.38	Retain Policy 6.3.38 as notified.
94.30	NZ Transport Agency	2.5.16 Policy	Support	Support Policy 2.5.16	Retain Policy 2.5.16 as notified.
94.31	NZ Transport Agency	25.7.8 Assessment Criteria	Support	Support Assessment Criteria 25.7.8	Retain 25.7.8 as notified
94.32	NZ Transport Agency	25.3.1 (f) Assessment Criteria	Support	Support Assessment Criteria 25.3.1(f)	Retain 25.3.1(f) as notified.
94.33	NZ Transport Agency	25.7.1(b) Assessment Criteria	Support	Support Assessment Criteria 25.3.9(c)	Retain 25.3.9(c) as notified.
94.34	NZ Transport Agency	25.2.4 (a) Assessment Criteria	Support	Support Assessment Criteria 25.2.4 (a)	Retain as notified.
94.35	NZ Transport Agency	25.3.9 (c) Assessment Criteria	Support	Support Assessment Criteria 25.2.4(a)	Retain 25.2.4(a) as notified.
94.36	NZ Transport Agency	25.3.4 (a) (ii) Assessment Criteria	Support	Support Assessment Criteria 25.7.1(b)	Retain 25.7.1(b) as notified.
94.37	NZ Transport Agency	25.7.11(b) Assessment Criteria	Support	Support Assessment Criteria 25.7.11(b)	Retain 25.7.11(b) as notified.
94.38	NZ Transport Agency	10.2.1 Objective	Support	Support Objective 10.2.1.	Retain Objective 10.2.1.
94.39	NZ Transport Agency	10.2.2 Policy	Support	Support Policy 10.2.2.	Retain Policy 10.2.2.
94.40	NZ Transport Agency	10.2.3 Policy	Support	Support Policy 10.2.2.	Retain Policy 10.2.2.
94.41	NZ Transport Agency	10.2.4 Policy	Support	Support Policy 10.2.2.	Retain Policy 10.2.2.
94.42	NZ Transport Agency	21.1.3 Rule	Support	Support Rule 21.1.3.	Retain Rule 21.1.3.
94.43	NZ Transport Agency	10.3.1 Objective	Support	Support Objective 10.3.1.	Retain Objective 10.3.1.
94.44	NZ Transport Agency	10.3.2 Policy	Support	Support Policy 10.3.2.	Retain Policy 10.3.2.
94.45	NZ Transport Agency	10.3.3 Policy	Support	Support Policy 10.3.3.	Retain Policy 10.3.3.
94.46	NZ Transport Agency	10.3.4 Policy	Support	Support Policy 10.3.4.	Retain Policy 10.3.4.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
94.47	NZ Transport Agency	10.3.5 Policy	Support	Support Policy 10.3.5.	Retain Policy 10.3.5.
94.48	NZ Transport Agency	10.3.6 Policy	Support	Support Policy 10.3.6.	Retain Policy 10.3.6.
94.49	NZ Transport Agency	10.3.7 Policy	Support	Support Policy 10.3.7.	Retain Policy 10.3.7.
94.50	NZ Transport Agency	10.3.8 Policy	Support	Support Policy 10.3.8.	Retain Policy 10.3.8.
94.51	NZ Transport Agency	10.3.9 Policy	Support	Support Policy 10.3.9.	Retain Policy 10.3.9.
94.52	NZ Transport Agency	10.3.10 Policy	Support	Support Policy 10.3.10.	Retain Policy 10.3.10.
94.53	NZ Transport Agency	10.3.11 Policy	Support	Support Policy 10.3.11.	Retain Policy 10.3.11.
94.54	NZ Transport Agency	10.3.12 Policy	Support	Support Policy 10.3.12.	Retain Policy 10.3.12.
94.55	NZ Transport Agency	10.1.1 Objective	Support	Support Objective 10.1.1.	Retain Objective 10.1.1.
94.56	NZ Transport Agency	10.1.2 Policy	Support	Support Policy 10.1.2.	Retain Policy 10.1.2.
94.57	NZ Transport Agency	10.1.3 Policy	Support	Support Policy 10.1.3.	Retain Policy 10.1.3.
94.58	NZ Transport Agency	10.1.4 Policy	Support	Support Policy 10.1.4.	Retain Policy 10.1.4.
94.59	NZ Transport Agency	10.1.5 Policy	Support	Support Policy 10.1.5.	Retain Policy 10.1.5.
94.60	NZ Transport Agency	10.1.6 Policy	Support	Support Policy 10.1.6.	Retain Policy 10.1.6.
94.61	NZ Transport Agency	10.1.7 Policy	Support	Support Policy 10.1.7.	Retain Policy 10.1.7.
94.62	NZ Transport Agency	10.1.8 Policy	Support	Support Policy 10.1.8.	Retain Policy 10.1.8.
94.63	NZ Transport Agency	10.1.9 Policy	Support	Support Policy 10.1.9.	Retain Policy 10.1.9.
94.64	NZ Transport Agency	10.1.10 Policy	Support	Support Policy 10.1.10.	Retain Policy 10.1.10.
94.65	NZ Transport Agency	10.1.11 Policy	Support	Support Policy 10.1.11.	Retain Policy 10.1.11.
94.66	NZ Transport Agency	10.1.12 Policy	Support	Support Policy 10.1.12.	Retain Policy 10.1.12.
94.67	NZ Transport Agency	10.1.13 Policy	Support	Support Policy 10.1.13.	Retain Policy 10.1.13.
94.68	NZ Transport Agency	10.1 Methods	Support	Support Methods 10.1.	Retain Methods 10.1.
95.00	New Zealand Defence Force	26 Definitions – Temporary Military Training Activity	Support	Support definition	Retain definition of Temporary Military Training Activity as notified.
95.01	New Zealand Defence Force	26 Definitions – Temporary Activity	In-Part	Permitted activity standards for “Temporary Activities” are more restrictive than for Temporary Military Training Facilities, so NZDF would prefer to clarify the definition of	Amend definition of Temporary Activity by adding a sub-clause to the exemption list as follows: ...

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				“Temporary Activities” further to indicate that it does not apply to Temporary Military Activities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> it does not include Temporary Military Training Activities.
95.02	New Zealand Defence Force	15.1(o) Rule	Support	Support inclusion of Temporary Military Training Activities as Permitted Activities.	Retain Rule 15.1(o) as notified
95.03	New Zealand Defence Force	16.1(s) Rule	Support	Support inclusion of Temporary Military Training Activities as Permitted Activities.	Retain Rule 16.1 (s) as notified
95.04	New Zealand Defence Force	17.1(y) Rule	Support	Support inclusion of Temporary Military Training Activities as Permitted Activities.	Retain as notified
95.05	New Zealand Defence Force	19.1(r) Rule	Support	Support inclusion of Temporary Military Training Activities as Permitted Activities.	Retain Rule 19.1(r) as notified.
95.06	New Zealand Defence Force	20.1(l) Rule	Support	Support inclusion of Temporary Military Training Activities as Permitted Activities.	Retain Rule 20.1 (i) as notified
95.07	New Zealand Defence Force	15.6.31(a)(i) Rule	In-Part	Neutral stance on Rule 15.6.31(a)(i).	Retain Rule 15.6.31(a)(i) as notified.
95.08	New Zealand Defence Force	16.6.23(a)(i) Rule	In-Part	Neutral stance on Rule 16.6.23 (a)(i).	Retain Rule 16.6.23(a)(i) as notified.
95.09	New Zealand Defence Force	17.6.25(a)(i) Rule	In-Part	Neutral stance on Rule 17.6.25(a)(i).	Retain Rules 17.6.25(a)(i) as notified.
95.10	New Zealand Defence Force	19.6.30(a)(i) Rule	In-Part	Neutral stance on Rule 19.6.30(a)(i).	Retain Rule 19.6.30(a)(i) as notified.
95.11	New Zealand Defence Force	20.6.22(a)(i) Rule	In-Part	Neutral stance on Rule 20.6.22(a)(i).	Retain Rule 20.6.22(a)(i) as notified.
95.12	New Zealand Defence Force	15.6.31(a)(iii) Rule	Support	Proposed change clarifies ambiguities which may have arisen with the definition in the Operative Plan.	Retain as notified
95.13	New Zealand Defence Force	16.6.23(a)(iii) Rule	Support	Proposed change clarifies ambiguities which may have arisen with the definition in the Operative Plan.	Retain as notified
95.14	New Zealand Defence Force	17.6.25(a)(iii) Rule	Support	Proposed change clarifies ambiguities which may have arisen with the definition in the	Retain Rule 17.6.25 (a) (iii) as notified

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				Operative Plan.	
95.15	New Zealand Defence Force	19.6.30 (a) (iii) Rule	Support	Proposed change clarifies ambiguities which may have arisen with the definition in the Operative Plan.	Retain Rule 19.6.30(a)(iii) as notified
95.16	New Zealand Defence Force	20.6.22 (a)(iii) Rule	Support	Proposed change clarifies ambiguities which may have arisen with the definition in the Operative Plan.	Retain Rule 20.6.22 (a) (iii) as notified
95.17	New Zealand Defence Force	15.6 Rule	Support	Support the removal of the following Permitted Activity Conditions; (i) The written consent of the owner shall have been obtained. (ii) Flying activity shall be in compliance with Civil Aviation regulations or in agreement with the local controlling authority. NZDF notes that this removes redundant requirement from the Plan.	Retain the removal of conditions as notified
95.18	New Zealand Defence Force	16.6 Rule	Support	Support the removal of the following Permitted Activity Conditions; (iii) The written consent of the owner shall have been obtained. (iv) Flying activity shall be in compliance with Civil Aviation regulations or in agreement with the local controlling authority. NZDF notes that this removes redundant requirement from the Plan.	Retain the removal of conditions as notified
95.19	New Zealand Defence Force	17.6 Rule	Support	Support the removal of the following Permitted Activity Conditions; (i) The written consent of the owner shall have been obtained.	Retain the removal of conditions as notified

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				<p>(ii) Flying activity shall be in compliance with Civil Aviation regulations or in agreement with the local controlling authority.</p> <p>NZDF notes that this removes redundant requirement from the Plan.</p>	
95.20	New Zealand Defence Force	19.6 Rule	Support	<p>Support the removal of the following Permitted Activity Conditions;</p> <p>(i) The written consent of the owner shall have been obtained.</p> <p>(ii) Flying activity shall be in compliance with Civil Aviation regulations or in agreement with the local controlling authority.</p> <p>NZDF notes that this removes redundant requirement from the Plan.</p>	Retain the removal of conditions as notified
95.21	New Zealand Defence Force	15.6.31(a)(iv)(v) Rule	In-Part	Conditionally supports the introduction of these new noise standards, but has commissioned at technical review to investigate the matter in more detail. At the time of this submission this review has not yet been completed; as soon as the results of the review are available, NZDF will come back to the Council to confirm its support (or otherwise) for the change and to discuss any specific recommendations or request that may arise from the review.	Retain as notified (conditionally)
95.22	New Zealand Defence Force	16.6.23(a)(iv)(v) Rule	In-Part	Conditionally supports the introduction of these new noise standards, but has commissioned at technical review to investigate the matter in more detail. At the	Retain as notified (conditionally)

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				time of this submission this review has not yet been completed; as soon as the results of the review are available, NZDF will come back to the Council to confirm its support (or otherwise) for the change and to discuss any specific recommendations or request that may arise from the review.	
95.23	New Zealand Defence Force	17.6.25(a)(iv)(v) Rule	In-Part	Conditionally supports the introduction of these new noise standards, but has commissioned at technical review to investigate the matter in more detail. At the time of this submission this review has not yet been completed; as soon as the results of the review are available, NZDF will come back to the Council to confirm its support (or otherwise) for the change and to discuss any specific recommendations or request that may arise from the review.	Retain Rules 17.6.25 (iv) (v) as notified (conditionally)
95.24	New Zealand Defence Force	19.6.30(a)(iv) (v) Rule	In-Part	Conditionally supports the introduction of these new noise standards, but has commissioned at technical review to investigate the matter in more detail. At the time of this submission this review has not yet been completed; as soon as the results of the review are available, NZDF will come back to the Council to confirm its support (or otherwise) for the change and to discuss any specific recommendations or request that may arise from the review.	Retain Rule 19.6.30(a)(iv) (v) as notified (conditionally)
95.25	New Zealand Defence Force	20.6.22(a)(iv) (v) Rule	In-Part	Conditionally supports the introduction of these new noise standards, but has	Retain Rule 20.6.22 (a) (iv) (v) as notified (conditionally)

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				commissioned at technical review to investigate the matter in more detail. At the time of this submission this review has not yet been completed; as soon as the results of the review are available, NZDF will come back to the Council to confirm its support (or otherwise) for the change and to discuss any specific recommendations or request that may arise from the review.	
95.26	New Zealand Defence Force	15.6.11(d) Rule	In-Part	<p>Temporary Military Training Activities are no longer included in the general permitted noise conditions for each proposed zone. However, the general provisions in 15.6.11(b) in the Permitted Conditions for Noise state that:</p> <p>“Sound levels shall be measured and assessed in accordance with the provisions of NZS 6801:2008 Acoustics - Measurement of environmental sound and assessed in accordance with the provisions of NZS 6802:2008 Acoustics - Environmental noise”. Therefore Rule 15.6.11(b) is redundant, as there is no possible situation to which it might apply.</p> <p>For the avoidance of doubt NZDF requests that this clause is specifically excluded, by amending 15.6.11(d).</p>	Amend Rule 15.6.11(d) as follows: The noise limits in Rule 15.6.11(a) <u>and the provision of Rule 15.6.11 (b)</u> shall not apply to... Temporary Military Training Activities.
95.27	New Zealand Defence Force	16.6.5(d) Rule	In-Part	<p>Temporary Military Training Activities are no longer included in the general permitted noise conditions for each proposed zone. However, the general provisions in 16.6.5 (b)</p>	Amend Rule 16.6.5(d) as follows: The noise limits in Rule 16.6.5(a) <u>and the provision of Rule 16.6.5 (b)</u> shall not apply to... Temporary Military

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				<p>in the Permitted Conditions for Noise state that:</p> <p>“Sound levels shall be measured and assessed in accordance with the provisions of NZS 6801:2008 Acoustics - Measurement of environmental sound and assessed in accordance with the provisions of NZS 6802:2008 Acoustics - Environmental noise”. Therefore Rule 16.6.5 (b) is redundant, as there is no possible situation to which it might apply.</p> <p>For the avoidance of doubt NZDF requests that this clause is specifically excluded, by amending 16.6.5(d).</p>	Training Activities.
95.28	New Zealand Defence Force	17.6.6 (d) Rule	In-Part	<p>Temporary Military Training Activities are no longer included in the general permitted noise conditions for each proposed zone. However, the general provisions in 17.6.6(b) in the Permitted Conditions for Noise state that:</p> <p>“Sound levels shall be measured and assessed in accordance with the provisions of NZS 6801:2008 Acoustics - Measurement of environmental sound and assessed in accordance with the provisions of NZS 6802:2008 Acoustics - Environmental noise”. Therefore Rule 17.6.6(b) is redundant, as there is no possible situation to which it might apply.</p> <p>For the avoidance of doubt NZDF requests that this clause is specifically excluded, by</p>	Amend Rule 17.6.6(d) as follows: The noise limits in Rule 17.6.6(a) <u>and the provision of Rule 17.6.6 (b)</u> shall not apply to... Temporary Military Training Activities.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				amending 17.6.6(d).	
95.29	New Zealand Defence Force	19.6.7(d) Rule	In-Part	<p>Temporary Military Training Activities are no longer included in the general permitted noise conditions for each proposed zone. However, the general provisions in 19.6.7(b) in the Permitted Conditions for Noise state that:</p> <p>“Sound levels shall be measured and assessed in accordance with the provisions of NZS 6801:2008 Acoustics - Measurement of environmental sound and assessed in accordance with the provisions of NZS 6802:2008 Acoustics - Environmental noise”. Therefore Rule 19.6.7 (b) is redundant, as there is no possible situation to which it might apply.</p> <p>For the avoidance of doubt NZDF requests that this clause is specifically excluded, by amending 19.6.7(d).</p>	Amend Rule 19.6.7(d) as follows: The noise limits in Rule 19.6.7(a) <u>and the provision of Rule 19.6.7 (b)</u> shall not apply to... Temporary Military Training Activities.
95.30	New Zealand Defence Force	20.6.7(d) Rule	In-Part	<p>Temporary Military Training Activities are no longer included in the general permitted noise conditions for each proposed zone. However, the general provisions in 20.6.7(b) in the Permitted Conditions for Noise state that:</p> <p>“Sound levels shall be measured and assessed in accordance with the provisions of NZS 6801:2008 Acoustics - Measurement of environmental sound and assessed in accordance with the provisions of NZS 6802:2008 Acoustics - Environmental noise”.</p>	Amend Rule 20.6.7(d) as follows: The noise limits in Rule 20.6.7(a) <u>and the provision of Rule 20.6.7 (b)</u> shall not apply to... Temporary Military Training Activities.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				Therefore Rule 20.6.7 (b) is redundant, as there is no possible situation to which it might apply. For the avoidance of doubt NZDF requests that this clause is specifically excluded, by amending 20.6.7(d).	
95.31	New Zealand Defence Force	15.6.11(a)(vi) Rule	Oppose	<p>The existing requirements for all zones (except Residential 1) is that: “Impulse Noise Resulting from the use of explosives and small arms is not to exceed 122 dBC”</p> <p>The Section 32 reports supporting the Proposed Plan states that “it is considered efficient and effective to provide for permitted noise levels that are in character with the zone” but do not give any specific reasons why the change from the status quo is necessary. NZDF submits that the status quo has been working satisfactorily to date and there appear to be no valid reasons given for introducing a blanket restriction on night-time use of explosives and small arms. For these reasons NZDF opposes this proposed Permitted Activity condition, and request that the current provisions for the District Plan in respect of night-time noise be retained, with the proviso that NZDF would wish to discuss this matter further with Council once a more detailed technical review has been completed.</p>	<p>Include provisions from the District Plan in regards to night time noise, which states; <u>Impulse Noise Resulting from the use of explosives and small arms is not to exceed 122 dBC</u></p>
95.32	New Zealand	16.6.23(a)(vi) Rule	Oppose	The existing requirements for all zones	Include provisions in the District Plan in

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
	Defence Force			<p>(except Residential 1) is that: “Impulse Noise Resulting from the use of explosives and small arms is not to exceed 122 dBC”</p> <p>The Section 32 reports supporting the Proposed Plan states that “it is considered efficient and effective to provide for permitted noise levels that are in character with the zone” but do not give any specific reasons why the change from the status quo is necessary. NZDF submits that the status quo has been working satisfactorily to date and there appear to be no valid reasons given for introducing a blanket restriction on night-time use of explosives and small arms. For these reasons NZDF opposes this proposed Permitted Activity condition, and request that the current provisions for the District Plan in respect of night-time noise be retained, with the proviso that NZDF would wish to discuss this matter further with Council once a more detailed technical review has been completed.</p>	<p>regards to night time noise, which states; <u>Impulse Noise Resulting from the use of explosives and small arms is not to exceed 122 dBC.</u></p>
95.33	New Zealand Defence Force	17.6.25(a)(vi) Rule	Oppose	<p>The existing requirements for all zones (except Residential 1) is that: “Impulse Noise Resulting from the use of explosives and small arms is not to exceed 122 dBC”</p> <p>The Section 32 reports supporting the Proposed Plan states that “it is considered efficient and effective to provide for</p>	<p>Include current provisions in the District Plan in regards to night time noise, which state; <u>Impulse Noise Resulting from the use of explosives and small arms is not to exceed 122 dBC.</u></p>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				permitted noise levels that are in character with the zone” but do not give any specific reasons why the change from the status quo is necessary. NZDF submits that the status quo has been working satisfactorily to date and there appear to be no valid reasons given for introducing a blanket restriction on night-time use of explosives and small arms. For these reasons NZDF opposes this proposed Permitted Activity condition, and request that the current provisions for the District Plan in respect of night-time noise be retains, with the proviso that NZDF would wish to discuss this matter further with Council one a more detailed technical review has been completed.	
95.34	New Zealand Defence Force	19.6.30(a)(vi) Rule	Oppose	<p>The existing requirements for all zones (except Residential 1) is that: “Impulse Noise Resulting from the use of explosives and small arms is not to exceed 122 dBC”</p> <p>The Section 32 reports supporting the Proposed Plan states that “it is considered efficient and effective to provide for permitted noise levels that are in character with the zone” but do not give any specific reasons why the change from the status quo is necessary. NZDF submits that the status quo has been working satisfactorily to date and there appear to be no valid reasons given for introducing a blanket restriction on night-</p>	<p>Retain current provisions in the District Plan in regards to night time noise, which state; <u>Impulse Noise Resulting from the use of explosives and small arms is not to exceed 122 dBC.</u></p>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				time use of explosives and small arms. For these reasons NZDF opposes this proposed Permitted Activity condition, and request that the current provisions for the District Plan in respect of night-time noise be retains, with the proviso that NZDF would wish to discuss this matter further with Council once a more detailed technical review has been completed.	
95.35	New Zealand Defence Force	20.6.22(a)(vi) Rule	Oppose	<p>The existing requirements for all zones (except Residential 1) is that: “Impulse Noise Resulting from the use of explosives and small arms is not to exceed 122 dBC”</p> <p>The Section 32 reports supporting the Proposed Plan states that “it is considered efficient and effective to provide for permitted noise levels that are in character with the zone” but do not give any specific reasons why the change from the status quo is necessary. NZDF submits that the status quo has been working satisfactorily to date and there appear to be no valid reasons given for introducing a blanket restriction on night-time use of explosives and small arms. For these reasons NZDF opposes this proposed Permitted Activity condition, and request that the current provisions for the District Plan in respect of night-time noise be retains, with the proviso that NZDF would wish to discuss this matter further with</p>	<p>Retain current provisions in the District Plan in regards to night time noise, which state; <u>Impulse Noise Resulting from the use of explosives and small arms is not to exceed 122 dBC.</u></p>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				Council one a more detailed technical review has been completed.	
95.36	New Zealand Defence Force	15.6.12 Rule	In-Part	<p>The Section 32 reports gives no specific reasons as to why these new standards are proposed, and gives no guidance as to the appropriateness or otherwise of these standards to Temporary Military Training Activities.</p> <p>NZDF adopts a neutral stance on the proposed introduction of the standards until a technical analysis of their implications has been completed. Once the results of this analysis are available, NZDF will come back to the Council with any further comments and requests.</p>	Retain Rule 15.6.22 as notified (conditionally).
95.37	New Zealand Defence Force	16.6.6 Rule	In-Part	<p>The Section 32 reports gives no specific reasons as to why these new standards are proposed, and gives no guidance as to the appropriateness or otherwise of these standards to Temporary Military Training Activities.</p> <p>NZDF adopts a neutral stance on the proposed introduction of the standards until a technical analysis of their implications has been completed. Once the results of this analysis are available, NZDF will come back to the Council with any further comments and requests.</p>	Retain Rule 16.6.6 as notified (conditionally).
95.38	New Zealand Defence Force	17.6.8 Rule	In-Part	The Section 32 reports gives no specific reasons as to why these new standards are proposed, and gives no guidance as to the	Retain Rule 17.6.8 as notified (conditionally).

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				appropriateness or otherwise of these standards to Temporary Military Training Activities. NZDF adopts a neutral stance on the proposed introduction of the standards until a technical analysis of their implications has been completed. Once the results of this analysis are available, NZDF will come back to the Council with any further comments and requests.	
95.39	New Zealand Defence Force	19.6.8 Rule	In-Part	The Section 32 reports gives no specific reasons as to why these new standards are proposed, and gives no guidance as to the appropriateness or otherwise of these standards to Temporary Military Training Activities. NZDF adopts a neutral stance on the proposed introduction of the standards until a technical analysis of their implications has been completed. Once the results of this analysis are available, NZDF will come back to the Council with any further comments and requests.	Retain Rule 19.6.8 as notified (conditionally).
95.40	New Zealand Defence Force	20.6.8 Rule	In-Part	The Section 32 reports gives no specific reasons as to why these new standards are proposed, and gives no guidance as to the appropriateness or otherwise of these standards to Temporary Military Training Activities. NZDF adopts a neutral stance on the proposed introduction of the standards until a	Retain Rule 20.6.8 as notified (conditionally).

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				technical analysis of their implications has been completed. Once the results of this analysis are available, NZDF will come back to the Council with any further comments and requests.	
95.41	New Zealand Defence Force	15.7.4 Rule	In-Part	Supports the retention of Controlled activity status for any Temporary Military Training Activities that are not Permitted Activities. However, NZDF requests that the matters for control are made more specific to noise In-Particular – in order to give the NZDF more certainty in understanding Council's requirements.	Retain Controlled activity status. Amend Rule 15.7.4 by clarifying matters for control, especially in regards to noise.
95.42	New Zealand Defence Force	16.7.6 Rule	In-Part	Supports the retention of Controlled activity status for any Temporary Military Training Activities that are not Permitted Activities. However, NZDF requests that the matters for control are made more specific to noise In-Particular – in order to give the NZDF more certainty in understanding Council's requirements.	Retain Controlled activity status. Amend Rule 16.7.6 by clarifying matters for control, especially in regards to noise.
95.43	New Zealand Defence Force	17.7.6 Rule	In-Part	Supports the retention of Controlled activity status for any Temporary Military Training Activities that are not Permitted Activities. However, NZDF requests that the matters for control are made more specific to noise In-Particular – in order to give the NZDF more certainty in understanding Council's requirements.	Retain Controlled activity status. Amend Rule 17.7.6 by clarifying matters for control, especially in regards to noise.
95.44	New Zealand Defence Force	19.7.10 Rule	In-Part	Supports the retention of Controlled activity status for any Temporary Military Training	Retain Controlled activity status. Amend Rule 19.7.10 by clarifying

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				Activities that are not Permitted Activities. However, NZDF requests that the matters for control are made more specific to noise In-Particular – in order to give the NZDF more certainty in understanding Council's requirements.	matters for control, especially in regards to noise.
95.45	New Zealand Defence Force	20.7.6 Rule	In-Part	Supports the retention of Controlled activity status for any Temporary Military Training Activities that are not Permitted Activities. However, NZDF requests that the matters for control are made more specific to noise In-Particular – in order to give the NZDF more certainty in understanding Council's requirements.	Retain Controlled activity status. Amend Rule 20.7.6 by clarifying matters for control, especially in regards to noise.
95.46	New Zealand Defence Force	23 General Matters	Support	NZDF acknowledges Section 23 Rules have updated to reflect the requirements of the HSNO legislation.	Retain as notified.
95.47	New Zealand Defence Force	26 Definitions	Support	NZDF acknowledges Definition have been updated to reflect the requirements of the HSNO legislation.	Retain definitions as notified.
95.48	New Zealand Defence Force	19.6.28(a) Rule	In-Part	Because Temporary Military Training Activities by definition can also include activities on the surface of the water, this rule creates an apparent contradiction with Rule 19.6.30 (a) (iii) for the same zone. NZDF therefore requests that for the avoidance of doubt this possible contradiction is removed by amending Rule 19.6. 28 (a).	Amend Rule 19.6.28 as follows: Any activity on the surface of any lake or river (<u>excluding any temporary military training activity</u>) shall not....
95.49	New Zealand Defence Force	20.6 Rule	Support	Support the removal of the following Permitted Activity Conditions; (v) The written consent of the owner	Retain the removal of conditions as notified

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				<p>shall have been obtained.</p> <p>(vi) Flying activity shall be in compliance with Civil Aviation regulations or in agreement with the local controlling authority.</p> <p>NZDF notes that this removes redundant requirement from the Plan.</p>	
95.50	New Zealand Defence Force	15.6.31(a)(ii) Rule	In-Part	Neutral stance on Rule 15.6.31(a)(ii).	Retain Rule 15.6.31(a)(ii) as notified.
95.51	New Zealand Defence Force	16.6.23(a)(ii) Rule	In-Part	Neutral stance on Rule 16.6.23(a)(ii).	Retain Rule 16.6.23(a)(ii) as notified
95.52	New Zealand Defence Force	17.6.25(a)(ii) Rule	In-Part	Neutral stance on Rule 17.6.25(a)(ii)	Retain Rules 17.6.25(a)(ii) as notified.
95.53	New Zealand Defence Force	19.6.30(a) (ii) Rule	In-Part	Neutral stance on Rule 19.6.30(a)(ii).	Retain Rule 19.6.30(a)(ii) as notified.
95.54	New Zealand Defence Force	20.6.22(a)(ii) Rule	In-Part	Neutral stance on Rule 20.6.22 (a)(ii).	Retain Rule 20.6.22(a)(ii) as notified.
96.00	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	2.1.20 Policy	Support	Support Policy 2.1.20 as it seeks to maintain rural character, and specifically because the policy includes rural productive values.	Retain Policy 2.1.20 as notified.
96.01	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	2.4 Issue	Oppose	<p>Oppose Issues 2.4 as it is outside the District Council's functions under Section 31 of the RMA and provides little value to the overall management of the District's resources.</p> <p>The discussion of this issue is focused on land management practice which can affect soil erosion and the productive capacity of soils.</p> <p>These are functions that belong to the Regional Council, as Section 30(1)(c) specifically states that the control of the use of land for the purpose of soil conservation is</p>	Delete Issue 2.4

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				<p>a regional council function.</p> <p>While the proposed District plan has provisions for subdivision and development for the purpose of reducing fragmentation and loss of productive potential due to property sizes which is considered consistent with its functions, an issue regarding land management practice for the purpose of soil conservation is outside the District Council's vires. There seems little value in including Issue 2.4 into the District Plan, when methods are limited to education which is already undertaken by the Regional Council.</p> <p>Issue 2.2 and its associated objectives and policies already deal with fragmentation in the soil resource due to subdivision.</p> <p>Federated Farmers considers that this is an appropriate concern to be addressed by the District Council under Section 31 of the RMA.</p>	
96.02	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	2.4.1 Objective	Oppose	<p>There is little value added by this suite of provisions regarding land management practice for the purpose of soil conservation when this is a function that belongs to the Regional Council, and when the District Council's methods are limited to education.</p> <p>The Objectives and Policies under Issue 2.2 already manage the concern around lost productive capacity through inappropriate subdivision causing fragmentation of the soil resource which is appropriate under Section 31 of the RMA, so there is no need for</p>	Delete Objective 2.4.1.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				Objective 2.4.1	
96.03	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	2.4.2 Policy	Oppose	There is little value added by this suite of provisions regarding land management practice for the purpose of soil conservation when this is a function that belongs to the Regional Council, and when the District Council's methods are limited to education. The Objectives and Policies under Issue 2.2 already manage the concern around lost productive capacity through inappropriate subdivision causing fragmentation of the soil resource which is appropriate under Section 31 of the RMA, so there is no need for Policy 2.4.2	Delete Policy 2.4.2
96.04	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	2.4.3 Policy	Oppose	There is little value added by this suite of provisions regarding land management practice for the purpose of retaining soils capacity when this is a function that belongs to the Regional Council, and when the District Council's methods are limited to education. The Objectives and Policies under Issue 2.2 already manage the concern around lost productive capacity through inappropriate subdivision causing fragmentation of the soil resource which is appropriate under Section 31 of the RMA, so there is no need for Policy 2.4.3.	Delete Policy 2.4.3
96.05	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	2.5 Issue	In-Part	In general Federated Farmers support the explanation and principle reasons for the policies and objectives contained in Section 2.5. It is critically important that existing and	Amend Issue 2.5 as follows: Diversity of primary production and non-primary production activities occur in the rural environment. These

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				<p>legitimate primary production land uses in the rural zone are protected from reverse sensitivity and that within the rural zone some primary production activities will at time generate external effects that cannot be avoided.</p> <p>Support is also given for the discussion of specific effect that should be anticipated such as noise from dogs and livestock, farm machinery etc.</p> <p>The Issue needs to specify that both positive and negative effects can arise, as just having the words “effects” makes the reader assume it is referring to negative effects.</p> <p>Support is given for the acknowledgement in the Issue that some effects are anticipated and expected in the rural environment. This acknowledgement should continue along this line by specifying that some effects are essential in order for activities to continue.</p>	<p>activities can have a wide range of <u>positive and negative</u> effects on the nature, character and amenity values of the rural environment, as well as the potential for incompatibility between activities. However, some of these effects are anticipated and expected in a rural environment <u>and are essential in order for activities to continue</u>. Or words to this effect.</p>
96.06	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	2.5.1 Objective	In-Part	<p>The recognition that primary production activities must be able to operate effectively in the rural zone is critical for a district such as Horowhenua, which is so reliant primary production for the community wellbeing. Also supported is the inclusion of rural-based activities into the Objective, as activities such as rural contracting or processing are important components of the primary production industry.</p> <p>Federated Farmers suppose the use of the</p>	<p>Amend Objective 2.5.1 as follows: To enable primary production activities and other associated rural based land uses to function efficiently and effectively in the Rural Zone, while avoiding, remedying or mitigating the adverse effects of activities, including reverse sensitivity effects, in a way that maintains and enhances the <u>productive capacity</u>, character and amenity values of the rural environment. Or words to</p>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				<p>term to enable as this is consistent with the enabling intent of the RMA.</p> <p>Also supports the provision to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects, as this is consistent with Section 5 (2) (c) of the RMA, and also provides more options on how to manage adverse effects.</p> <p>However, not only character and amenity aspects of the rural environment are worthy of maintenance or enhancement. The productive capacity of the rural environment is an important component of enabling primary production and should be included into the Objective. The term productive capacity incorporates many aspects and is a broad enough term to use in and objective that seeks to enable primary production.</p>	this effect.
96.07	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	2.5.2 Policy	Support	<p>Supports Policy 2.5.2 in that both establishment of new and operation of existing primary production activities will be provided for. This will ensure that Horowhenua is able to evolve and provide for new markets that may emerge and retain a thriving local economy and community.</p> <p>Support for the provision to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects, as this is consistent with Section 5 (2) (c) of the RMA, and also provides more options on how to manage adverse effects.</p> <p>The ability to use their land productively is an important value to landowners that needs to</p>	Retain Policy 2.5.2

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				be understood by decision makers, and the inclusion of this wording is appreciated.	
96.08	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	2.5.3 Policy	Support	<p>Support for Policy 2.5.3 in that both establishment of new and operation of existing activities that are associated primary production will be provided for. Support activities such as rural contracting and processing are vital to the overall production industry.</p> <p>Support for the provision to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects, as this is consistent with Section 5 (2) (c) of the RMA, and also provides more options on how to manage adverse effects.</p>	Retain intent of Policy 2.5.3
96.09	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	2.5.4 Policy	In-Part	<p>Support Policy 2.5.4 which seeks to manage sensitive activities. Reverse sensitivity towards the effects of their farms and the confidence to continue farming operation is an important issue for our members.</p> <p>The clarity of Policy 2.5.4 could be improved by specifying that it is not only the environment that needs to be protected from adverse effects from sensitive activities, but also production activities. While Policy 2.5.11 specifically refers to reverse sensitivity issues between sensitive activities and primary production, that policy only applies for separation distances. Policy 2.5.4 is broader in scope and it would be useful to include established production activities in what is to</p>	<p>Amend Policy 2.5.4 as follows:</p> <p>Control and manage the establishment and operation of a range of other land use activities, including sensitive activities, in the rural environment to ensure their adverse effects on the environment <u>and existing legitimately established rural activities</u> are avoided, remedied or mitigated. Or words to this effect.</p>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				be protected.	
96.10	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	2.5.7 Policy	In-Part	<p>Federated Farmers understands that what contributes to rural amenity is the low density of buildings; however, it is important to remember that buildings are necessary for primary production activities. Rural buildings may be clustered together for ease of access, and others may be tall in order to be fit for storing equipment. Corresponding Rule 19.6.2 gives a maximum height of 15m as a permitted activity which Federated Farmers considers sufficient.</p> <p>Support is also given for the provision to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects, as this is consistent with Section 5(2) (c) of the RMA, and also provides more options on how to manage adverse effects.</p>	<p>Amend Policy 2.5.7 as follows: Avoid, remedy or mitigate the impact of buildings on the rural landscape and maintain overall low building density and building height throughout the rural environment, <u>while recognising that buildings are necessary for primary production activities.</u></p>
96.11	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	2.5.9 Policy	In-Part	<p>Federated Farmers considers that life-supporting capacity of soils can be enhanced by the provision of additional dwellings, allowing for worker accommodation as without workers the soil will not be productive.</p> <p>Corresponding Condition 19.6.1 only allows for one house and one 70m² flat, this is insufficient for worker accommodation. Many farmers have multiple dwellings on the farm as accommodation for employees, farm managers or retired parents. Because farms are located in remote rural areas, by necessity worker accommodation needs to be</p>	<p>Amend Policy 2.5.9 as follows: Manage the effects of additional dwellings on the life-supporting capacity of soils and the character and amenity values of the rural environment, recognising <u>that rural housing provides an important social service, and any farm worker accommodation should be located and related to the scale and intensity of the primary production activities on site.</u> Or words to this effect.</p>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				<p>provided. Allowing multiple dwellings will enable the social well-being of rural communities.</p> <p>Support is given for the intent that farm worker accommodation must be related to the scale and intensity of production occurring, however this good intention is not reflected in Condition 19.6.1</p>	
96.12	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	2.5.10 Policy	In-Part	<p>Farmers are more concerned about the ability to continue farming, rather than privacy and amenity. Federated Farmers reminds the Council that privacy and amenity policies should not adversely impact on farming activities. While it is important that farmers are able to live on their land, primary production is the purpose of the rural zone. New dwellings should be setback, rather than rural buildings.</p> <p>Corresponding Rule 19.64 for building setbacks has a greater setback for new houses than the setback for other buildings. This is supported as it reflects our concern that new houses as sensitive activities should be managed allowing existing farming operations the confidence to continue. The policy should reinforce that is it new buildings that will be setback, and that existing buildings are not affected by setback rules. Support is also given for the provision to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects, as this is consistent with Section 5 (2) (c) of the</p>	Amend Policy 2.5.10 as follows: Avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects on rural privacy and rural character in the Rural Zone by maintaining road and site boundary setbacks for all <u>new</u> buildings, while recognising the degree of privacy and rural spaciousness is different in areas comprising existing smaller rural-residential lots. Or words to this effect.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				RMA, and also provides more options on how to manage adverse effects.	
96.13	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	2.5.11 Policy	In-Part	Supports the appropriate priority is given to existing lawfully established activities within Policy 2.5.11. This is an important aspect to managing reverse sensitivity in an area that is used actively for production, the main purpose of the rural zone is for production and existing productive land uses and activities need to have the ability to continue. The concepts of covenants is covered in the last paragraph of the Explanation and Principle Reasons on page 2-29 which is supported in principle by Federated Farmers. However the Policy should extend the range of ways to manage reverse sensitivity by including covenants. These can be issued at the time of consent for residential subdivision or other sensitive activities in the Rural Zone.	Amend Policy 2.5.11 as follows: Manage reverse sensitivity conflict between primary production activities and sensitive activities through appropriate separation distances, <u>and no-complaints on new sensitive activities</u> , while giving priority to existing lawfully established activities. Or words to this effect.
96.14	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	3.3.6 Policy	In-Part	Federated Farmers supports Policy 3.3.6 which seeks to promote and encourage planting of water margins. Non-regulatory methods are an important part of the tool box when managing water margins and amenity values of natural features. However, corresponding methods are limited to co-operation with regional initiatives, particularly as the One Plan has assumed functions over biodiversity. In corresponding conditions for subdivision 24.2.5 article (h) states that Council may require reserves to be	Amend Policy 3.3.6 to include non-regulatory methods which promote and encourage actions such as financial assistance, provision of material and plants, rates relief and regulatory incentives. Or words to this effect.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				fenced. There is an opportunity here to promote and encourage fencing and riparian planting by providing financial assistance, gifting of plants, rates relief or regulatory incentives such as transferable development rights.	
96.15	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	4.2 Issue	In-Part	<p>Federated Farmers recognises the benefit to the community that the putting aside of esplanade strips and reserves at the time of subdivision offers. However, it is equally relevant that the application of esplanade reserves and strips is done so appropriately and in manner that does not restrict the existing lawful operation of adjoining landowners, or endorse trespass. Federated Farmers believes that the comments made under Issue 4.2 suggest that the Council does recognise that provision of access to water bodies must not adversely affect the operating requirements of adjoining landowners (paragraphs 1 and 2 of Page 4-7). Similarly Federated Farmers also note that on page 4-9 reference is made to the public benefit gained by enhanced access must be weighed against the effects of that access on the values of the water body and also the impact for adjoining properties. Federated Farmers endorse such recognition by the council of the potential negative impacts that public access to water bodies may present for adjoining landowners.</p>	<p>Amend Issue 4.2 as follows: Maintaining and enhancing public access to water bodies and the coast is highly valued by the community. However, in maintaining and enhancing this public access, the operational requirements of adjoining landowners and landowner rights may <u>must not</u> be compromised, or and the other qualities of the water bodies and their margins including natural character, ecological values, and hazard risks may be <u>are not</u> degraded. Or words to this effect.</p>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				Federated Farmers is concerned that public access provisions give the public the impression that access is freely available over private land. It is important to remember that members of the public need to ask permission for access over private property, and that landowners are within their rights to decline access. The District Plan should not contradict these rights.	
96.16	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	4.2.1 Objective	In-Part	<p>Federated Farmers believe that a strengthening of recognition for private landowners through Objective 4.2.1 is appropriate.</p> <p>Support is given to the recognition that public access may be maintained and enhanced only at appropriate locations. Federate Farmers recognises that esplanade reserves and strips may be a way of increasing public access, but we do not support any expectation that private landowners will provide access. Access over private land is a matter for the landowner to decide.</p>	Amend Objective 4.2.1 as follows: Maintain and enhance public access to and along the coast, rivers, lakes and streams, at appropriate locations while preserving the natural character and other values of these water bodies and their margins <u>and recognising the right of private landowners to refuse access over private land.</u> Or words to this effect.
96.17	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	4.2.2 Policy	In-Part	Federated Farmers is concerned that policies seeking to improve public access may be read to mean that the public can access water bodies by crossing over private land, which is in fact trespass. Public access needs to be limited to land that is owned by a local authority such as an esplanade or a park, or by the Crown as a reserve.	Amend Policy 4.2.2 as follows: Prioritise <u>Recognise</u> the needs for public access <u>where appropriate</u> to water bodies with significant natural/ecological, natural hazards, recreational/access and cultural values <u>whilst recognising the rights of private landowners to refuse access over private land.</u> Or words to this effect.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
96.18	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	4.2.3 Policy	In-Part	<p>Federated Farmers acknowledges that the RMA provides for esplanade areas to be taken or set aside when allotments of less than 4 hectares are created. However, Section 77 of the RMA also provides for district plans to include rules to waive, reduce or enlarge the required width of a reserve, to enable a reserve to be taken from allotment of 4 hectares or greater, and for an esplanade strip to be required instead.</p> <p>Section 237 F of the RMA requires that where any esplanade reserve or esplanade strip of any width is required to be set aside or created on an allotment of 4 hectares or more created when land is subdivided, the territorial authority shall pay to the registered proprietor of that allotment compensation for any esplanade reserve or any interest in land taken for any esplanade strip, unless the registered proprietor agrees otherwise.</p> <p>Federate Farmers is concerned that Policy 4.2.3 will mean that the Council may not have the financial resources to keep up with compensation. The requirement for taking esplanade reserves should be waived if the Council is unable to pay compensation or there is no agreement to voluntarily vest a reserve.</p>	<p>Amend Policy 4.2.3 as follows: Require <u>where appropriate</u> esplanade reserves or strips along the coast and identified rivers, lakes and streams that are considered of significant value in the District <u>in accordance with Section 237 F of the RMA</u>.</p>
96.19	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	4.2.6 Policy	In-Part	<p>Supports Policy 4.2.6 which provides for a reduction of esplanade requirements. An ability to waiver the requirement for an</p>	<p>Amend Policy 4.2.6 as follows: Consider the reduction in width or waiver of the esplanade reserve or</p>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
	Federated Farmers of New Zealand			<p>esplanade reserve will provide the Council and resource users with more flexibility. However, further circumstances where the ability to waiver requirements needs to be included.</p> <p>Esplanade strips or reserves may not always be appropriate in all circumstances, including when protection of the riparian area is more appropriately achieved by an alternate protection mechanism such as a Land Transfer Act or QEII covenant, the subdivision involves only a minor boundary adjustment, or public safety and security reasons means that public access is not always desirable. Protection mechanisms other than perpetual protection can also be appropriate. Covenants under the Land Transfer Act 1951 can be registered to maintain or enhance natural functioning of the adjacent water body. Allowing for these types of mechanisms to be available will provide the Council and resource users with more options and flexibility so case-by-case solutions can be used.</p>	<p>strips requirements where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The reduced width still provides for the use and enjoyment of the area; • The purpose for the esplanade area can still be achieved; • The creation of the esplanade area would adversely affect the natural, ecological, and cultural values of the water body and its margins; • Public health and safety is protected; • Conflicts with other recreational uses are minimised; • Flooding and other natural hazards are managed; and • Alternative public access is available. • <u>Compensation as per Section 237 of the RMA is impractical for the Council.</u> • <u>The land has little or no value in terms of enhancing public access.</u> • <u>Where the land is protected in perpetuity, provided that public access is secured along the margins of the coast, river or lake concerned.</u>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Protection of the riparian area is more appropriately achieved by an alternate protection mechanism.</u> • <u>The subdivision involves only a minor boundary adjustment</u> • <u>For reasons of public safety and/or security an esplanade reserve would be inappropriate. For example, where there are defences lands, existing road reserve, sensitive machinery, network utilities or works.</u> <p>Or words to this affect.</p>
96.20	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	4.2.7 Policy	Support	<p>Federated Farmers is generally supportive of the intent of Policy 4.2.7. Landowners wishing to develop esplanade areas and other open spaces which are of benefit to the wider community should be supported to do this by the District Council.</p> <p>Support is given to the provision for other open space connections, as esplanade strips or reserves may not always be appropriate in all circumstances. Protection of the riparian area can be achieved by an alternate protection mechanism such as a Land Transfer Act 1951 or QEII covenant. While not all QEII covenants provide for public access, this can be an agreed condition with the</p>	Retain Policy 4.2.7 as notified.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				landowner. Allowing for these types of mechanisms to be available will provide the Council and resource users with more options and flexibility so case-by-case solutions can be used.	
96.21	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	4.2 Method	Support	Federated Farmers support the flexibility of methods in the District Plan to reduce or waive the requirements of esplanade strips or reserves adjacent to Schedule 12 water bodies and rule that can allow for the appropriate development of reserves or strips adjacent to other water bodies.	Retain Methods 4.2 as notified.
96.22	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	13.3 Issue	Support	Support Issue 13.3. Many of our members are impacted by heritage provisions as they own land where historic and archaeological sites are located, and often use their own resources to manage these sites. Our members value heritage, but often the unknown costs or implications of heritage can create a perception that heritage is a burden. When developing policy around heritage, the impacts on resource users must be addressed. Resource users for value heritage resources and Council's mechanisms to protect them should include encouragement for resource users. If the effects on landowners are ignore it could be perceived that recognised heritage resources are a hindrance and a liability, resulting in negative consequences all around. Policies that provide for recognition of the private efforts	Retain Issue 13.3 as notified.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				that go into protecting a public resource, and non-regulatory methods that assist landowners is a great initiative from this Council.	
96.23	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	13.3.2 Policy	Support	Support is given for Policy 13.3.2 which seeks to increase public awareness of the responsibility that private landowners assume over heritage that is located on private property.	Retain Policy 13.3.2 as notified.
96.24	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	13.3.3 Policy	Support	Federated Farmer strongly supports Policy 13.3.3 which provides for the development of non-regulatory mechanisms as tools for managing heritage. The corresponding methods include a great range of non-regulatory methods that will go a long way toward achieving this policy.	Retain Policy 13.3.2 as notified.
96.25	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	13.3 Methods	In-Part	Federated Farmers supports these methods provided for the heritage Chapter. Currently the wording of the first bullet point only indicated that Long Term Plan and Annual Plan processes may occur, but further assurance that these methods will be implemented will provide assurance to landowners that they will occur. Further financial assistance should be provided by a fund, or a cost-share agreement system. Landowners may intend to fence off archaeological sites or carry out maintenance and repairs on historic buildings. We not however that presently the Schedule 2 of the Plan only contains one archaeological	Amend Methods 13.3 as follows: Through the Long Term Plan and Annual Plan processes, Council may <u>will</u> commit resources such as rates relief, grants, waive administration fees, low interest loans or offer access to professional technical advice to encourage the management and protection of scheduled historic heritage buildings and sites. That a new bullet point be added the Council will have a cost-share system or a fund to provide landowners with

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				site of a midden on private land, but more sites could be added in the future.	financial assistance regarding their heritage sites.
96.26	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	19.1(a) Rule	Support	Strongly supports the provision of primary production activities as permitted. Primary production is the main reason for the rural zone, and is vital to the economy of Horowhenua, and people and communities wellbeing.	Retain Rule 19.1(a) as a permitted activity.
96.27	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	19.1(g) Rule	Support	Supports the provision of building associate with a permitted activity being permitted. This is a recognition that buildings are needed for activities such as farming to operate.	Retain Rule 19.1 (g) as notified.
96.28	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	19.1(k) Rule	Oppose	Permitted status for the construction and upgrading is entirely inappropriate and does not take into account the adverse effects that this can create. Network utilities such as electricity transmission or telecommunications traverse over private land, this is different to generation or station facilities where the infrastructure is located on land owned by the utility company. Federated Farmers is gravely concerned that this Rule displays an insufficient understanding of the adverse impacts created by the construction or upgrading that burden the owners of the land that infrastructure is located on. Construction and upgrading will involve the Network Utility operator temporarily occupying a wider strip of land than what it	Amend Rule 19.1(k) by classifying that construction and upgrading of network utilities is a discretionary activity.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
	Federated Farmers of New Zealand			<p>needs for the life of the lines. Disturbance and impacts of construction include damage to pasture and soil compaction; damage to property, gates and fence lines; livestock disturbance; having to change farming practice like not being able to graze particular paddocks or continue with irrigation; damage and destruction of crops; and storage of materials and machinery on property. There will be effects on the remainder of the property as workers will need access over the property to reach the construction site such as damage to private roads and tracks, the removal of fences or widening of gateways. Even worker facilities like smoko rooms and portaloos will be located on the land. Landowners are also concerned about liability if there is an accident while workers are on their land.</p> <p>Activities such as maintenance, repair and operation as permitted are more reasonable. Activities such as washing or repainting pylons, repair of conductors, trimming trees, re-tensioning and re-sagging of conductors are activities that Federate Farmers considers as maintenance, repair and operation, and that we accept are needed to ensure that transmission continues. It needs to be remembered that network utility operators still have an obligation to give notice to landowner prior to entering the property for</p>	

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				<p>maintenance, repair and operation, and the landowner may set conditions of entry. We will continue discussing what constitutes maintenance and repair further in our submission on Rule 22.1.10.</p> <p>There may be a perception that the adverse effects of construction and upgrading are managed by other legislation, but the permitted activity status in the District Plan enables these activities to occur without consideration of the needs of and effects on the landowners.</p>	
96.29	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	19.1(m) Rule	In-Part	<p>Support is given for the provision of primary activities as permitted within the Flood Hazard Overlay Areas. However, there is some confusion when this permitted status interacts with Condition 19.6.11 and the definition of Primary Production Activities which makes the permitted status seem not so favourable.</p> <p>Common understanding of primary production activities would include earthworks and buildings which are vital for farming such as tracking, digging silage pits, and buildings for equipment storage or for livestock, and it would seem that these are permitted under Rule 19.1 (m). However, Condition 19.6.11 limits earthworks to only 20m³ and buildings to only 40m², which would mean that many normal activities associated with primary production would</p>	Amend Rule 19.1(m) by permitting earthworks and buildings that are associated with primary production within Flood Hazard Overlays.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				need resource consent. This is compounded by the definition of Primary Production Activities which doesn't seem to be as to whether this includes activities ancillary to production – like earthworks and buildings. Federated Farmers submits that the logical solution to this would be to specify that activities ancillary to primary production like earthworks and buildings are included within the definition of Primary Production Activities.	
96.30	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	19.4.1(a) Rule	Oppose	<p>Oppose the discretionary status of activities that are not assigned a status elsewhere. Under Section 9 the use of land is presumed to be permitted unless it is restricted by a rule in a plan. We appreciate that not every eventuality can be covered with the use of activity lists, which is why the Council should be identifying resource issues specific to the District and only control land use relating to the management of any adverse effects on those resources.</p> <p>As per Section 76(3) when making a rule a territorial authority shall have regard to the actual or potential effect on the environment. The power to include rules in plans is provided by Section 77A and the types of activities can only be described as “any activity not listed”. Further, the issue of adverse effects which have not been anticipated can be addressed via a plan or</p>	<p>Delete Rule 19.4.1(a)</p> <p>And</p> <p>That permitted status is the default status for activities not otherwise provided for.</p>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				variation. This is the appropriate remedy as provided by the RMA for activities otherwise unanticipated.	
96.31	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	19.4.11(a) Rule	In-Part	Federated Farmers is concerned that the use of the word site in this Rule will bring confusion when it interacts with the definition of Site in Chapter 26. The definition of Site refers to an entire property or certificate of title, whereas this Rule appears to refer to the discrete area that has the historic significance. Seeking to restrict buildings, earthworks and subdivision on the entire property even when not located near the historic area is impractical. While it is noted that there is only one historic site that is listed in Schedule 2 of the Plan that appears to be on private land, more sites may be added in the future.	Amend Rule 19.4.11(a) as follows: (a) Where a site is listed in Schedule 2 – Historic Heritage, the following are discretionary activities: (i) New building or the extension of the footprint of an existing building or structure on a site <u>the historic site</u> . (ii) Earthworks <u>on the historic site</u> . (iii) Subdivision of land <u>where the boundary is on the historic site</u> .
96.32	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	19.6.1 Rule	In-Part	Providing only for one dwelling and one flat per property is too restrictive and will compromise the social and economic well-being of people and communities. Many farmers require multiple dwellings on the farm as accommodation for employees, farm managers or retired parents. Because farms are located in remote rural areas, by necessity worker accommodation needs to be provided, providing housing in rural areas fulfils an important social service. Other Councils such as Hauraki provide for a graduated approach to number of houses,	Amend Rule 19.6.1 through employing a graduated approach to the number of houses permitted per property, providing more than two dwellings for larger rural properties.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				where the number of dwellings permitted depends on the size of the property. This means that issues around density of dwellings in the rural zone are managed while also providing for more houses for larger properties. As currently written, the rule would only provide for one house and one flat if the property was 1ha or 1,000ha. Policy 2.5.9 states that farm worker accommodation should be related to the scale of the primary production activities on site, however, this condition does not allow for scale of the property or production activity to be taken into account.	
96.33	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	19.6.7 Rule	In-Part	Noise from farming activities should be anticipated in the rural zone and unrestrained by secondary activities such as rural residential dwellings. Noise is part and parcel of a landscape that is used activity for primary production, and farm households accept this noise as incidental to getting the job done. Federated Farmers believes that education is a better method of reducing complaints about noise, rather than constraining normal farming activities with regulations. Federated Farmers support the condition (d) (iii) regarding exemption for mobile sources associated with primary production. This could however be further improved by also allowing for temporary sources along the lines of (viii) temporary events. An example	Amend Rule 19.6.7 as follows: ... d(iii) Mobile <u>and/or temporary sources</u> associated with primary production activities. Or words to that effect.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				may be temporary calf rearing and the associated noise levels to also be exempt based on the temporary nature of the activity.	
96.34	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	19.6.11 Rule	Oppose	<p>This condition is severely restricting for farmed properties and should be deleted. Federated Farmers notes that significant areas of land are included within the Flood Hazard Overlay Areas, Planning Map 5 shows a good example of how much farmland is included within this overlay and therefore subject to this condition. In many cases entire properties are classified within the Flood Hazard Overlay Areas.</p> <p>Federated Farmers submits that the focus should be on adverse effects arising from land use and development rather than the activities themselves, and adverse effects should be avoided, remedied or mitigated to retain consistency with Section 31(1)(b)(i) of the RMA. Regulation should not unnecessarily restrict land use that is appropriate for the location susceptible to natural hazards like farming.</p> <p>The restriction to only 20m³ of earthworks per site per 12 months will severely limit normal farming earthworks, which are unnecessary and will not achieve sustainable management. Council would be processing resource consent applications for minor activities like clean filling around troughs</p>	Delete Rule 19.6.11

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				<p>which will have no effect on flooding. The purpose of the rule needs to be further delineated as to prevent normal farming activities in the appropriate rural zone being captured. Most of the areas shown to be floodable are rural, and rural land use is appropriate and well established here, and earthworks are vital for farming to continue. While we recognise that tracks are excluded, this does not go far enough to ensure that normal farming earthworks can continue. The restriction to only 40m² floor area and the inclusion of non-habitable structures with permeable floors will directly restrict farm buildings, Federated Farmers submits that this is unnecessary and should be deleted. Rules intended to manage flood risk should not accidentally regulate farm building or fences, as these are not inhabited so lives will not be at risk, and such sheds and fences will not make flooding worse. There is no need to require resource consent for a shed used to park tractors with a dirt floor: no lives are at risk if it floods; and there will be minimal damage compared to a house being flooded. The Building Consent process and Building Codes already manage a building's resilience to natural hazards and ensures that building will be constructed sufficiently to withstand natural hazards and keep people safe. There is no need for further regulation in the District</p>	

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				Plan when concerns are already met by current building codes.	
96.35	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	19.6.14 Rule	Oppose	<p>Oppose all provisions relating to this subject. Transmission corridor rules in district plans that seek to constrain normal rural activities undertaken by a landowner on their own land should be deleted.</p> <p>Transmission is Over Private Land: Matters concerning transmission lines across privately owned land should be private matters between network utility operators and the landowners across whose land the transmission lines pass, and should not be regulated in district plans.</p> <p>Undermines Compensation: The Electricity Transmission Corridors and provisions will supplant the rights of landowners to achieve compensation when future upgrades to transmission lines are carried out. The Public Works Act 1981 outlines that compensation will be paid when injurious affection has occurred even if no land has been taken. If the injurious has occurred by restrictions in the District Plan, then this will erode landowner's ability to obtain fair compensation.</p> <p>Unnecessary to Protect Transmission Interests: Transpower already has the means to secure their interest by using the easement agreement system pursuant to the Land Transfer Act 1952, Part 3 of the Electricity Act</p>	Delete Rule 19.6.14

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				<p>1992 provides for the powers and duties of electricity operators and owners of electricity works, and also grants statutory right of access to existing works in Section 23 of the Electricity Act 1992.</p> <p>Misunderstood NPS Direction: Policy 10 of the National Policy Statement on Electricity Transmission only seeks to ensure that electricity transmission of the nation grid is not compromised. Policy 11 only requires that “sensitive activities” need to be managed, which are specifically defined in the NPS as schools, houses and hospitals. Farm buildings and primary production structures should not be managed as sensitive activities, nor will these activities compromise transmission. Any provisions relating to lines other than the national grid are also in breach of the NPS.</p> <p>Duplicate Regulation: There is already a regulatory framework for safety distances for buildings and structures from overhead line supports. The NZECP34:2001 outlines distances for buildings in Section 2.4 and Section 3.3 has distances between buildings and conductors without engineering advice.</p> <p>Duplicate Process: Landowners are already expected to obtain prior written consent from the owner of overhead electric line support structures if their activities exceed the minimum safe distances in NZECP34:2001.</p> <p>The proposed rules in the District Plan will</p>	

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				mean that landowners will have to go through duplicate and parallel processes – obtaining prior written consent under NZECP34:2001, and applying to the Council for resource consent.	
96.36	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	19.6.15 Rule	In-Part	<p>Rule 19.6.14 needs to focus on setback from a separately owned property, to avoid capturing adjacent properties owned by the same landowner.</p> <p>Shelterbelts are commonly planted around houses to protect them from wind, and the definition could even capture hedges. It should be up to the landowner to determine whether they want shelter around the house, or to set trees back further to prevent shading.</p> <p>Internal effects created by a forest or shelterbelt close to a house on the same property and owned by the same person should not be a concern. Creating effects upon oneself is not a matter of concern to the Council, as regulations should seek to reduce conflict and manage effects imposed upon others. It would be impractical to require resource consent when the affected party is also the applicant. A level of on-site flexibility needs to be retained so that landowners can tailor solutions to their individual needs and property considerations. Replanting of existing forests that have been harvested need to be provided for as an</p>	<p>Amend Rule 19.6.15 as follows:</p> <p>(a) No <u>new</u> plantation forest shall be planted within 10 metres from any <u>site boundary of a separately owned site</u>.</p> <p>(b) No <u>new</u> plantation forest shall be planted within 25 metres from any existing residential dwelling unit <u>located on a separately owned site</u>.</p> <p>(c) Vegetation planted to form a <u>new</u> shelterbelt for more than 20 metres in length shall not exceed 6 metres in height from ground level within 10 metres horizontal distance from any <u>site boundary of a separately owned site</u>.</p> <p>(d) No <u>new</u> plantation forest or shelterbelt shall be planted or allowed to grow in any position which could result in any icing of any public road carriageway as a result of shading of the road between 10.00am and 2.00pm on the shortest day.</p>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				existing use right, so Rule 19.6.15 should be limited to new trees only.	
96.37	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	19.6.16 Rule	Oppose	Rule 19.6.16 should be deleted. Resource management issues regarding harvesting of forestry should be left to the Regional Council.	Delete Rule 19.6.16
96.38	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	22.1.10(b) Rule	Oppose	<p>Oppose Rule 22.1.10(b) which gives a definition for minor upgrading, which mean that a large scale of activities that can have significant adverse effects are inappropriately provided for as permitted, it must be remembers that often network utilities can be located on land that is not owned by the network utilities company, but a private landowner. Farmers host network utilities such as transmission lines on their own private land, and so rules that allow upgrading activities will have a direct impact on them.</p> <p>Rule 22.1.10(b) provides for much larger scale of activities such as the replacement of an entire electricity transmission tower, which does not even have to occupy the same footprint but can be within alignment of the existing corridor, as permitted. Increase in tower height will also be permitted. This Rule display an insufficient understanding of the adverse impacts that burden the owners of the land that infrastructure is located on. Upgrading activities will involve a network utility operator temporarily occupying a wider</p>	<p>Delete Rule 22.1.10(b)</p> <p>And</p> <p>Amend rules to make:</p> <p>Minor upgrading and upgrading of network facilities are a discretionary activity.</p>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				<p>strip of land than what the completed utility needs. Disturbance and impacts of construction include damage to pasture and soil compaction; damage to property, gates and fence lines; livestock disturbance; having to change farming practice like not being able to graze particular paddocks or continue with irrigation; damage and destruction of crops; and storage of material and machinery on the property. There will be effects on the remainder of the property as workers will need access over the property to reach the construction site such as damage to private roads and tracks, the removal of fences or widening of gateways. Even worker facilities like smoko rooms and portaloos will be located on the land. Landowners are also concerned about liability if there is an accident while workers are on their land. Adverse effects of upgrading need to be considered during a resource consent process and avoided, remedied, or mitigated by conditions. Allowing for any scale of upgrading as permitted is inappropriate and will not achieve sustainable management as envisaged by Section 5 of the RMA.</p>	
96.39	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	23.1 Rule	In-Part	<p>Support the permitted activity status of hazardous substances that do not exceed the medium threshold hazard factor which, as we understand it covers, farm fertilisers (which may be corrosive, toxic/ecotoxic and</p>	<p>Amend Rule 23.1 as follows: (a) Fuel contained in tanks of motor vehicles, agricultural and forestry equipment, boats, aircraft, locomotives and small engines <u>and the storage of</u></p>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
	Federated Farmers of New Zealand			<p>oxidative), fuel (flammable) and agrochemicals (toxic/ecotoxic). Supports the explicit exemptions for some hazardous substances as outlined on page 23-1 of the proposed district plan. Within these listed exemptions there are sound provisions made for the exemption of storage and use of agrichemicals (m) as long as the use and storage is in accordance with the New Zealand standard 8409:2004 Management of Agrichemicals.</p> <p>Although an exemption is also included for the storage of superphosphates and lime or similar fertilisers in the rural zone Federated Farmers believes that improvements could be made which align the fertiliser provision more closely to the agrichemical exemption. Given the reasons for exemptions as outlined at the top of page 23-2 of the draft district plan which include small quantities of material stored, impracticality of exercising control or because industry codes of practice provide adequate levels of security the citing of the relevant legislation for fertilisers would strengthen the exemption for fertilisers and align this exemption with that included for agrichemicals.</p> <p>Federated Farmers believe that an advice note should accompany this exemption to ensure that readers of the plan know to refer to the regional plan for rules governing</p>	<p><u>fuel for primary production where it complies with the Guidelines for Safe Above-Ground Fuel Storage on Farms (Department of Labour, Oct 2001) for fuel.</u></p> <p>(e) Storage of superphosphate or lime or any similar other fertiliser in the Rural Zone <u>where that storage is done so in accordance with the Fertiliser Group Standards (corrosive (HSR002569), oxidising (HSR002570, subsidiary hazard HSR002571) and Toxic (HSR002572) 2006.</u></p> <p>And</p> <p>That an advice note be provided for Rule 23.1.1 to ensure that readers of the plan know to refer to the regional plan for rules governing fertiliser use.</p>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				<p>fertiliser use. We do note that reference to use being managed by the regional plan is under Section 9.1 Issue Discussion on page 9-2 of the proposed district plan.</p> <p>Federated Farmers also believe that it is appropriate to list an exemption for the storage of fuel for use in primary production where the storage of the fuel complies with Guidelines for Safe Above Ground Fuel Storage on Farms.</p> <p>Federated Farmers have a firm belief that where current and relevant legislation exists that such legislation forms the basis of district plan provision and guidelines.</p> <p>The inclusion of reference to relevant industry standards also complements the methods for Issue 9.1 and Objective 9.1.1.</p>	
96.40	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	24.2.5 Rule	In-Part	<p>Federated Farmers understands that the identification of the Schedule 12 Water bodies is generally so that a more comprehensive network of esplanade reserves of strips can be formed. If this is the case then Federated Farmers is generally supportive but would however suggest some minor amendments to Rule 24.4.5(b) to improve clarity.</p> <p>Regarding additional provisions with Rule 24.2.5 Federated Farmers support the level of flexibility that these rules represent with regard to how and when the requirements of an esplanade reserve or strip is applied and</p>	<p>Amend Rule 24.2.5 as follows:</p> <p>(b) All esplanade reserves required by (a) above shall be vested in the Council, and have a minimum width of 50 metres, where adjacent to the Tasman Sea (from MHWS) and 20 metres, where adjacent to any other <u>Schedule 12</u> water body.</p> <p>And</p> <p>That Rules 24.2.5 (f) and (g) are retained.</p>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				<p>the ability to waive reserves or strips in appropriate circumstances specifically 24.2.5(g) (I-x).</p> <p>Federated Farmers supports Rule 24.2.5 (f) providing for payment of compensation unless agreed otherwise with the proprietor, which is consistent with Section 23F of the RMA.</p> <p>Support is also given for Rule 24.2.5(g) which enables the reduction or waiver of esplanade in certain circumstances. Particular support is given for article (vi): the rights of property owners and the security of private property.</p>	
96.41	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	26 Definitions - Earthworks	In-Part	<p>Federated Farmers submits that the definition of Earthworks excludes normal farming earthworks.</p> <p>Earthworks are part and parcel of farming activities, and comprise of such a range of activities from depositing clean fill around gates and troughs to reduce mud, laying water pipes to troughs, digging silage pits, bulldozing for new fence lines, and farm tracking. These are all activities that are expected to occur on farms and are minor scale compared to subdivision development earthworks or network utility earthworks.</p> <p>Councils such Western Bay of Plenty and Franklin exclude agricultural and horticultural earthworks from the definition of earthworks and thus a subsequent exclusion from regulation. This is a common-sense approach</p>	Amend definition of Earthworks by excluding agricultural and horticultural earthworks.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				that acknowledges how important agriculture and horticulture is to these rural districts. Their approach means that farmers and orchardists are permitted to carry on their normal activities and that the Council need not waste time and resources processing consents that have little benefit. Federated Farmers urges Horowhenua District Council to follow their lead and include an enabling, forward-thinking and practical definition of earthworks.	
96.42	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	26 Definitions – Hazardous Facility	In-Part	Federated Farmers submits that the definition of Hazardous Facility expressly excludes farm storage of substances. Rule 23.1 exempts fertilisers and agrichemical use and storage in the rural zone from provisions in Chapter 23, for consistency the definition of Hazardous Facility should also exclude on-farm storage.	Amend Hazardous Facility definition by inserting a new sub-clause to the exclusion list as follows: ... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>On-farm use and storage of fertilisers, fuel and agrichemicals.</u>
96.43	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	26 Definitions – Open Space	In-Part	Federated Farmers is concerned that this definition of Open Space may lead to confusion around public access over private land. The inclusion of private areas and the note that they do not specifically need to be zoned as Open Space should indicate to the public that farms are available as Open Space and publically accessible. Areas such as QEII covenants may be protected for their intrinsic scenic or natural qualities, but these remain on private land. Members of the public who enter private land without permission from	Amend definition of Open Space as follows: Open Space means any public or private area of substantially unoccupied space or vacant land; and includes parks, reserves, playgrounds, landscaped areas, gardens, together with any ancillary seating and vehicle parking and pedestrian shelters and conveniences; but excludes any recreation facilities. It need not specifically be zoned as Open Space.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				the landowner are trespassing.	
96.44	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	26 Definitions – Primary Production Activity	In-Part	Federate Farmers supports the definition of Primary Production Activity, however, we submit that earthworks associated with agriculture and horticulture is incorporated into the definition of Primary Production Activities.	Amend definition of Primary Production Activities by inserting reference to agricultural and horticultural earthworks.
96.45	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	3.2 Issue	In-Part	The Horizons Regional Council under the One Plan now must be responsible for developing objectives, policies and methods for the purpose of developing a region wide approach for managing indigenous biological diversity, which has been acknowledged in the Issue Discussion on page 3-5.	Amend Issue 3.2 to provide for a transfer of the biodiversity function from the Horowhenua District Council to the Manawatu-Wanganui Regional Council under Section 33 of the RMA and associated consultation takes place.
96.46	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	3.2 Issues	In-Part	<p>Federated Farmers considers that Issue 3.2 needs to accurately reflect pressures on indigenous biodiversity from introduced pests and weeds. We are concerned that Issue 3.2 places blame on land use activities on biodiversity loss and ignores the many positive contributions of landowners to biodiversity.</p> <p>It is critical for both the Regional and the District Councils to acknowledge that in many instances the reason why indigenous biodiversity still exists on privately owned land is because landowners have, at their own expense, protected the area and as such have provided a significant public good.</p> <p>Federated Farmers also considers it vital that an accurate reflection of the pressures on the</p>	Amend Issue 3.2 as follows: Land use, subdivision and development can result in the damage and destruction of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna and the intrinsic values of ecosystems, including loss of indigenous biological diversity. <u>The single biggest threat to the long term viability of indigenous biodiversity is that of invasive pests, both plant and animal. Pressure from land use activities such as clearance of forest and scrub and drainage of wetland areas is tightly controlled and significantly constrained through the regional policy statement.</u>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				<p>maintenance of indigenous biodiversity is outlined within the District Plan.</p> <p>Within Issue 3.2 and paragraph 2 of the Issues Discussion the current wording is highly suggestive that clearance by landowners and stock access to patches of bush are the key threats to indigenous biodiversity in the region. This is not the case and in many instances the protection that private landowners have provided for indigenous biodiversity on their land which includes fencing and extensive pest management at their own expense is the very reason it still exists.</p> <p>The community must be better informed about the true threats facing indigenous biodiversity and it is a responsibility of the District Council to serve the community better in this regard.</p>	Or words to that effect.
96.47	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	3.2.1 Objective	Oppose	<p>Federated Farmers recognise that both the Regional and the District Council have an obligation under the RMA to maintain indigenous biodiversity under section 30 (ga) and 31 (b) (iii).</p> <p>However Federated Farmers note that within the Regional Plan and Regional Policy Statement there is now extensive protection provided for indigenous biodiversity and that the Regional Council will take and retain control of land use for the management of indigenous biodiversity. Although this is</p>	<p>Amend Objective 3.2.1 to provide for a transfer of the biodiversity function from the Horowhenua District Council to the Manawatu-Wanganui Regional Council under Section 33 of the RMA and associated consultation takes place, and</p> <p>Delete Objective 3.2.1.</p>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				accepted by Federated Farmers as the decision of the Court, we remain concerned that the required transfer of the biodiversity function process and the associated community consultation did not occur as required under Section 33 of the RMA. The submitter expects that the protection required under Objective 3.2.1 of the District Plan does not extend beyond that protection already granted under the One Plan.	
96.48	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	3.2.3 Policy	In-Part	Federated Farmers supports Policy 3.2.3 which seeks to encourage subdivision, land use and development which maintains and enhances biodiversity. Regulation is not always only about regulating undesirable activities but also should include encouragement of desirable activities. While the submitter recognises that there is limited scope for the District Council to encourage activities when biodiversity is a function that the Regional Council has assumed, there are still opportunities. Many landowners undertake personal actions that maintain or enhance indigenous biodiversity on their properties by carrying out pest and weed control, fencing off areas, formally protecting areas by QEII covenants, and planting native species. These actions are undertaken because of the value placed in the inherent values of the land by the landowner.	Amend Policy 3.2.3 as follows: Encourage subdivision, land use and development that maintains and enhances indigenous biological diversity through the protection and enhancement of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna, <u>and recognise voluntary actions undertaken by landowners.</u> Or words to that effect.
96.49	Federated Farmers	3 General Matters	In-Part	Federated Farmers is concerned that the suite	Amend Chapter 3 to relocate all

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
	of New Zealand			<p>of provisions under Issue 3.3 are misplaced in the Natural Features and Values section of the Plan, and that they seem to belong more in the Open Space and Access provisions in Chapter 4.</p> <p>Priority water bodies do not link to Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes provisions which already identify features according to strict criteria and are addressed in the suite of provisions under Issue 3.1, although some features such as Lake Horowhenua and Lake Papaitonga appear in both lists. Other priority water bodies have not been assessed using ONFL criteria and are not intended to fulfil Section 6(b) functions of the RMA,</p> <p>The key reason for the specific identification of priority water bodies appears to be the application of more comprehensive network of esplanade strips or reserves around these features. This is supported by the fact that subdivision is highlighted as the main problem in Issue 3.3, the emphasis of policies on subdivision and public access, and the practical application of Schedule 12 to Conditions 24.2.5 for esplanade reserves/strips in the subdivision chapter of the Plan. The purpose of priority water bodies appears to be more related to Section 6(d) of the RMA.</p> <p>Therefore Federated Farmers submits that</p>	provisions under Issue 3.3 to Chapter 4: Open Space and Access to Water Bodies.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				the provisions under Issue 3.3 are relocated to Chapter 4: Open Space and Access to Water Bodies.	
96.50	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	3.3 Issue Discussion	In-Part	<p>Within paragraph 2 of the Discussion of Issue 3.3 the division of the responsibility of activities in and adjacent to water bodies is conversed. It is important to recognise that the rules within Chapter 12 of the Horizons One Plan have a significant impact on activities along the margins of water bodies. Setback distances for vegetation clearance, land disturbance and cultivation as well as the activity status of activities within these setback distances is now explicit in the One Plan rules. Although these rules are yet to be finalised its important that the District Plan effectively links through to the Regional Plan. The last paragraph on page 3-7 states that there remains potential for the modification of river margins due to unsustainable land use practices, vegetation clearance and earthworks. Federated Farmers strongly disagrees with this statement. Not only does the One Plan control such activities through the rules stream of Chapter 12, but Chapter 16 of the One Plan is also very explicit regarding what can and what can't be done in and adjacent to water bodies (refer to table 16.1 of the One Plan).</p>	<p>Amend 3.3 Issue Discussion as follows: The management of water its self (taking, use and discharge,); <u>activities including land disturbance, vegetation clearance and cultivation on the margins of water bodies (Chapter 5 and 12 Regional Policy Statement and Regional Plan)</u> and the beds of fresh water bodies (<u>Chapter 16, Regional Plan</u>) are managed by Horizons Regional Council. Or words to that effect.</p>
96.51	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	3.3.2 Policy	In-Part	Policy 3.3.2 links through to Schedule 12 of the District Plan but also through to the One	Amend Policy 3.3.2 as follows: Identify priority lakes, rivers and other

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				<p>Plan schedule AB: Surface Water Management Values where the water bodies of the Horizons region are all given values which include values such as natural state, sites of significance cultural and sites of significance aquatic. There should be good alignment between the District and the Regional Plan regarding the priority water bodies in the Horowhenua District.</p> <p>Policy 3.3.2 does not explain to what purpose priority water bodies are to be identified.</p> <p>Policy 3.3.3 follows on to provide for management of subdivision and/or land development in order to retain values but does not mention prioritising, so it is perhaps to be assumed that this is why priority water bodies are identified. Rules for the creation of esplanade reserves and strips during subdivisions in Conditions for Subdivision 24.2.5 directly reference the Schedule 12 priority water bodies, and seem to be the only application of priority water bodies in the District Plan. In order to provide further clarity for Policy 3.3.2 the purpose of prioritising water bodies should be included directly into this policy to ensure that priority water bodies are only used to provide a network of esplanade reserves.</p>	<p>water bodies with high natural character and conservation, recreation, cultural, amenity and intrinsic value, <u>for the purpose of creating a comprehensive network of esplanade reserves and strips to maintain and enhance public access and natural character.</u></p>
96.52	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	3.3.3 Policy	Oppose	Federated Farmers submits that Policy 3.3.3 be deleted, as we have suggested an amendment to Policy 3.3.2 which should	Delete Policy 3.3.3

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				address concerns regarding subdivision and development reducing public access and natural character.	
97.00	Lowe Corporation Ltd & Colyer Mair Assets Ltd	16.6.2 Rule	In-Part	<p>Generally support the proposed district plan, particularly emphasis on economic, social and cultural wellbeing. However, the submitter concern is that the objectives, policies and rules do not unduly restrict business to operate.</p> <p>The application of Rules 16.6.2 and 16.6.5 could be an undue restriction on properties in the Industrial Zone when the effects they are endeavouring to resolve could be mitigated or resolved by some adjustments on neighbouring properties.</p>	Amend Rule 16.6.2 so that the setback and screening rules are applied to the properties situated in the adjacent zones, rather than to the Industrial Zone.
97.01	Lowe Corporation Ltd & Colyer Mair Assets Ltd	16.6.5 Rule	In-Part	<p>Generally support the proposed district plan, particularly emphasis on economic, social and cultural wellbeing. However, the submitter concern is that the objectives, policies and rules do not unduly restrict business to operate.</p> <p>The application of Rules 16.6.2 and 16.6.5 could be an undue restriction on properties in the Industrial Zone when the effects they are endeavouring to resolve could be mitigated or resolved by some adjustments on neighbouring properties.</p>	<p>No specific relief requested.</p> <p>Inferred: Amend Rule 16.6.5 so that the noise limits set in the permitted activity conditions are applied to the properties situated in the adjacent zones, rather than to the Industrial Zone.</p>
97.02	Lowe Corporation Ltd & Colyer Mair Assets Ltd	16.6.7 Rule	In-Part	The submitter considers Rule 16.6.7 is too vague and does not take into account the rationale for having a separate Industrial Zone in the first place. Where an odour is offensive	<p>No specific relief requested.</p> <p>Inferred: Amend Rule 16.6.7 (a) so that the permitted activity conditions relating to offensive odour is more</p>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				should be judged not only by at least two people but should also have regard to the frequency, intensity, duration, offensiveness and location of the odour (the FIDEL factors) and the fact that odours from other sources and those typical of an industrial environment could be anticipated near an industrial zone.	precise and reflects the FIDEL factors.
98.00	Horticulture New Zealand	26 Definitions Building	In-Part	The definition of building does not include any pergola or similar structure of a substantially open nature. Horticulture NZ supports the exclusion but seeks that crop support structures and crop protection structures are specifically included in the exemption as they are of a substantially open nature	Amend Clause (g) of the definition of Building as follows: Building means any temporary or permanent or movable or immovable structure; and includes any structure intended for occupation by people or animals or machinery but does not include any of the following: (a) (g) Any pergola, <u>crop support structure or crop protection structure</u> or similar structure of a substantially open nature. ...
98.01	Horticulture New Zealand	26 Definitions - Bund	In-Part	The definition describes a number of functions of a bund. A bund can also be used as a sediment control mechanism to stop sediment laden storm water getting into water bodies. This should be added to the definition of bund or the definition amended so that it is not limited to the specific uses listed.	Amend the definition of Bund by either: a) replace 'means' with 'includes' or b) add 'or sediment control mechanism' as follows: Bund means <u>includes</u> an embankment which may be used as a mitigation measure to limit noise effects, provide

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
					<p>a visual screen or as a liquid containment system designed to prevent the dispersal of hazardous substances from accidental on-site discharges.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Bund means an embankment which may be used as a mitigation measure to limit noise effects, provide a visual screen or as a liquid containment system designed to prevent the dispersal of hazardous substances from accidental on-site discharges <u>or sediment control mechanism.</u></p>
98.02	Horticulture New Zealand	26 Definitions – Development	In-Part	<p>The definition of ‘development’ is very broad: Carrying out: - any work - or ancillary activity on any land including - construction alteration or demolition of any building - any excavation of land - any deposit of material on land.</p> <p>The use of the word ‘including’ means that ‘development’ is not limited to the specified matters.</p> <p>The term development is used in the RMA in the context of ‘subdivision, use and development’ so the term development is likely to be used throughout the requirements</p>	<p>Amend the definition of Development as follows: Development means carrying out any work or ancillary activity on any land including the construction, alteration, or demolition of any building or any excavation of land or any deposit of materials on land.</p> <p><u>Development means carrying out construction, alteration or demolition of any building or any excavation of land not provided as a permitted activity and excludes day to day rural production activities such as fencing, cultivation and maintenance of farm</u></p>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				of the District Plan. The open ended nature of the definition therefore is of concern.	<u>tracks, orchard activities such as planting, shelterbelt and tree removal and root ripping.</u>
98.03	Horticulture New Zealand	26 Definitions Earthworks	In-Part	The definition of earthworks could include a range of activities undertaken as part of rural production activities. Proposed Rule 19.6.12 in Plan Change 22 includes provisions for earthworks in the Rural Zone but specifically has a note stating: The term earthworks does not include activities such as digging post holes, cultivation of crops, planting trees, burials, drilling bores, digging offal pits and installations of services where these activities do not reshape or re-contour the land. However it is questioned what status a Note has in the Plan and so it is sought that the exclusion be added to the definition of earthworks in the Proposed Plan. Harvesting of crops, removal of trees and root ripping are specifically sought to be added as they are activities that may disturb the soil but with minimal effects.	Amend the definition of Earthworks by adding an exclusion as follows. Earthworks means any alteration to the existing natural ground level including re-shaping, re-contouring, excavation, backfilling, compaction, stripping of vegetation and top soil and depositing of clean fill. <u>The term earthworks does not include activities such as digging post holes, cultivation and harvesting of crops, planting trees removal of trees and root ripping, burials, drilling bores, digging offal pits and installations of services where these activities do not reshape or re-contour the land.</u>
98.04	Horticulture New Zealand	26 Definitions – Hazardous Facility	In-Part	The Proposed Plan has a definition of hazardous facility which includes a number of exclusions. However Rule 23.1 lists a range of items and facilities that are exemptions from the hazardous substance rules. Therefore the definition of hazardous facility is misleading as it is not consistent with Rule 23.1.	Delete the definition of Hazardous Facility.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				The focus in the rules should be on the substances and quantities stored so a definition of hazardous facility is not required.	
98.05	Horticulture New Zealand	26 Definitions – Open Space	In-Part	Horticulture NZ is concerned that the combination of ‘private area’, ‘substantially unoccupied space’ and not zoned as Open Space could give an impression that rural production land could be termed ‘open space’. An amendment is sought to the definition to ensure that primary production land is not considered to be ‘open space’.	<p>Amend the definition of ‘Open Space’ by: Open Space means any public or private area of substantially unoccupied space or vacant land; and includes parks, reserves, playgrounds, landscaped areas, gardens, together with any ancillary seating and vehicle parking and pedestrian shelters and conveniences; but excludes any recreation facilities. It need not specifically be zoned as Open Space. <u>Land used for Primary Production Activities is not included as open space.</u></p> <p>OR</p> <p>Open Space means any public or private area of substantially unoccupied space or vacant land; and includes parks, reserves, playgrounds, landscaped areas, gardens, together with any ancillary seating and vehicle parking and pedestrian shelters and conveniences; but excludes any recreation facilities. It need not specifically be zoned as Open Space.</p>
98.06	Horticulture New	26 Definitions –	In-Part	The definition of sensitive activities includes a	Amend the definition of Sensitive

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
	Zealand	Sensitive Activities		list of activities. However hospitals, rest homes or medical facilities are not included. It would be appropriate to specify these facilities as sensitive activities.	activities by inserting additional facilities as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> hospitals, rest homes or medical facilities.
98.07	Horticulture New Zealand	26 Definitions - New definition "Reverse sensitivity"	In-Part	The Proposed Plan discusses reverse sensitivity but there is no definition for the term. It would be useful that there is clarity as to what the term means and that it is the potential effects of a new activity on an existing lawfully established activity that is the issue.	Include a new definition for "Reverse sensitivity" as follows: <u>"Reverse sensitivity" is the vulnerability of an existing lawfully established activity to other activities in the vicinity which are sensitive to adverse environmental effects that may be generated by such existing activity, thereby creating the potential for the operation of such existing activity to be constrained.</u>
98.08	Horticulture New Zealand	2.1.20 Policy	In-Part	Policy 2.1.20 is to implement Objective 2.1.1 which is not open for submission. The policy seeks to avoid remedy or mitigate adverse effects on rural character, including rural production values. This approach is supported. However it is considered that there should be specific mention of potential reverse sensitivity effects as these are a concern to primary production in the district.	Amend Policy 2.1.20 as follows: Ensure that new activities locating in the rural area are of a nature, scale, intensity and location consistent with maintaining the character of the rural area and to be undertaken in a manner which avoids, remedies or mitigates adverse effects on rural character, including rural productive values <u>and potential reverse sensitivity effects.</u>
98.09	Horticulture New Zealand	2.1.21 Policy	In-Part	Policy 2.1.21 seeks to encourage the creation of local open space areas when land is subdivided. However there is a concern the rural production land could be taken out of	Amend Policy 2.1.21 as follows: Encourage the creation of an integrated network of local open

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				production to create such open spaces. This should be a matter of consideration in the policy.	spaces and connections when land is subdivided which provides: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> convenient and practical public access to existing and future areas of open space, reserves and water bodies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Protection of primary production activities in the area and does not take land out of rural production activities.</u>
98.10	Horticulture New Zealand	2.1.1 Explanation & Principal Reasons	In-Part	Consistent with the change sought [concern the rural production land could be taken out of production to create such open spaces] to Policy 2.1.21 an additional sentence is sought to the Explanation and Principal Reasons.	Amend the Explanation and Principal Reasons for Objective and Policies 2.1.1 by adding the following paragraph: <p>...</p> <u>However the importance of, and effects of, primary production activities in the District must be taken into account when open space connections are being established.</u>
98.11	Horticulture New Zealand	2.4 Issue	Oppose	The Proposed Plan seeks to introduce a new section on Sustainable Land Management Practices. The Council seeks to “assess and positively influence the significantly adverse effects of land use activities on soil capability.” Given the Regional Council is the authority directly responsible for soil conservation and land disturbance and also discharges, it is	Delete Section 2.4 Sustainable Land Management Practices. Inferred: delete 2.4 Issue, 2.4.1 Objective and corresponding policies, Explanation & Principal Reasons, Methods and Anticipated Environmental Result.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				unclear the extent to which Section 2.4 should be included in the Proposed Plan. Growers are facing regulation through the Proposed One Plan and adding an additional layer on similar issues within the District Plan is not appropriate.	
98.12	Horticulture New Zealand	2.5 Issue	In-Part	<p>Section 2.5 introduces provisions that relate to rural character and seeks to manage reverse sensitivity effects. This approach is supported, subject to amendments regarding clarity of responsibility.</p> <p>The Issue describes a number of adverse effects of activities that are of concern. The language is rather emotive and describes activities rather than adverse effects.</p> <p>Many factors that can contribute to off-target spray drift and are the responsibility of the regional council as they manage discharges to air. The district council's function relates to land use to ensure that reverse sensitivity effects do not occur – that is rural residential lifestyle being located too close to primary production activities where agrichemical spraying is likely to be undertaken – resulting in potential for complaints from the lifestyle. Often the complaints are linked to perception rather than actual effects.</p>	<p>Amend Issue 2.5, bullet point 5 as follows:</p> <p>The careless and indiscriminate use of air sprays resulting in spray drift.</p> <p><u>The potential for adverse effects from off target spray drift and complaints due to agrichemical spraying being undertaken.</u></p>
98.13	Horticulture New Zealand	2.5.1 Objective	In-Part	The objective seeks to ensure that primary production activities can function efficiently and effectively while avoiding reverse sensitivity effects. As written it would appear	<p>Amend Objective 2.5.1 and Include a new Objective as follows:</p> <p>To enable primary production activities</p>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				<p>that it is the primary production activity that should be avoiding remedying or mitigating the reverse sensitivity effects. The presumption should be the other way around – it is the responsibility of the new sensitive activity to manage the potential for the reverse sensitivity effects due to sensitivity to the lawfully established primary production activity.</p> <p>It is considered that Objective 2.5.1 addresses two matter and they would be better split into two separate objectives.</p>	<p>and other associated rural based land uses to function efficiently and effectively in the Rural Zone, while avoiding, remedying or mitigating the adverse effects, including reverse sensitivity effects, in a way that maintains and enhances the character and amenity values of the rural environment. <u>of activities.</u></p> <p><u>To enable sensitive activities to locate in the rural zone providing that potential reverse sensitivity on primary production activities are avoided, and the character and amenity values of the rural environment are enhanced.</u></p>
98.14	Horticulture New Zealand	2.5.2 Policy	Support	The policy provides for the operation of primary production activities that meet minimum environmental standards necessary to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects without unduly affecting the landowner's ability to use their land productively. This policy is supported.	Retain Policy 2.5.2.
98.15	Horticulture New Zealand	2.5.3 Policy	Support	Policy 2.5.3 provides for the establishment of new non-primary production activities as long as they are compatible with primary production activities and as long as they avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects. It would be useful to add 'including potential reverse sensitivity effects' to the policy so it is	<p>Amend Policy 2.5.3 as follows:</p> <p>Provide for the establishment and operation of new non-primary production activities and the ongoing operation of existing lawfully established activities which are</p>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				clear the effects that need to be managed.	compatible and/or associated with primary production activities in the rural environment provided they meet minimum environmental standards to avoid, remedy or mitigate any adverse effects, <u>including potential reverse sensitivity effects</u> .
98.16	Horticulture New Zealand	2.5.4 Policy	In-Part	Policy 2.5.4 is similar to Policy 2.5.3 however the existence of primary production should be included in the policy.	Amend Policy 2.5.4 as follows: Control and manage the establishment and operation of a range of other land use activities, including sensitive activities, in the rural environment to ensure their adverse effects on the environment <u>including effects on primary production activities</u> are avoided, remedied or mitigated.
98.17	Horticulture New Zealand	2.5.9 Policy	Support	Policy 2.5.9 recognises the need for farm worker accommodation to be located on the site of the primary production activity and this is supported.	Retain Policy 2.5.9.
98.18	Horticulture New Zealand	2.5.10 Policy	In-Part	Policy 2.5.10 seeks to manage the effects of buildings on rural privacy and character through boundary setbacks. The location of buildings is also a key factor contributing to potential for reverse sensitivity effects. This should be acknowledged in the policy.	Amend Policy 2.5.10 as follows: Avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects, <u>including potential reverse sensitivity effects</u> , on rural privacy and rural character in the Rural Zone by maintaining road and site boundary setbacks for all buildings, while recognising the degree of privacy and rural spaciousness is different in areas

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
					comprising existing smaller rural-residential lots.
98.19	Horticulture New Zealand	2.5.11 Policy	In-Part	Policy 2.5.11 specifically seeks to manage reverse sensitivity conflicts, through appropriate separation distances, giving priority to existing lawfully established activities. This is supported. However the policy should include 'potential reverse sensitivity conflict' because the point where such potential conflicts are best managed is through subdivision and building locations to avoid the potential for such effects. It would be better for Policy 2.5.14 (addresses odour) to be incorporated into Policy 2.5.11.	Amend Policy 2.5.11 as follows: Manage <u>potential</u> reverse sensitivity conflict between primary production activities and sensitive activities, <u>including effects from odour</u> , through appropriate separation distances, while giving priority to existing lawfully established activities.
98.20	Horticulture New Zealand	2.5.14 Policy	In-Part	The policy relates specifically to odour and the potential for reverse sensitivity conflicts. This is best addressed in Policy 2.5.11.	Delete Policy 2.5.14 and include within Policy 2.5.11. (See relief sought for Policy 2.5.11). Avoid, remedy or mitigate, where necessary, any adverse odours likely to affect the amenity of residential properties or buildings and other sensitive activities.
98.21	Horticulture New Zealand	2.5.16 Policy	In-Part	The policy seeks to manage land use activities, subdivision and development adjacent to the National Grid, State Highway and rail network. However there is also a need to consider the effects of such activities on primary production activities, particularly the National Grid, which may traverse across rural land.	Amend Policy 2.5.16 as follows: Ensure that land use activities, subdivision and development adjoining the National Grid, the State Highway network and the North Island Main Trunk Railway Line avoid, remedy or mitigate any adverse effects on the safe and efficient operation of the

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
					electricity transmission, roading and rail networks <u>while not compromising the primary production activities undertaken on the site.</u>
98.22	Horticulture New Zealand	2.X New Policy	In-Part	There is no mention of signage relating to hazard identification and safety on the site in policies 2.5.19 and 2.5.20. Such signage should be provided for as a permitted activity in the Rural Zone. The policy structure needs to allow for such provisions.	Include a new policy to provide for signage for hazard identification and safety on the site.
98.23	Horticulture New Zealand	2.5.1 Explanation & Principal Reasons	In-Part	The last paragraph in the Explanation describes reverse sensitivity as it relates to the Levin Wastewater Treatment Plant. However reverse sensitivity is wider than just that effect and the explanation should be amended to broaden the discussion.	Amend Paragraph 10 in the Explanation by adding: <u>Reverse sensitivity can also exist where sensitive activities locate adjacent to existing primary production activities, leading to complaints about the existing lawfully established activity.</u>
98.24	Horticulture New Zealand	2(b) Anticipated Environmental Result	Support	Anticipated Environmental Result 2b) provides for primary production activities as the principal land use in the rural zone. This is supported.	Retain Anticipated Environmental Result 2(b).
98.25	Horticulture New Zealand	3 GM	In-Part	It is recognised that there are significant water bodies in the district where there is a requirement to protect natural character and Section 3.3.1 provides for that. However the term 'adjacent' is used in a number of the policies. Horticulture NZ seeks to ensure that the extent of 'adjacent' does not impact on existing primary production activities. It is also important to recognise that there are	Amend the provisions in relation to Issue 3.3 to ensure that existing primary production activities are not adversely affected through provisions in Section 3.3 or duplication of Regional Plan requirements.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				activities adjacent to water bodies that are managed through the Proposed One Plan because of potential discharges to water. Horticulture NZ wants to avoid duplication in terms of requirements between the district and regional plans.	
98.26	Horticulture New Zealand	3.3.8 Policy	Support	Horticulture NZ supports a strategic and collaborative approach to management of lakes, rivers and other water bodies and their margins and catchments. This approach to Lake Horowhenua was sought through the Proposed One Plan, seeking that all parties are involved in developing a management approach to the lake.	Retain Policy 3.3.8.
98.27	Horticulture New Zealand	2.5.1 Explanation & Principal Reasons	In-Part	There is no mention of signage relating to hazard identification and safety on the site. Such signage should be provided for as a permitted activity in the Rural Zone. The policy structure needs to allow for such provisions.	Amend Paragraph 8 of the Explanation to include recognition of signs for hazard identification and safety on site.
98.28	Horticulture New Zealand	4.1.1 Objective	Support	Horticulture NZ supports that the objective of Open Space Zone ensures that uses and development are compatible with the character and amenity of their surrounding environment. However it should also be compatible with the surrounding land uses.	Amend Objective 4.1.1 as follows: Council's parks and reserves are efficiently used and developed with a range of recreational activities and opportunities that meet the changing needs of community, while ensuring the uses and development are compatible with the character, <u>land uses</u> , and amenity of the open spaces and their surrounding environment.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
98.29	Horticulture new Zealand	26 Definitions - Coastal Environment	Support	Horticulture NZ supports the definition of the coastal environment linked to the Zone of Coastal Dominance.	Retain definition for Coastal Environment.
98.30	Horticulture new Zealand	8 General Matters	In-Part	Horticulture NZ recognises that there are flood prone areas within the Horowhenua District, including the Moutoa Floodway, and that Council is seeking to take a proactive approach to managing potential risks, particularly through controls on the location of buildings and structures. This is an appropriate approach. It is also recognised that primary production activities are undertaken on much land that is identified as flood prone. It is important that existing primary production activities are able to be continued on such land.	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Amend Chapter 8 provisions to ensure that primary production activities are able to continue on land identified as flood prone.
98.31	Horticulture new Zealand	9.1.3 Policy	Support	Horticulture NZ supports Policy 9.1.3 that seeks to provide for land use activities to use of hazardous substances through avoiding or mitigating adverse effects.	Retain Policy 9.1.3.
98.32	Horticulture New Zealand	9.2.3 Policy	In-Part	Policy 9.2.3 requires 'development sites' to undertake investigations. As identified in relation to the definition of the term 'development' the proposed definition is very wide. When the term is used in a context such as Policy 9.2.3 it is important that the definition is clear and not open-ended.	Amend the definition of 'development' (refer to relief sought in Section 26, Definitions).
98.33	Horticulture New Zealand	10.3.5 Policy	In-Part	Policy 10.3.5 seeks to ensure adequate on-site parking and manoeuvring space is a 'safe and visually attractive manner'. Provision of parking space is a functional requirement.	Amend Policy 10.3.5 as follows: Ensure that adequate on-site parking and manoeuvring space is provided for

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				The need for safety is accepted. However it is unclear how council will determine if the area is 'visually attractive'. This requires a judgment that may not be related to the functional requirements of the site.	each type of activity in a safe and visually attractive manner.
98.34	Horticulture New Zealand	10.3.6 Policy	In-Part	Provision of on-site loading and unloading is a functional requirement. It is unclear how council will determine if the area is 'attractive'. This requires a judgment that may not be related to the functional requirements of the site.	Amend Policy 10.3.6 as follows: Ensure that adequate on-site loading and unloading provision be made in a safe and attractive manner.
98.35	Horticulture New Zealand	12.1.3 Policy	In-Part	While provision of network utilities is important to the district, doing so should not unreasonably compromise existing land use activities, particularly primary production activities in the Rural Zone. Horticulture NZ is concerned about the use of the term 'upgrading' which is not defined in the Plan. 'Minor upgrading' is described in Rule 22.1.10 b). The scale and nature of upgrading can have significant impact. Policy 12.1.3 seeks that network utilities avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects on the environment. Horticulture NZ seeks that the policy explicitly list adverse effects on primary production activities.	Amend Policy 12.1.3 as follows: Avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse environmental effects, <u>including effects on primary production activities</u> , arising from the establishment, construction, operation, maintenance and upgrading of network utilities.
98.36	Horticulture New Zealand	19.1(k)(i)	In-Part	Rule 19.1 lists activities provided for as permitted in the Rural Zone. Clauses k) and m) refer to upgrading of network utilities. Clause m) specifically refers to 'minor upgrading'. Clause k) should be consistent	Amend Rule 19.1(k)(i) as follows: (k) The following network utilities and electricity generation activities: (i) The construction, operation, maintenance and <u>minor</u> upgrading

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				with this approach. Rule 22.1.10 sets out what is 'minor upgrading'. Any upgrade that does not meet this description should not be a permitted activity.	<p>of network utilities.</p> <p>(ii) Wind monitoring masts.</p> <p>(iii) Domestic scale renewable energy device.</p> <p>(iv) The operation, maintenance, refurbishment, enhancement and upgrading of an existing energy generation facility, except where significant external modification is involved.</p>
98.37	Horticulture New Zealand	19.1(l) Rule	In-Part	Rule 19.1 lists activities provided for as permitted in the Rural Zone. Clause l) relates to signs. There should be provision for signs for safety and hazard identification as a permitted activity.	Amend Rule 19.1(l) to include signs for safety and hazard identification as a permitted activity.
98.38	Horticulture New Zealand	19.4.8 Rule	In-Part	Rule 19.4.8 a) iv) makes the use of hazardous substances a discretionary activity in a flood hazard area. That would mean that a farmer or grower could not use agrichemicals or apply fertiliser in these areas without getting a discretionary consent. It is accepted that storage of such substances presents a risk, but inclusion of 'use' is inappropriate in terms of risk management.	<p>Amend Rule 19.4.8.(a)(iv) by either:</p> <p>(a) Any activity within the Flood Hazard Overlay Areas (excluding Moutoa Floodway) that is not listed as a permitted or controlled activity, including but not limited to the following:</p> <p>...</p> <p>(iv) Any activity involving use, storage or disposal of hazardous substances.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Provide an exemption for use as part of primary production activities.</p>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
98.39	Horticulture New Zealand	19.6.4 Rule	Oppose	Horticulture NZ does not support the reduction in the setback distances for dwellings. These are a key tool in managing potential reverse sensitivity effects. Reducing the setbacks does not implement the objectives and policies in Chapter 2. It is considered that there could be a distinction in setbacks between dwellings and other buildings. It is where people are located in dwellings that it is most likely to generate reverse sensitivity effects. A dwelling could be located closer, but would require an assessment of the effects, including potential reverse sensitivity effects. Greater setbacks are provided for residential dwelling units adjacent to intensive farming activities and effluent storage. Setbacks for dwellings from primary production activities should be included in this part of the rule.	Amend 19.6.4(b) as follows: (b) All residential dwelling units and sensitive activities shall comply with the following additional setbacks and separation distances: (i) 300 metres from any building containing an existing intensive farming activity on any other site; ... (iv) <u>30 metres from any property where existing primary production activities are undertaken.</u>
98.40	Horticulture New Zealand	19.6.7(d) Rule	Support	There is provision in 19.6.7 d) iii) for an exemption in the noise rule for noise associated with primary production activities.	Retain Rule 19.6.7 (d) (iii).
98.41	Horticulture New Zealand	19.6.7(e) Rule	In-Part	The provisions for audible bird scaring devices provide for the use of such devices within reasonable parameters. However some changes are sought to ensure the workability of the provisions. The main time of challenge from birds is before sunrise and after sunset so amendment is sought to be able to use devices in that time. The provisions set an ASEL 65dB which takes	Amend Rule 19.6.7(e) as follows: Audible bird-scaring devices (including firearms) shall comply with the following conditions: (i) Devices shall not operate between <u>one hour after</u> sunset and <u>one hour before</u> sunrise. (ii) Devices shall not be used within any Residential Zone or

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				into account the noise over a period of time so there is no need to also limit the number of events. The issue is the noise exposure which is addressed in clause iii).	<p>within 200m of a Residential zone boundary.</p> <p>(iii) Impulsive noise from bird-scaring devices shall not exceed ASEL 65dB when assessed at any point within the notional boundary of any dwelling on any other site <u>in different ownership</u>.</p> <p>(iv) There shall be no more than 12 events per hour on any site within 500 metres of a dwelling.</p> <p>(v) For the purpose of this rule, an 'event' includes clusters of up to three shots from gas operated devices, or three multiple shots from a firearm in rapid succession.</p>
98.42	Horticulture New Zealand	19.6.9 Rule	Oppose	Odour is a discharge to air which is managed by the Regional Council. The rule is a duplication and unnecessary.	Delete Rule 19.6.9.
98.43	Horticulture New Zealand	19.6.14 Rule	In-Part	Rule 19.6.14 limits activities within certain distances from transmission lines. There are exemptions for fences up to 2.5 metres in height. Horticulture NZ wants to ensure that there is provision for crop support structures and crop protection structures without setback requirements so an exemption is sought to Rule 19.6.14.	<p>Amend Rule 19.6.14 by adding another exemption in Rule 19.6.14(b), as follows:</p> <p>....</p> <p>The following are exempt from the setback requirements in Rule 19.6.14(b):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fences up to 2.5 metres in height • Mobile machinery and equipment • Utilities within a road or rail corridor and electricity

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
					<p>infrastructure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>crop support structures and crop protection structures that meet the requirements of NZECP 34:2001.</u>
98.44	Horticulture New Zealand	19.6.15 Rule	In-Part	The issue that the Council is seeking to address is shading of the road and neighbouring properties. Rather than apply an arbitrary height and setback distance the rule should provide that no shading of roads or neighbouring properties occurs at midday on the shortest day.	Amend Rule 19.6.15 to require that there is no shading of roads or neighbouring properties occurs at midday on the shortest day.
98.45	Horticulture New Zealand	19.6.26 Rule	In-Part	There should be specific provision for signs for hazard identification and safety.	Amend Rule 19.6.26(b) to provide official signs, including for hazard identification and safety.
98.46	Horticulture New Zealand	22.1.2 Rule	In-Part	Rule 22.1.2 provides for new electricity lines up to 110kV as a permitted activity. Such an approach means that landowners affected by the new line have no ability to comment or submit on the proposed new lines. This is important in that there may be requirements for separation distances of activities under NZECP 34:2001 that will impact on landowners. It is considered that all new lines should require resource consent.	Delete Rule 22.1.2.
98.47	Horticulture New Zealand	22.1.10(b)	In-Part	Horticulture NZ supports the description of 'minor upgrading' in Rule 22.1.10 b). However Clause ii) is linked to the increase of voltage which is included at the end of the description. The two should be linked. In addition, minor upgrading should not increase	Amend Rule 22.1.10(b) so that the following is provided for: Renumber point ii) as ix) with the requirement regarding increase in voltage part of the minor upgrading of re-conductoring the line with higher

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				the separation distances required in NZECP 34:2001 therefore impacting on adjacent landowners.	capacity conductors. After 'operating at a reduced voltage' add and 'will not increase the separation distances required by NZECP 34:2001.'
98.48	Horticulture New Zealand	23.1 Rule	Support	Rule 23.1 provides exemptions for a range of hazardous substances including storage of fertiliser in the Rural Zone and the use and storage of agrichemicals in accordance with NZS 8409:2004. Horticulture NZ supports this approach.	Retain Rule 23.1 Exemptions as notified.
98.49	Horticulture New Zealand	23.2 Rule Permitted Activities	In-Part	Storage of fuel on rural properties is not provided as an exemption from the hazardous substances rules so it is taken that Rule 23.2.1 b) would apply.	Include a new sub-clause to Rule 23.2 as follows: <u>(c) Storage of fuel in the Rural Zone for primary production activities that meets HSNO requirements is a permitted activity.</u>
98.50	Horticulture New Zealand	23.2 Table Appendix 1	In-Part	The quantities specified in Table 23.2 are in weight. Substances such as fuels should be expressed in volume – litres. Storage of fuel that meets the requirements of HSNO should be provided for as a permitted activity. It is noted that the quantities in Table 23.2 appear to be sourced from the Land Use Planning Guide for Hazardous Facilities (MfE). This publication is pre-HSNO and should be used with caution. Quantities in Table 23.2 should therefore be reassessed to determine their alignment with HSNO provisions.	Amend Table 23 and review quantities in Table 23.2 to determine alignment with HSNO and express quantities in Table 23.2 to include volumes by litre.
98.51	Horticulture New	25.2.1(d)	Support	Horticulture NZ supports the inclusion of	Retain 25.2.1(d).

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
	Zealand	Assessment Criteria		25.2.1 d) to assess the likelihood of reverse sensitivity effects on primary production activities.	
98.52	Horticulture New Zealand	25.2.2 Assessment Criteria	In-Part	There are specific criteria listed for buildings under 25.2.2. It is assumed that the general criteria in 25.2.1 would also apply to buildings. This should be explicit.	<p>Amend Assessment Matter 25.2.2 Buildings as follows:</p> <p>25.2.2 Buildings</p> <p><u>In addition to assessment criteria in 25.2.1 buildings need to address specific assessment criteria</u></p> <p>(a) The extent of any adverse effects on the environment from exceeding maximum height and In-Particular the effect of any increased building height on the visual character of the area and its compatibility with the scale of adjoining buildings.</p> <p>...</p> <p>(h) Any adverse effects on adjoining sites of the proximity of the building, in terms of reduced privacy through being overlooked from or being in close proximity to neighbouring buildings, to an extent which is inconsistent with the surrounding environment <u>including potential reverse sensitivity effects on primary production activities.</u></p>
98.53	Horticulture New Zealand	25.2.6(f) Assessment Criteria	In-Part	Matter (f) relates to reverse sensitivity effects. The assessment should be on the potential for reverse sensitivity as actual effects are not known at assessment stage.	<p>Amend 25.2.6(f) as follows:</p> <p>(f) The extent to which the non-primary production activity <u>has the potential to</u> generates reverse sensitivity effects and reduces the</p>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
					efficient and effective use of the Rural Zone by primary production activities.
98.54	Horticulture New Zealand	4 General Matters	In-Part	The focus in Chapter 4 is on land owned by Council. However the proposed definition of open space is wider than just council owned land. A change is sought to the definition of open space so that it is clearly council owned land or other land designated or administered for open space.	Amend the definition of 'open space' refer to relief sought in Definitions Chapter.
99.00	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	Introduction – Part A	In-Part	Reference is made to the Proposed Plan not containing any rules that could duplicate the regulations in the NESETA. While Transpower supports this, reference to the fact that rules cannot conflict with the NESETA needs to be made to be consistent with Section 44A of the RMA. In the event duplication or conflict arises, the NESETA prevails and the Plan would need to be amended accordingly. Transpower supports the approach of including cross references to the NESETA in the relevant rule chapters. The integration of the NESETA in this manner is considered both appropriate and effective.	Amend Part A, Introduction, Hierarchy and Relationship and Resource Management and Policy and Plans, National Environmental Standards section (page A-6) as follows: The District Plan does not contain any rules that could duplicate <u>or conflict with</u> the regulations in the above NESs. Cross references to the relevant NES regulations are included in the relevant rule Chapters (e.g. Chapter 22 -Utilities and Energy).
99.01	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	2.5.1 Objective	In-Part	Transpower supports the inclusion of Objective 2.5.1 but requests that the objective be amended to recognise established activities in the rural area which are not necessarily associated with primary production activities. National Grid infrastructure is not associated with primary production activities and not necessarily a	Amend Objective 2.5.1 as follows: To enable primary production activities and other associated rural based <u>established</u> land uses <u>that have a functional necessity to be located within the rural area</u> to function efficiently and effectively in the Rural

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				„rural based land use“; however it is an established land use that must be located within the rural area. This approach would be consistent with Policy 1, 2 and 5 of the NPSET. In seeking this relief, Transpower note a number of policies (e.g. Policy 2.5.3) seek to provide for the establishment of new non primary production activities and existing lawfully established activities.	Zone, while avoiding, remedying or mitigating the adverse effects of activities, including reverse sensitivity effects, in a way that maintains and enhances the character and amenity values of the rural environment.
99.02	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	2.5 Explanation & Principal Reasons	In-Part	National Grid infrastructure is not associated with primary production activities and not necessarily a “rural based land use; however it is an established land use that must be located within the rural area.	Amend the Explanation and Principal Reasons Section by inserting the following: <u>In many cases, infrastructure relies on a rural location due its linear nature and the need to traverse districts and regions (e.g. transmission lines, roads and rail. Minimum standards are applied to ensure any significant adverse effects of these activities are avoided, remedied or mitigated.</u>
99.03	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	2.5.16 Policy	Support	Transpower supports Policy 2.5.16 which specifically seeks to ensure that land use activities, subdivision and development adjoining the National Grid avoid, remedy or mitigate any adverse effects on the safe and efficient operation of the electricity transmission network. The policy captures both existing and proposed activities, subdivision and development.	Retain Policy 2.5.16
99.04	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	8.1.5 Policy	Support	The electricity transmission network often has operational and locational constraints and	Retain Policy 8.1.5

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				requirements. Transpower already has support structures within a natural hazard area identified on the District Planning Maps and there may be a requirement to locate a new tower or pole within a natural hazard area at some point in the future. In recognition of this, Transpower supports Policy 8.1.5 which recognises there may be a functional necessity to locate a structure within an identified hazard areas, and where this is the case the structure will be allowed. The relief sought would give effect to Policy 3 of the NPSET.	
99.05	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	8.1.8 Policy	Support	Transpower also supports the wording of Policy 8.1.8 which seeks to avoid, where practicable, the siting of new critical infrastructure and services within areas of significant risk from natural hazard events. Avoidance may not always be practicable because of location and operational constraints; however, Transpower's route, site and method selection process (NPSET Policy 4) will ensure adverse effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated.	Retain Policy 8.1.8
99.06	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	26 Definitions - New definition "Critical Infrastructure"	In-Part	The term "critical infrastructure" is not defined in the District Plan. Transpower recommend a definition be provided which aligns with the Proposed One Plan, thereby including electricity transmission infrastructure.	Include a definition of the term "critical infrastructure" as follows: <u>Critical infrastructure: means infrastructure necessary to provide services which, if interrupted, would have a serious effects on the people within the district or a wider</u>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
					<u>population, and which would require immediate reinstatement. Critical infrastructure includes infrastructure for electricity substations and the electricity transmission network.</u>
99.07	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	12 Introduction	In-Part	<p>Transpower supports many of the specific network utility provisions and the retention of many of these provisions is sought.</p> <p>The District Plan is required to give effect to a National Policy Statement. Transpower considers the introductory section to the Utilities section (12-1) would benefit from a statement to this effect. This would be consistent with the statement regarding the need to give effect to the NPS: Renewable Electricity Generation in the Energy section of Chapter 12.</p>	<p>Include the following paragraphs to the 12 Introduction, Utilities Section as follows:</p> <p><u>The Council is required to give effect to any National Policy Statement (NPS).</u></p> <p><u>The stated objective of the NPSET is to “Recognise the national significance of the electricity transmission network by facilitating the operation, maintenance and upgrade of the existing transmission network and the establishment of new transmission resources to meet the needs of present and future generations, while:</u></p> <p><u>- Managing the adverse environmental effects of the network; and</u></p> <p><u>- Managing the adverse effects of other activities on the network”.</u></p> <p><u>The issues associated with electricity transmission are significant at a national, regional and local level and the benefits of the network must be recognised and provided for. Within the District, there is the potential for the development of new high voltage electricity transmission.</u></p>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
99.08	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	12.1 Issue	In-Part	Transpower supports Issue 12.1 which recognises the need to both enable and protect network utilities.	Retain Issue 12.1
99.09	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	12.1 Issue Discussion	In-Part	The Issue Discussion under Issue 12.1 Network Utilities includes a statement to the effect that pylons would intrude into outstanding natural features and landscapes (and residential areas). Transpower seeks the deletion of the explanatory sentence as it relates to outstanding natural landscapes. The inference of the sentence is to preclude pylon (inferred as including high voltage electricity transmission pylons) development whereas the consideration of this issue would need to be assessed under the policy framework provided by the District Plan.	Amend the fourth paragraph of 12.1 Network Utilities, Issue Discussion as follows: For example, residential areas and areas containing outstanding natural features and landscapes would be vulnerable to the intrusion of large buildings or pylons.
99.10	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	12.1 Issue Discussion	Support	In considering such development, the decision maker must recognise and provide for the development of the electricity transmission network and appreciate there may be locational constraints. This is consistent with Policy 2 of the NPSET.	Retain paragraphs 5 and 6 of 12.1 Network Utilities, Issue Discussion (page 12-3).
99.11	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	12.1.1 Objective	Support	Transpower supports the intent of Objective 12.1.1 Network Utilities and seeks its retention subject to any amendments which recognises the need to protect network utilities and that there may, in certain circumstances, be adverse effects associated with the establishment operation, maintenance and upgrading of network utilities. This would be consistent with the	Amend Objective 12.1.1 Network Utilities as follows: To <u>protect and</u> provide for the establishment, operation, maintenance and upgrading of network utilities, while avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse effects on the environment <u>to the extent practicable</u> .

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				issue identified (12.1).	
99.12	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	12.1.3 Policy	Support	Policy 4 of the NPSET requires decision makers to have regard to the extent to which any adverse effects have been avoided, remedied or mitigate by the route, site and method selection. This should be recognised in the policy framework. Transpower has developed the ACRE2 model to identify and secure the most suitable location for new and replacement transmission infrastructure (such as lines, substations and switching stations). An amendment to Policy 12.1.3 is sought to recognise this.	Amend Policy 12.1.3 as follows: <u>To the extent practicable, Avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse environmental effects arising from the establishment, construction, operation, maintenance and upgrading of network utilities and where appropriate, consider the extent to which any adverse effects have been avoided, remedied or mitigated by a route, site and method selection process.</u>
99.13	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	12.1.6 Policy	Support	In considering such development, the decision maker must recognise and provide for the development of the electricity transmission network and appreciate there may be locational constraints. This is consistent with Policy 2 of the NPSET.	Retain Policy 12.1.6
99.14	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	12.1.9 Policy	In-Part	Transpower acknowledge the intent of Policy 12.1.9 but considers the provision requires strengthening to give effect to the NPSET. An amendment is sought to manage land use, subdivision and also „development“ which could compromise the safe and efficient functioning of network utilities. Transpower considers this gives effect to the NPSET	Amend Policy 12.1.9 as follows: Recognise the presence and function of existing network utilities, and their locational and operational requirements, by managing <u>land use, development and / or subdivision in locations which could compromise their safe and efficient operation and maintenance</u> subdivision and new land use activities adjacent to them, to ensure the long-term efficient and effective functioning of that utility.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
99.15	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	12.1.1 Explanation & Principal Reasons	Support	The Proposed Plan recognises the impracticality of under grounding high voltage transmission lines and this statement is supported by Transpower. Undergrounding of such infrastructure can be cost prohibitive and constrained by operational limitations.	Retain the last sentence of paragraph 4 in the 12.1.1 Explanation and Principal Reasons. Some exceptions to under grounding of services will exist, such as high voltage transmission lines, as it is often not practical to underground these in terms of cost and operation.
99.16	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	12.1.1 Explanation & Principal Reasons	In-Part	An amendment is sought to manage land use, subdivision and also “development” which could compromise the safe and efficient functioning of network utilities. Transpower considers this gives effect to the NPSET.	Amend the second sentence of final paragraph in the 12.1.1 Explanation & Principal Reasons as follows: In-Particular, it is important to protect the operation of network utilities from incompatible activities on adjacent <u>sites</u> .
99.17	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	12.1 Methods	In-Part	The methods to address the network utility issue and achieve the objective include the application of rules and standards of NESs. The specific reference to the NESETA is supported in this context as is the promotion of relevant Codes of Practice. The electricity transmission network needs to be included on the Planning Maps to give effect to Policy 12 of the NPSET, regardless of whether it is designated or not. . Transpower can provide GIS data free of charge to assist with the implementation of this Policy.	Amend the Methods for Issue 12.1 & Objective 12.1.1 (page 12-6) as follows: - Promote the use of relevant Codes of Practice <u>and industry guidelines</u> - Designated network utilities and sites <u>and the electricity transmission network</u> will be identified on the Planning Maps
99.18	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	12.X New Objective	In-Part	Policies 10 and 11 of the NPSET relate to the protection of the electricity transmission network. To give effect to these policies, Transpower considers that an objective	Include a new Objective that provide for the following: To protect the operation of network

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				should be included in the District Plan to protect the operation of network utilities from inappropriate land use, development and / or subdivision activities. This relief sought would be consistent with the issue identified (12.1).	utilities from inappropriate land use, development and / or subdivision activities.
99.19	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	12.2.1 Objective Energy	support	The Proposed Plan recognises that facilities for the distribution of generated electricity to the grid may also be necessary and that transmission activities may generate environmental effects. This is supported, subject to amendments sought to better give effect to the NPSET (Policies 1, 2, 3 and 4).	Amend Objective 12.2.1 Energy as follows: To recognise the need for, and provide for the development, <u>transmission and distribution</u> and use of energy utilising renewable resources through appropriately sited and designed renewable electricity generation activities, while ensuring environmental effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated.
99.20	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	12.2.5 Policy	Support	This policy is supported.	Retain Policy 12.2.5
99.21	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	12.2.11 Policy	support	This is supported, subject to amendments sought to better give effect to the NPSET (Policies 1, 2, 3 and 4).	Amend Policy 12.2.11 as follows: Ensure that new <u>land use, development and / or subdivision</u> subdivisions and land use activities do not adversely affect the <u>efficient</u> operation, and maintenance <u>and upgrading</u> of existing renewable electricity generation or distribution facilities.
99.22	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	12.2.6 Policy	support	This is supported, subject to amendments sought to better give effect to the NPSET (Policies 1, 2, 3 and 4).	Amend Policy 12.2.6 as follows: <u>To the extent practicable, a</u> Avoid, remedy or mitigate, adverse effects on

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
					the environment from renewable electricity generation and distribution activities, specifically on those parts of the environment most sensitive to change.
99.23	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	19.1(k) Rule	Support	The majority of Transpower's assets within the District are contained within the Rural Zone. The Proposed Plan provides for the construction of new network utilities and the operation, maintenance and upgrading of existing network utilities as a permitted activity, subject to conditions (19.1(k)).	Retain Rule 19.1(k).
99.24	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	19.1(m) Rule	Support	The maintenance and minor upgrading of existing network utilities in the flood overlay areas is also a permitted activity (19.1(m)). These provisions are supported by Transpower, as is reference to the NESETA regulating activities involving the operation, maintenance, upgrading, relocation, or removal of an existing transmission line (rather than the District Plan).	Retain Rule 19.1(m).
99.25	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	19.1 Notes	Support	Support reference to the NESETA applying to activities involving the operation, maintenance, upgrading, relocation, or removal of an existing transmission line but ensure this is not solely linked to earthworks.	Retain reference to the NESETA in the Rule 19.1 Note.
99.26	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	19.4.6 Rule	Support	Lines and support structures (including towers, mast and poles) for conveying electricity at a voltage exceeding 110kV are specifically identified as a discretionary activity under Rule 19.4.6(a).	Retain Rule 19.4.6

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
99.27	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	19.6.14 Rule	Support	<p>Permitted activity standards apply to development and activities within the transmission line corridor and the principle of this is supported to give effect to NPSET Policies 10 and 11. Permitted activity standard 19.6.14 a) and b) is supported, subject to the definitions of “sensitive activity” and “building” being retained. Transpower seek that the rule, currently titled “Transmission Line Corridor” be replaced with “National Grid Corridor” as in Transpower’s experience, members of the public are more familiar with this term. To assist implementation, a definition for the National Grid Corridor is sought to be added. Within the transmission corridor, the undertaking of earthworks could potentially compromise the network. Accordingly, Transpower seek the addition of provisions to appropriately manage earthworks and certain other activities within the electricity transmission corridor to give effect to Policy 10 of the NPSET.</p>	<p>Amend Rule 19.6.14 as follows: 19.6.14 Transmission Line Corridor <u>National Grid Corridor</u> (a) All buildings <u>within a National Grid Corridor</u> shall comply with New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice of Electrical Safety Distances (NZECP 34:2001). (b) Retain</p> <p>Add a subclause (c) so to provide for earthworks within the corridor and an advice note relating to vegetation within the electricity transmission corridor as follows: <u>1. Earthworks Around Poles shall be</u> (a) <u>no deeper than 300mm within 2.2 metres of a transmission pole support structure or stay wire; and</u> (b) <u>no deeper than 750mm between 2.2 to 5 metres from a transmission pole support structure or stay wire.</u> <u>Except that:</u> <u>Vertical holes not exceeding 500mm diameter beyond 1.5 metres from the outer edge of a pole support structure or stay wire are exempt from (a) and (b) above.</u> <u>2. Earthworks Around Towers shall be</u> (a) <u>no deeper than 300mm within 6</u></p>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
	Transpower New Zealand Ltd				<p><u>metres of the outer visible edge of a transmission tower support structure; and</u></p> <p><u>(b) no deeper than 3 metres between 6 to 12 metres from the outer visible edge of a transmission tower support structure.</u></p> <p><u>3. Earthworks 12m either side of a high voltage transmission line shall not:</u></p> <p><u>a) create an unstable batter that will affect a transmission support structure; and/or</u></p> <p><u>b) result in a reduction of the existing conductor clearance distances as required by NZECP34:2001.</u></p> <p><u>The following activities are exempt from 1 and 2 above:</u></p> <p><u>(a) Earthworks undertaken by a Network Utility operator; or</u></p> <p><u>(b) Earthworks undertaken as part of agricultural or domestic cultivation, or repair, sealing or resealing of a road, footpath or driveway.</u></p> <p><u>Note:</u></p> <p><u>Vegetation to be planted within the transmission corridor as shown on Councils Planning Maps or near any electrical line should be selected and/or managed to ensure that it will not result in that vegetation breaching</u></p>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
					<u>the Electricity (Hazards from Trees) Regulations 2003</u>
99.28	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	19.6.24(b) Rule	In-Part	Transpower considers the maintenance, replacement and minor upgrading of network utility activities and infrastructure should not also be required to comply with the Rural Zone District Plan provisions. Permitted activities provided for through Chapter 22 should be recognised for their existence and performing function. An amendment to Rule 19.6.24 is sought.	Amend 19.6.24 Network Utilities and Energy as follows: (a) All network utilities and structures associated with network utilities shall comply with the permitted activity conditions in Chapter 22. (b) All other relevant conditions in this part of the District Plan shall also apply to any <u>new</u> network utility or associated structure.
99.29	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	19.6.10 Rule 19.4.9 Rule	In-Part	Incorporate Rule 19.6.10 into 19.4.9 to simplify the District Plan	Amend Rule 19.4.9 Discretionary Activity (Moutoa Floodway) so that the 19.6.10 Permitted Activity condition (Moutoa Floodway) is incorporated into the Discretionary Activity rule.
99.30	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	19.6 Rule	In-Part	NESETA Regulation 30 provides for the trimming, felling or removal of any tree or vegetation as a permitted activity subject to the activity not being restricted by a rule in a district plan or being in a natural area. Transpower seeks the inclusion of a permitted activity related to the trimming, felling and removal of vegetation and trees, where that activity is required to minimise an operational risk to a network utility activity.	Include a new permitted activity condition to provide for trimming, felling and removal of vegetation and non-notable trees.
99.31	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	19.6.27 Rule	In-Part	Transpower also seek that a trimming of Notable Trees also be included where that	Amend Rule 19.6.27 Notable Trees as follows in the event relief sought under

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				tree(s) would compromise the effective operation of the network. The term „interfering with“ in the context of overhead lines is not supported as when vegetation has reached this point, it is already compromising the integrity of the network. Trimming in advance of this point is required and appropriate wording is suggested.	Chapter 22 is not accepted: c) Any trimming and maintenance of a tree listed in Schedule 3 - Notable Trees shall be limited to: (ii) the removal of branches interfering with buildings, structures, overhead wires or utility networks, but only to the extent that they are touching those buildings, or structures, or interfering with <u>likely to compromise the effective operation of</u> those overhead wires or utility networks.
99.32	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	19.3 Rule	In-Part	New buildings and structures, extensions to existing buildings and structures, and some earthworks (those that could undermine the support structures or reduce clearances to live wires below safe separation distances). It is appropriate these activities require resource consent and an accompanying assessment of the effects of the activity on the integrity of the electricity transmission network.	Include notification statement(s) to Rule 19.3 to the effect that where activities are proposed within the National Grid Corridor and resource consent is required, Transpower will be considered an affected party.
99.33	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	19.5 Rule	In-Part	Where the permitted activity standards relating to subdivision, use and development within the National Grid corridor are not met, Transpower considers a Non-Complying activity status is appropriate.	Include a new Rule to 19.5 Non-Complying Activities as follows: Where the permitted activity standards relating to subdivision, use and development within the National Grid corridor are not met.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
99.34	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	22 Introduction	Support	The last paragraph of the introductory section specifically refers to the applicability of the NESETA for the operation, maintenance, upgrading, relocation or removal of an existing transmission line that is part of the National Grid. The intent of this is supported however an amended paragraph is sought to better reflect the applicability of the NESETA in the context of Section 44A of the RMA.	Retain the last paragraph to 22 Introduction without modification.
99.35	Transpower new Zealand Ltd	22.1.2 Rule	Support	110kV transmission lines form part of the electricity transmission network. The provision of new 100kV lines and associated transformers as a permitted activity supported by Transpower.	Retain Rule 22.1.2 without modification:
99.36	Transpower new Zealand Ltd	22.1.5(a) Rule	Support	Transpower supports the note attached to Rule 22.1.5: Undergrounding of Services which confirms that the rule does not include high voltage new electricity. There may be operational limitations and prohibitive costs associated with undergrounding high voltage electricity.	Retain the Note under 22.1.5(a) without modification
99.37	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	22.1.10 Rule	Support	Rule 22.1.10(a) provides for the maintenance and replacement of existing transformers and lines above ground for conveying electricity at all voltages and capacities as a permitted activity. Further, Rule 22.1.10(b) provides for minor upgrading of electricity and telecommunication lines as a permitted activity. In the context of maintaining network utilities and to provide for their efficient and effective	Retain Rule 22.1.10 (a) and (b) and Include a new subclause as follows ... <u>(c) The trimming, felling and removal of vegetation and trees</u> <u>i) The trimming, felling and removal of vegetation and non-notable trees to retain the operational efficiency of existing network utilities.</u>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				functioning, Transpower seek enabling provisions associated with the trimming, felling and removal of vegetation and trees where that vegetation and / or tree represent an operational risk to the network utility. Relief is sought in order to give effect to Policies 2, 3 and 5 of the NPSET. While relief is sought under Chapter 19 relating to the trimming, felling and removal of vegetation, relief is also sought under Chapter 22 for certainty and ease of reference. Transpower considers it appropriate to reference a permitted activity condition to this effect in the utilities section, rather than dispersed throughout other chapters of the Plan (e.g. Rule 19.6.27). In the event relief to this effect is accepted, Transpower recommends Rule 19.6.27c) ii) be deleted.	<u>ii) The trimming and removal of branches likely to compromise the operational efficiency of overhead wires or utility networks</u>
99.38	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	24 General Matters	In-Part	Transpower accepts there is no scope to submit on the District Plan provisions relating to subdivision and development which formed part of Plan Changes 20 -22. Notwithstanding this, Transpower would accept the subdivision corridor could be realigned with the revised transmission corridor widths (commented on in section 6) when the opportunity arises.	Amend PC 20 – 22 provisions to align with revised transmission corridor widths.
99.39	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	25.2.1 (e) and (k) Assessment Criteria	Support	The criteria reference the extent to which alternative sites, designs and layout have been considered, thereby giving effect to Policy 4 of the NPSET.	Retain assessment criteria 25.2.1(e), (k)

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
99.40	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	25.2.1 Assessment Criteria	In-Part	Transpower seeks an assessment criteria be included in Section 25.2.1 of the District Plan to require an assessment as to whether land use development in the Rural Zone would have an adverse effect on the operation, maintenance, upgrading or development of the electricity transmission network.	Include a new General Assessment Criteria under 25.2.1 as follows: (a) ... <u>(l) whether the development would have an adverse effect on the operation, maintenance, upgrading or development of the electricity transmission network</u>
99.41	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	25.2.2 Assessment Criteria	In-Part	Additional relief is sought below to require an assessment of the development / activity on the operation, maintenance, upgrading or development of the electricity transmission network as well as appropriately assess network utility activities in general.	Include a new assessment criteria relating to buildings under 25.2.2 as follows: <u>(k) whether development within the transmission corridor would have an adverse effect on the operation, maintenance, upgrading or development of the electricity transmission network.</u>
99.42	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	25.2.4 Assessment Criteria	In-Part	Additional relief is sought below to require an assessment of the development / activity on the operation, maintenance, upgrading or development of the electricity transmission network as well as appropriately assess network utility activities in general.	Include a new assessment criteria relating to Tree Planting under 25.2.4 as follows: <u>(h) whether tree planting within the transmission corridor would have an adverse effect on the operation, maintenance, upgrading or development of the electricity transmission network.</u>
99.43	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	25.7.12(a) Assessment Criteria	In-Part	Additional relief is sought below to require an assessment of the development / activity on the operation, maintenance, upgrading or development of the electricity transmission network as well as appropriately assess	Amend assessment criteria 25.7.12 a) as follows: (a) The size and scale of proposed structures and whether they are <u>appropriate and necessary for their</u>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				network utility activities in general.	function in keeping with the size and scale of any existing development
99.44	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	25.7.12(b) and (f) Assessment Criteria	Support	Assessment criteria contained in Chapter 25.7.12 are supported in the context of giving effect to the NPSET.	Retain assessment criteria 25.7.12 (b) and (f).
99.45	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	26 Definitions Building	Support	The definition of “building” means any temporary or permanent or movable or immovable structure but specifically excludes any electricity poles or pylons. This exclusion is supported by Transpower, subject to amendment of the terminology used. Transpower notes the terms pylons and towers are used interchangeably in the Proposed Plan; “towers” are the standard industry terminology.	Amend Clause (f) of the definition of Building as follows: (f) Any electricity poles and towers. pylons.
99.46	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	26 Definitions Earthworks	In-Part	Transpower considers more certainty is required in respect of earthworks near support structures and maintaining clearance distances. The relief sought under Rule 19.6.14 c) would enable some earthworks to be undertaken as a permitted activity within the transmission corridor. With this rule based approach adopted, Transpower seek to retain the current definition of “earthworks”.	Retain the definition of Earthworks, subject to relief sought under Rule 19.6.14.
99.47	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	26 Definitions Sensitive Activities	In-Part	The definition of “sensitive activities” in the context of activities within the transmission line corridor includes some activities which are not considered sensitive to the transmission line. Transpower does not wish to unnecessarily restrict these activities. Accordingly, an amendment to the definition	Amend the definition of Sensitive activities as follows: Sensitive Activities means any of the following activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residential activities • Visitor accommodation • Community activities

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				is sought.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recreational facilities and activities • Camping grounds • Educational facilities • Places of assembly • Marae and papakainga housing • Cafes and restaurants <p><u>For activities within the National Grid corridor, recreational facilities and activities are not considered “sensitive activities”.</u></p>
99.48	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	26 Definitions - New definition “National Grid Corridor”	In-Part	The term “Transmission Line Corridor” is used in the District Plan but not defined and a definition of the term is required for implementation purposes. Transpower considers a more appropriate term would be “National Grid Corridor” and suggests a suitable definition below. Transpower notes the term “National Grid” is used elsewhere in the District Plan and that use of the term will be appropriate for consistency.	<p>Include a definition for the term “National Grid Corridor” as follows:</p> <p><u>National Grid Corridor: means a corridor either side of the assets used or owned by Transpower NZ Limited as part of the National Grid. The measurement of setback distances from National Grid electricity lines shall be taken from the centre line of the electricity transmission line and the outer edge of any support structure. The centre line at any point is a straight line between the centre points of the two support structures at each end of the span as depicted on the diagram below:</u></p> <p><u>[refer to Transpower’s diagram in full submission]</u></p> <p><u>The corridor widths of the National</u></p>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
					<p><u>Grid corridor are:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For a 220kV Electricity Transmission Line a 12m red zone corridor and green zone of an additional 25m for a total corridor width of 37m either side of the centreline • For a 110kV Electricity Transmission Line a 10m red zone corridor and green zone of an additional 6m for a total corridor width of 16m either side of the centreline
99.49	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	S1 -D40 – Outdoor Switchyard	In-Part	The Outdoor Switchyard (D40 designation) only occupies part of Section 1 SO 37683, as is correctly depicted on planning map 22. When originally designated the whole land parcel Section 1 SO 37063 was designated for the switchyard. Since that time Section 1 SO 37063 has been incorporated in Section 1 SO 37683. To provide clarity and avoid any further confusion, as the area shown on the map does match the legal description listed, Transpower seeks that the legal description has the words “part of” to the legal description.	<p>Amend the legal description of the D40 designation as follows:</p> <p><u>Part of</u> Section 1 SO 37683.</p>
99.50	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	Planning Maps	Oppose	The Planning Maps forming part of the Proposed Plan do not illustrate the electricity transmission network. The absence of this nationally significant infrastructure is contrary to Policy 12 of the NPSET, which the District	Amend all relevant Planning Maps, so that the electricity transmission network is identified on the District Plan Planning Maps.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				Plan must give effect to. Transpower can provide GIS data for this purpose free of charge.	
100.00	New Zealand Wind Energy Association	12 Introduction Energy	Support	NZWEA supports this introduction section subject to one amendment. The introduction states <i>“the benefits and need for renewable energy is recognised”</i> but this is not substantiated.	<p>Amend Introduction, Energy (page 12-2) and substantiate the statement <i>“the benefits and need for renewable energy is recognised”</i>.</p> <p>Possible wording to the fifth paragraph includes:</p> <p>The benefits and need for renewable energy is recognised <u>through objectives, policies and methods (including rules) that provide for the development, maintenance, operation and upgrading of renewable energy activities.”</u></p>
100.01	New Zealand Wind Energy Association	12.2 Issue	Support	NZWEA supports the issue but considers the issue should acknowledge the need for Horowhenua to provide for renewable electricity generation as a matter of national significance.	<p>Amend Issue 2.2 by inserting the following statement: <u>Like all districts in New Zealand the Horowhenua district needs to provide for the development of new renewable electricity facilities as a matter of national significance.</u> The development of new electricity generation facilities can create adverse effects on the environment...</p>
100.02	New Zealand Wind Energy Association	12.2.1 Objective	Support	NZWEA supports the plans direction to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects. However, it is not always possible to fully avoid, remedy	<p>Amend Objective 12.2.1 as follows: To recognise the need for, and provide for the development and use of energy</p>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				or mitigate adverse effects of renewable electricity generation activities. Insertion of the term 'appropriately' into the objective would address this issue.	utilising renewable resources through appropriately sited and designed renewable electricity generation activities, while ensuring environmental effects are <u>appropriately</u> avoided, remedied or mitigated.
100.03	New Zealand Wind Energy Association	12.2.4 Policy	Support	NZWEA supports the plans direction to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects. However, it is not always possible to fully avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects of renewable electricity generation activities. Insertion of the term 'appropriately' into the policy would address this issue.	Amend Policy 12.2.4 as follows: Manage the establishment and development of new renewable electricity generation facilities to ensure the adverse effects on the environment are <u>appropriately</u> avoided, remedied or mitigated.
100.04	New Zealand Wind Energy Association	12.2.5 Policy	Support	NZWEA supports this policy because it accords with the NPSREG and therefore the purpose of the Act.	Retain Policy 12.2.5
100.05	New Zealand Wind Energy Association	12.2.6 Policy	Oppose	This Policy duplicates policy 12.2.4 and is not necessary.	Delete Policy 12.2.6.
100.06	New Zealand Wind Energy Association	12.2.7 Policy	Oppose	It would be virtually impossible for a wind farm proposal located in or near an ONFL or the Tararua Ranges to satisfy these two policies. The desire for a wind farm to not 'interrupt' or 'intrude' views from public spaces or the Levin urban area is a particularly high threshold. These policies may be appropriate if the benefits of a wind farm proposal are able to be taken into account alongside these policies. However, if the activity status of a wind farm proposal is non-	Delete Policy 12.2.7 OR Amend Policy 12.2.7 as follows 12.2.7 Avoid the development of renewable electricity generation facilities where they will <u>significantly</u> adversely affect the character and values of Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				complying, the s104D(1) gateway test may prevent the benefits of the proposal being considered. Such an outcome would be contrary to the NPSREG.	(Refer to Submission Point 100.07)
100.07	New Zealand Wind Energy Association	12.2.8 Policy	Oppose	It would be virtually impossible for a wind farm proposal located in or near an ONFL or the Tararua Ranges to satisfy these two policies. The desire for a wind farm to not 'interrupt' or 'intrude' views from public spaces or the Levin urban area is a particularly high threshold. These policies may be appropriate if the benefits of a wind farm proposal are able to be taken into account alongside these policies. However, if the activity status of a wind farm proposal is non-complying, the s104D(1) gateway test may prevent the benefits of the proposal being considered. Such an outcome would be contrary to the NPSREG.	Delete Policy 12.2.8 OR Amend Policy 12.2.8 as follows 12.2.8 Ensure development of renewable electricity generation facilities <u>minimises visual</u> do not interruption or intrusion of intrude views of the Tararua Ranges when viewed from public spaces within the Levin urban area. (Refer to Submission Point 100.06)
100.08	New Zealand Wind Energy Association	12.2.9 Policy	Support	NZWEA supports this policy but cannot identify the method which supports this policy in the plan.	Amend policy by substantiating how the plan provides for the identification and assessment of potential sites and renewable energy sources. OR Include Methods in the District Plan to give effect to Policy 12.2.9.
100.09	New Zealand Wind Energy Association	12.2.10 Policy	Support	NZWEA supports this policy because it accords with the NPSREG and therefore the purpose of the ACT.	Retain Policy 12.2.10
100.10	New Zealand Wind Energy Association	12.2.1 Explanation & Principal Reasons	Support	NZWEA suggests a minor correction to distinguish renewable electricity generation	Amend 6 th paragraph of the 12.2 Explanation & Principal Reasons as

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				activities from network utilities.	follows: As with other <u>network</u> utilities, the District Plan...
100.11	New Zealand Wind Energy Association	12.1 Methods	Opposes	<p>NZWEA opposes the more stringent activity status within ONFLs and Domains of High Landscape Amenity. Non-complying activity status could make it virtually impossible for a wind farm proposal located in or near an ONFL or Domains of High Landscape Amenity to satisfy the s104D(1) gateway test, which may prevent the benefits of the proposal being considered. Such an outcome would be contrary to the NPSREG. A more appropriate method for achieving this policy is to ensure that renewable electricity generation activities are provided for as discretionary activities while ensuring the objectives and policies in the plan clearly signal the desire to protect these sensitive areas from development.</p> <p>In addition to the relief sought above, NZWEA suggests the council prepares a non-statutory renewable energy strategy or infrastructure strategy, which among other things, highlights locations where people in the community think potential renewable electricity generation activities might be appropriate.</p>	<p>Amend Methods 12.1, District Plan, fourth bullet point as follows:</p> <p>Resource consents will be required for new renewable electricity generation facilities, with more stringent activity status within Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes and Domains of High Landscape Amenity. <u>to ensure that Assessment of environmental effects are properly assessed through the resource consent process, and impose conditions to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects <u>as appropriate.</u></u></p> <p>Include an additional Method 12.1 Long Term Plan and Annual Plan as a seventh bullet point as follows:</p> <p><u>The council may develop an infrastructure strategy that, among other things, signals community interest in preferred locations for potential renewable electricity generation.</u></p>
100.12	New Zealand Wind Energy Association	14 General Matters	Support	NZWEA supports the provisions in Chapter 14.	Retain Chapter 14 as proposed.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
100.13	New Zealand Wind Energy Association	22.1.8(b) Rule	Support	NZWEA supports the provision of permitted wind monitoring masts but considers the minimum diameter standard too restrictive. Metrological masts are typically temporary activities that have benign adverse environmental effects and there appears to be no rationale for restricting the width to 250mm when met masts can be up to 450mm in diameter.	Amend 22.1.8(b) so that the permitted diameter is changed from 250mm to 500mm. All wind monitoring masts shall comply with the following conditions: (i) Maximum Height: 80 metres. (ii) Maximum Diameter: 250 500mm. (iii) Minimum Setback: 500 metres from all boundaries. (iv) Equipment: Limited to instrumentation necessary to record and log wind direction and speed.
100.14	New Zealand Wind Energy Association	22.1.X New Rule	Oppose	In order to provide for the national significance of wind farm activities the district plan should simply classify 'wind farms' as either permitted, controlled, restricted discretionary or discretionary activities. There is no need for wind farms to be subject to other rules in the district plan. Rather, a simple rule framework can be provided that ensures the benefits of any wind farm proposal are considered alongside: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental effects known to arise from wind farm developments • Relevant planning provisions, including the district plan objectives and policies. 	Include new rules to provide for wind farm activities: <u>22.1.11 Wind farms</u> <u>(a) The construction, operation, maintenance and upgrading of a new wind farm in the rural zone outside any ONFL is a restricted discretionary activity. Council's discretion is restricted to:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. the matters contained in the <u>national policy statement for renewable electricity generation;</u> ii. <u>effects on peoples amenity values, particularly noise and visual amenity;</u> iii. <u>effects on other infrastructure;</u> iv. <u>effects on the relationship of tangata whenua and their culture</u>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
					<p><u>and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu and other taonga;</u> <u>v. effects on areas of significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitats of indigenous fauna; and</u> <u>vi. effects on maintaining public access to and along the coastal marine area, lakes and rivers.</u> <u>(b) The development of any new wind farm outside the rural zone or within an ONFL is a discretionary activity.</u></p> <p>Or Alternatively Amend the matters for discretion to those listed in 25.7.13 (Refer to relief sought under this provision)</p>
100.15	New Zealand Wind Energy Association	22.1.X New Rule	Oppose	<p>In order to provide for the national significance of wind farms the district plan should set a permitted noise limit for wind farm sound, in accordance with NZS6808:2010.</p> <p>The efficient and effective assessment of wind farm noise effects, with or without adherence to NZS6808:2010, will be greatly improved if the district plan provides specific noise limits as recommended in NZS6808:2010. This should involve the council identifying any locations to be afforded more stringent protection from wind turbine noise</p>	<p>Include a new permitted activity standard to provide appropriate limits for wind farm sound as follows:</p> <p><u>22.1.12 Wind farm noise Permitted Activity...</u> <u>Wind Farm Noise received outside a High Amenity Area Wind turbine sound received outdoors at the boundary of any Urban Area or at the notional boundary of any Noise Sensitive Activity is a permitted activity provided:</u></p>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				(high amenity areas).	<p><u>i. At any wind speed wind farm sound levels (LA90(10 min)) shall not exceed the background sound level by more than 5 dB, or a level of 40 dB LA90(10 min), whichever is the greater.</u></p> <p><u>ii. Noise is measured and assessed in accordance with NZS6808:2010.</u></p>
100.16	New Zealand Wind Energy Association	25.7.1 Assessment Criteria	Opposes	NZWEA opposes noise assessment requirements on wind farm proposals that are not set out in NZS6808:2010. NZS6808:2010 is the most appropriate mechanism for assessing noise effects from wind farms and the district plan should recognise and provide for this.	<p>Include a new clause in 25.7 Assessment Criteria for Consents in All Zones, Noise as follows:</p> <p>25.7.1 Noise ... <u>(XX) Noise effects from wind farms shall be measured and assessed in accordance with NZS6808:2010.</u></p>
100.17	New Zealand Wind Energy Association	25.7.13 Assessment Criteria	Support	NZWEA supports the provision of specific assessment criteria for wind farm proposals subject to deletion or amendment of some of the proposed assessment matters, which are too stringent and/or are not necessary.	<p>Amend Assessment Criteria 25.7.13 as follows: Wind Farms Energy Facilities</p> <p>(a) The landscape and visual effects of the proposal, including:</p> <p>(i) The extent to which the proposal will adversely affect rural character, views from residences, key public places, including roads, and recreation areas.</p> <p>(ii) The visibility of the proposal, including the number of turbines and their height.</p> <p>(iii) The extent to which the</p>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
	New Zealand Wind Energy Association				<p>proposal will adversely affect the natural character of the Coastal Environment, water bodies, and Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes.</p> <p>(iv) The extent to which any aspects of the proposal can be sited underground.</p> <p>(b) The ecological impact of the proposal, including the extent of disruption to vegetation and habitat, any impacts on waterways, and the likely effect on birds and other fauna.</p> <p>(c) The effects on heritage, cultural, geological and archaeological values and sites.</p> <p>(d) The effects of traffic and vehicle movements.</p> <p>(e) The actual or potential noise effects of the construction, development and operation of the wind farm energy facilities, <u>In-Particular</u> including particular consideration of the special audible characteristics, and the proximity to and effect on settlements or dwellings, and the ability to comply with meet NZS 6808:2010 Acoustics – Wind Farm Noise.</p> <p>(f) The extent to which the proposal will adversely affect amenity values of the surrounding environment,</p>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
					<p>including the effects of electromagnetic interference to broadcast or other signals, blade glint and shadow flicker.</p> <p>(g) The <u>effects</u> extent of any earthworks, including the construction of access tracks, roads and turbine platforms.</p> <p>(h) The cumulative effects of the proposal.</p> <p>(i) The benefits to be derived from <u>the proposal</u> renewable energy.</p> <p>(j) Mitigation and rehabilitation works.</p> <p>(k) Operational and technical considerations.</p>
100.18	New Zealand Wind Energy Association	26 Definitions - Domestic Scale Renewable Energy Device	Support	NZWEA supports the proposed definition.	Retain the definition of Domestic Scale Renewable Energy Device as proposed.
100.19	New Zealand Wind Energy Association	26 Definitions - Network Utility	Opposes	<p>Electricity generators are not necessarily "network utility operators" under the RMA and the district plan can appropriately capture wind turbines in other definitions (either Domestic Scale Renewable Energy Devices or Wind Farm).</p> <p>Accordingly, NZWEA opposes the inclusion of wind turbines in the definition of network utility.</p>	<p>Amend the definition of Network Utility as follows:</p> <p>Network Utility includes any:</p> <p>(a) aerial or mast or antennae or dish antennae;</p> <p>(b) tower or pole, including any wind turbine;</p> <p>(c) pole-mounted street light;</p> <p>....</p>
100.20	New Zealand Wind Energy Association	26 Definitions - Wind Energy	In-Part	<p>NZWEA supports this definition In-Part.</p> <p>NZWEA recommends the term 'Wind farms'</p>	Amend definition of Wind Energy Facility as follows:

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
		Facilities		should be used instead of 'Wind Energy Facilities'. Wind farms are primarily rural activities that farm the wind. NZWEA also suggests minor amendments to accord with the NPSREG.	Wind Farm <u>Energy Facilities</u> means the land, buildings, turbines, structures, substations, underground cabling, earthworks, access tracks and roads associated with the generation of electricity by wind force and the operation, <u>maintenance and upgrading</u> of the wind farm <u>energy facility</u> . This does not include domestic scale renewable energy device or any cabling required to link the wind energy facility to the point of entry into the electricity network, whether transmission or distribution in nature.
101.00	Director-General of Conservation	2.1.20 Policy	In-Part	Policy 2.1.20 seeks to maintain the character of the rural area. There is no mention of the natural environment within this policy. The natural environment is what makes up the character of the rural area.	Amend Policy 2.1.20 as follows: Ensure that new activities locating in the rural area are of a nature, scale, intensity and location consistent with maintaining the character of the rural area <u>and natural environment</u> and to be undertaken in a manner which avoids, remedies or mitigates adverse effects on rural character, including rural productive values
101.01	Director-General of Conservation	2.1.21 Policy	Support	Submitter supports Policy 2.1.21.	Retain Policy 2.1.21 as notified.
101.02	Director-General of Conservation	2.4.1 Objective	Support	Submitter supports Objective 2.4.1.	Retain Objective 2.4.1 as notified.
101.03	Director-General of Conservation	2.4.2 Policy	Support	Submitter supports Policy 2.4.2.	Retain Policy 2.4.2 as notified.
101.04	Director-General of	2.4.3 Policy	Support	Submitter supports Policy 2.4.3.	Retain Policy 2.4.3 as notified.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
	Conservation				
101.05	Director-General of Conservation	2.5.1 Objective	In-Part	It is not clear when stating “while avoiding, remedying or mitigating the adverse effects of activities, including reverse sensitivity issues.	Amend Objective 2.5.1 by adding further explanation pertaining to reverse sensitivity effects or provide a list of what is envisaged via reverse sensitivity matters.
101.06	Director-General of Conservation	2.5.2 Policy	In-Part	The use of wording “meet minimum environmental standards” is of concern as there is no guidance or explanation on the use of this terminology.	Amend Policy 2.5.2 by either; providing a list detailing the minimum environmental standards, or, define what is meant by the term “minimum environmental standards”.
101.07	Director-General of Conservation	2.5.4 Policy	In-Part	Policy 2.5.4 does not take into account the cumulative effects.	Amend Policy 2.5.4 as follows: Control and manage the establishment and operation of a range of other land use activities, including sensitive activities, in the rural environment to ensure their adverse effects, <u>including cumulative effects</u> , on the environment are avoided, remedied or mitigated.
101.08	Director-General of Conservation	2.5.5 Policy	In-Part	Policy 2.5.5 states that “Manage any activity which does not meet minimum standards”. What does the plan deem as meeting minimum standards? If there is no threshold to explain this, then minimum standards could mean the least afforded protection. This policy needs to be clear and unambiguous to ensure that any adverse effects on the environment will be avoided, remedied or mitigated. This term has been referred to throughout the plan hence the importance of definition or explanation	Amend Policy 2.5.5 by either defining or adding an explanation of the term “minimum standards”.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
101.09	Director-General of Conservation	2.5.6 Policy	In-Part	Policy 2.5.6 is of concern in that “dispose of wastes in a manner that avoids...” could refer to a number of things. This policy must clearly identify what is intended when referring to “wastes”.	Amend Policy 2.5.6 by either adding a list of wastes, or, further explaining what is meant by the term “wastes” in this policy.
101.10	Director-General of Conservation	2.5.4 Policy	In-Part	Policy 2.5.11 should require compliance with the resource consent to ensure that any effects that arise from this activity are captured.	Amend Policy 2.5.4 by adding the wording “as long as it is operating within its resource consent”.
101.11	Director-General of Conservation	3.2.1 Objective	In-Part	Objective 3.2.1 is reasonable but should align with Horizons Regional Council’s Proposed One Plan.	Amend Objective 3.2.1 as follows so that it aligns with the Horizons Regional Council’s One Plan; To protect the areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna <u>or to maintain indigenous biological diversity including enhancement where appropriate.</u>
101.12	Director-General of Conservation	3.2.2 Policy	Support	Submitter supports Policy 3.2.3.	Retain Policy 3.2.3 as notified.
101.13	Director-General of Conservation	3.2.3 Policy	In-Part	The Policy is generally supported. The addition of the words “where appropriate” will ensure that these types of activities are suitable on the basis that the protection and enhancement of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna are provided for.	Amend Policy 3.2.3 as follows: Encourage <u>where appropriate</u> subdivision, land use and development that maintains and enhances indigenous biological diversity through the protection and enhancement of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna.
101.14	Director-General of Conservation	3.3.1 Objective	In-Part	Issue 3.3 briefly discusses Lakes, Rivers and Other Water Bodies (including wetlands).	Amend Objective 3.3.1 as follows: To protect the natural character of

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				Objective 3.3.1 omits any reference to wetlands despite this being discussed throughout the section. Horowhenua is well known for its national important coastal wetlands some of which may occur wholly or partially in the “coastal marine area”. The RMA definition of “water bodies” does not include wetlands which occur in the coastal marine area, meaning these areas would not be covered by the Objective.	lakes, rivers, <u>wetlands</u> and other water bodies and their margins, from inappropriate use, and development.
101.15	Director-General of Conservation	3.3.2 Policy	In-Part	Policy 3.3.2 could be improved to better provide for the protection of wetlands generally. One of the matters of national importance in Section 6 of the RMA is the preservation of the natural character of wetlands, lakes and rivers, and their margins. Policy 3.3.2 needs to implement the Objective and provide for all types of wetland and also margins.	Amend Policy 3.3.2 through rewording to better provide for wetland types generally.
101.16	Director-General of Conservation	3.3.3 Policy	In-Part	Policy 3.3.3 could be improved to better provide for the protection of wetlands generally. One of the matters of national importance in Section 6 of the RMA is the preservation of the natural character of wetlands, lakes and rivers, and their margins. Policy 3.3.3 needs to implement the Objective and provide for all types of wetland and also margins.	Amend Policy 3.3.3 through rewording to better provide for wetland types generally.
101.17	Director-General of Conservation	3.3.5 Policy	In-Part	Policy 3.3.5 could be improved to better provide for the protection of wetlands generally. One of the matters of national	Amend Policy 3.3.5 through rewording to better provide for wetland types generally.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				importance in Section 6 of the RMA is the preservation of the natural character of wetlands, lakes and rivers, and their margins. Policy 3.3.5 needs to implement the Objective and provide for all types of wetland and also margins.	
101.18	Director-General of Conservation	3.3.6 Policy	In-Part	Policy 3.3.6 is not clear when the term “planted water body margins”. There is no mention or explanation throughout the section to advise the reader what this term involves?	Amend Policy 3.3.6 by clarifying what is meant by the term “planted water body margins” or provide explanation within the section.
101.19	Director-General of Conservation	5 Anticipated Environmental Result	In-Part	This section does not have one objective or policy relating to Tangata Whenua. 5 (c) states that “The protection and enhancement of historic and cultural values, including Tangata whenua spiritual values (taonga raranga) associated with the coast”. This needs to be reflected in the objective and policies within this section.	Include an objective and policies that relate to Tangata Whenua and their association with the coastal environment.
101.20	Director-General of Conservation	3.4 Issue	Support	The issues, discussion, objectives, and policies of this section are generally supported as written.	Retain intent of Issue 3.4.
101.21	Director-General of Conservation	4 General Matters	In-Part	Section 4 discusses riparian management but there are no policies that implement riparian management. Even though esplanades are provided for, the use and development of riparian margins has a key role to play in maintaining and enhancing the Open Space network.	Include a policy that provides for the management of riparian margins or to that effect.
101.22	Director-General of Conservation	4.1.1 Objective	In-Part	Objective 4.1.1 should reflect the issues that have been discussed. Through Section 4,	Amend Objective 4.1.1 by adding wording to the effect as follows: “does

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				adverse effects have been highlighted and addressed as a major issue. It is important to address this within the objective	not have significant adverse effects upon the environmental quality of the open space zone/areas, or on any surrounding land or water body"
101.23	Director-General of Conservation	4.1.3 Policy	In-Part	The intent of Policy 4.1.3 is supported, however, the addition of "and protection" will assist implementation	Amend Policy 4.1.3 as follows: Ensure the character, amenity and special values of individual parks and reserves are recognised <u>and protected</u> and recreational activities are compatible with the values of the site and the amenity values of the immediate environment.
101.24	Director-General of Conservation	4.1.7 Policy	In-Part	Policy 4.1.7 states that "Provide for the management of storm water in suitable places within the Open Space Zone..." what does "suitable places" mean in this context?	Amend Policy 4.1.7 by either defining or explaining what is meant by "suitable places".
101.25	Director-General of Conservation	4.2.3 Policy	Support	Policy 4.2.3 is supported as written.	Retain Policy 4.2.3 as notified.
101.26	Director-General of Conservation	5 Introduction	In-Part	The discussion of issues, policies and methods of this section are generally supported as written, apart from any specific areas of concern identified below.	Amend paragraph two, third sentence in the Introduction as follows: ... This estuary is considered an important estuarine ecosystem...
101.27	Director-General of Conservation	5 Introduction	In-Part	The discussion of issues, policies and methods of this section are generally supported as written, apart from any specific areas of concern identified below.	Amend paragraph five, second sentence of the Introduction as follows: ... The preservation of the natural character of the coastal environment, and it's <u>its</u> protection from inappropriate subdivision, use and

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
					development is a matter of national importance (section 6(a))....
101.28	Director-General of Conservation	5 Introduction	In-Part	The discussion of issues, policies and methods of this section are generally supported as written, apart from any specific areas of concern identified below.	Amend paragraph eight of the Introduction as follows: Add at the conclusion of the paragraph a new sentence: <u>"it must give effect to"</u> .
101.29	Director-General of Conservation	5 Introduction	In-Part	The discussion of issues, policies and methods of this section are generally supported as written, apart from any specific areas of concern identified below. Reference should be made to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2011 (NPSFWM), as the management of coastal and freshwater requires an integrated and consistent approach.	Include a reference in the Introduction to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2011 (NPSWM).
101.30	Director-General of Conservation	5 Introduction	In-Part	The discussion of issues, policies and methods of this section are generally supported as written, apart from any specific areas of concern identified below. Pursuant to Section 74(2) and 74(2A) of the RMA, Council shall have regard to relevant Conservation Management Strategy and Iwi Management Plans to the extent their content has a bearing on relevant issues of the District.	Amend paragraph 10 through mentioning relevant Conservation Management Strategy and Iwi Management Plans.
101.31	Director-General of Conservation	5 Introduction	In-Part	The discussion of issues, policies and methods of this section are generally supported as written, apart from any specific areas of concern identified below. Figure 5-1 as the current approach in	Amend Figure 5-1 through giving effect to Policy 1 of the NZCPS.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				identifying Coastal Environment does not appear to give effect to Policy 1 as it does not account for NZCPS 2010 Policy 1(2) or 1(2)(f). Policy 1(2)(f) is an important factor where the coastal environment is concerned. Furthermore, given the recent review of plan change 22, the figure is incorrect. The identification of the Coastal Environment has still not been defined correctly. This is still under review.	
101.32	Director-General of Conservation	5 Introduction	In-Part	The discussion of issues, policies and methods of this section are generally supported as written, apart from any specific areas of concern identified below. The wording of “Coastal Dominance Zone” is unclear.	Amend Figure 5-1 through clarifying what is meant by the wording “Coastal Dominance Zone”
101.33	Director-General of Conservation	5.1 Issue Discussion	In-Part	The discussion of issues, policies and methods of this section are generally supported as written, apart from any specific areas of concern identified below. Referring to the second page of the issue discussion, the seven components of natural character, the use of the word “Perceptual” – Policy 13 (2) e, f, g, h of the NZCPS are all experiential, not perceptual.	Amend Paragraph 2 of the Issue Discussion through deleting “perceptual” from the seven components of natural character, or, provide a term that is better aligned with the NZCPS.
101.34	Director-General of Conservation	5.1 Issue Discussion	In-Part	The discussion of issues, policies and methods of this section are generally supported as written, apart from any specific areas of concern identified below. Referring to the second page of the issue discussion, the seven components of natural	Amend Paragraph 2 of the Issue Discussion through adding two new bullet points to the seven components of natural character; <u>Context</u> and <u>Setting</u> .

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				character, context and setting are also important components.	
101.35	Director-General of Conservation	5.1.1 Objective	In-Part	Objective 5.1.1 in its current form adds nothing to part 2 of the RMA. Subdivision and development in the coastal environment must be done in an appropriate manner to preserve its natural character.	<p>Delete the current Objective 5.1.1 and rewrite as follows:</p> <p>To preserve natural character of the Coastal Environment and avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse environmental effects from inappropriate subdivision, use and development. <u>Ensure only appropriate subdivision, use and development occurs in the Coastal Environment.</u></p> <p>Alternatively reword as follows:</p> <p><u>To provide for the appropriate subdivision, use and development consistent with the need to preserve the natural character of the coastal environment.</u></p>
101.36	Director-General of Conservation	5.1.2 Policy	In-Part	The wording “zone of coastal dominance” needs to be defined or have further explanation.	Amend Policy 5.1.2 by providing a definition or further explanation of the term “zone of coastal dominance”
101.37	Director-General of Conservation	5.1.3 Policy	In-Part	The components listed are acceptable in its current form with the exception of the deletion of “perceptual”. The addition of the word “experiential” (from Policy 12(2) of the NZCPS, reflecting paragraph (e), (f), (g) and (h)) is consistent with the preservation of the natural character. Also the inclusion of two new bullet points Context and Setting add to	<p>Amend Policy 5.1.3 as follows:</p> <p>....</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perceptual • <u>Context</u> • <u>Setting</u>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				the components of natural character.	
101.38	Director-General of Conservation	5.1.4 Policy	In-Part	Policy 5.1.4 is not necessary given section 6(b) of the RMA provides for this.	Retain intent of Policy 5.1.4
101.39	Director-General of Conservation	5.1.5 Policy	In-Part	Policy 5.1.5 is not necessary given Policy 15 of the NZCPS 2010.	Retain intent of Policy 5.1.5
101.40	Director-General of Conservation	5.1.6 Policy	In-Part	Policy 5.1.6 is reasonable in its current form. However, it could be improved.	Amend Policy 5.1.6 as follows: ... except where <u>there is a significant public benefit</u> , and there is <u>no reasonable alternative outside very high natural areas of natural character</u> and...
101.41	Director-General of Conservation	5.1.8 Policy	In-Part	Policy 5.1.8 needs to be re-worded	Amend Policy 5.1.8 as follows: Ensure development within the Coastal Environment recognises and respects <u>avoids adverse effects on the sensitive...</u>
101.42	Director-General of Conservation	3.3.9 Policy	In-Part	Submitter generally supports Policy 3.3.9 but it would be improved by adding reference to the margins of lakes and rivers, consistent with Section 6 of the RMA. Cross referencing to Section 11, particularly policy 11.1.3 would aid this policy.	Amend Policy 3.3.9 as follows: Provide for the maintenance of the natural character of lakes, rivers <u>and their margins</u> and other water bodies, whilst balancing the need to provide public access to and along these water bodies by way of an esplanade network. Include a cross reference to Section 11, Policy 11.1.3.
101.43	Director-General of Conservation	5.2 Issue	In-Part	Policy 5.1.4 is not necessary given section 6(b) of the RMA provides for this.	Retain intent of Policy 5.1.5

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
101.44	Director-General of Conservation	5.2 Issue Discussion	In-Part	Issue discussion does not discuss vehicles access. Policy 20 of the NZCPS is relevant as vehicle access can cause adverse effects in the coastal environment if not managed appropriately.	Amend Issue Discussion 5.2 by the addition of “vehicle access” and a discussion of the issues that arise from this type of activity within the coastal environment and the adverse effects that might arise from this use.
101.45	Director-General of Conservation	5.2.1 Objective	Support	Support Objective 5.2.1 as written	Retain Objective 5.2.1 as notified.
101.46	Director-General of Conservation	5.2.2 Policy	Support	Support Policy 5.2.2 as written	Retain Policy 5.2.2 as notified.
101.47	Director-General of Conservation	5.2.4 Policy	In-Part	The intent of Policy 5.2.4 is supported but the addition of the word “appropriate” is necessary to ensure the policy captures existing public access.	Amend Policy 5.2.4 as follows: Develop, improve and maintain existing <u>appropriate</u> forms of access to the coast.
101.48	Director-General of Conservation	5.2.5 Policy	In-Part	The intent of Policy 5.2.5 is supported but the addition of the word “existing” is necessary to ensure the policy capture existing public access.	Amend Policy 5.2.5 as follows: Ensure that adverse effects arising from the provision of <u>existing</u> new or upgraded public access are avoided, remedied or mitigated particularly on areas with high natural character and areas subject to coastal hazards.
101.49	Director-General of Conservation	5.2.6 Policy	In-Part	The intent of Policy 5.2.6 is supported but it needs to refer to location and construction.	Amend Policy 5.2.6 as follows: Where new access to the coast is provided, ensure <u>it is located and constructed so that</u> disturbance to foredunes and adjacent coastal marine area is minimised.
101.50	Director-General of Conservation	5.3 Issue Discussion	In-Part	Sea level rise and climate change are topical issues that are present in every coastal environment. The issue discussion does not discuss sea level rise, climate change effects,	Amend Issue discussion 5.3 by reflecting Policies 24 to 27 of the NZCPS in this section and providing for them in the policies.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				or give effect to NZCPS Policies 24 to 27.	
101.51	Director-General of Conservation	5.2 Explanation and Principal Reasons	In-Part	There is no mention of vehicle access within this section. This should be considered in order to give effect to the NZCPS Policy 20.	Include a Policy and explanation to control where vehicle access is allowed or to that effect.
101.52	Director-General of Conservation	5.3.1 Objective	In-Part	Objective 5.3.1 is too wordy and long. It is requested that the paragraph be split into two objectives.	Amend Objective 5.3.1 as follows: Relief A: Obj 1: Avoid or mitigate subdivision, land use and development in the Coastal Environment where it is subject to natural hazards, and Obj 2: <u>Ensure that land use and development do not significantly worsen the risk of occurrence or the severity of coastal hazards or compromise the effective functioning or integrity of natural hazard protection or mitigation works.</u> Or; Relief b: Delete <u>“and ensure that land use and development do not significantly worsen the risk of occurrence or the severity of coastal hazards or compromise the effective functioning or integrity of natural hazard protection or mitigation works”</u> As the example provided in Relief a, would suffice.
101.53	Director-General of Conservation	5.3.3 Policy	In-Part	Policy 5.3.3 makes no sense. It is too wordy and is not clear in its intent.	Amend Policy 5.3.3 by clarifying what the intent of this policy is.
101.54	Director-General of Conservation	5.3.4 Policy	In-Part	Policy 5.3.3 needs to reflect the objective. The objective uses the term “significantly worsen” whereas in this policy it stated that “land does	Delete “significant” from Objective 5.3.1 if Policy 5.3.4 is going to remain as notified then.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				not accelerate or worsen any material..." Consistency is requested when applying such words.	
101.55	Director-General of Conservation	5.3.5 Policy	In-Part	New development is acceptable. However, Policy 5.3.5 lacks any mention of hazards which under NZCPS Policy 24 need to be assessed looking at least 100 years out.	Include a policy that takes into account hazard risks over at least 100 years, are to be assessed or to that effect.
101.56	Director-General of Conservation	5.3.5 Policy	In-Part	In general, the overall section is lacking in consideration of the NZCPS. Policies 24; 25 (c) (d), (e); Policy 26, and Policy 27 are not adequately addressed.	Include new policies that align with the NZCPS or to that effect.
101.57	Director-General of Conservation	5.3 Methods	In-Part	Bullet point 4 does not give effect to Policy 24 of the NZCPS which requires "Identification of areas that are potentially affected by coastal hazards".	Amend method by adopting the approach of Policy 24 of the NZCPS or to that effect.
101.58	Director-General of Conservation	8 Objective	In-Part	A new objective is required that will include future hazards thereby taking a precautionary approach and to recognise the need to manage hazards arising with climate change.	Include a new objective on future hazards or to that effect.
101.59	Director-General of Conservation	6 General Matters	In-Part	The provisions in this section lack consideration of the effect of activities in the urban/residential, commercial and industrial zone on natural values. Activities in the aforementioned areas can have effects on natural systems; especially water bodies. One effect comes from storm water runoff from the large area of hard surfaces. Ensuring that this water is clean before it enters water bodies should be a priority. Towns located within Coastal settings are subject to natural hazards the mitigation of which often involves	Include an issue and policy outlining the importance of treating any pollutants on-site in the aforementioned zones so that they don't impact on off-site or downstream environments for example; <u>While urban and commercial zones do not generally have significant natural values; activities in these areas can have effects on other natural systems; especially water bodies. The main effect comes from storm water runoff</u>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				protection works. Such works should have regard to the “intrinsic values” of the site’s ecosystem.	<u>and associated contamination for the large number of hard surfaces. Ensuring that this water is clean before it enters water bodies should be a priority. Natural hazard protection works at coastal townships will have regard for the intrinsic values of the site’s ecosystem.</u>
101.60	Director-General of Conservation	8.X New Policies	In-Part	Further policies are required to confirm the precautionary approach and to recognise the need to manage hazards arising with climate change.	Include two policies that ensure development locates outside known hazard areas, and recognising that the nature, location and extent of hazards will change as a result of continued climate change, and managing activities to minimise the potential impact of such changes or to that effect.
101.61	Director-General of Conservation	10.1 Issue Discussion	In-Part	The issue discussion raises valid points. However, particular regard should also be given to road earthworks which scar the landscape or cause siltation of waterways which can cause adverse effects if not managed properly. The concern is the policies are lacking any consideration of the points raised in this submission and do not correlate well with the objective.	Include policies that link to the objective and also take into account the issues that have been identified.
101.62	Director-General of Conservation	11.1.2 Policy	In-Part	Policy 11.1.2 is generally supported, however, when using the term “significant values” does this incorporate cultural and biological values? The Definitions section does not cover this term.	Amend Policy 11.1.2 through explaining what “significant values” means within this policy or define the term “significant values”.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
101.63	Director-General of Conservation	11.1 Methods	In-Part	Under “other” there is the statement “existing management arrangements for certain lakes would seem to operate...” What are the existing management arrangements that Council are referring to?	Amend Method section 11.1 by providing a list of these existing management arrangements.
101.64	Director-General of Conservation	12 General Matters	Support	General support for provisions.	Retain as notified.
101.65	Director-General of Conservation	13.2.3 Policy	In-Part	General support for Policy 13.2.3 Reference to the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) NZ Charter principles would assist.	Amend Policy 13.2.3 by inserting “ <u>adhering to ICOMOS principles</u> ” to the policy in order to provide assistance to the reader when any maintenance, redecoration, repair etc. type work is required.
101.66	Director-General of Conservation	14 General Matters	Support	General support for provisions.	Retain as notified.
101.67	Director-General of Conservation	19.1(j) Rule	In-Part	In the last bullet point of Rule 19.1 (j) the use of the words “noxious plat” should be defined or explained further to avoid ambiguity. If the intention is to cover those plants in National and Regional pest management plans then the words “noxious plants” should be replaced with “pest plants” as per the Biosecurity Act 1993. To give the Department the ability to control plants that have an adverse impact on conservation values then the following relief is sought. It is also preferable to refer to the “animal pests” as this is commonly used.	Amend Rule 19.1 (j) as follows: ... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noxious plant and pest control. • <u>Control of Pest plant, other plants adversely impacting on conservation values and animal pests.</u>
101.68	Director-General of Conservation	19.1(n) Rule	In-Part	The addition of a paragraph (iii) referring to the ICOMOS NZ Charter would assist implementation. This charter should be made	Amend Rule 19.1(n) by adding the following sentence; “(iii) <u>Consider ICOMOS NZ Charter to</u>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				an integral part of statutory or regulatory heritage management policies or plans, and should provide support for decision makers in statutory or regulatory processes.	<u>guide conservation work</u> ”, or to that effect.
101.69	Director-General of Conservation	19.4.10 Rule	In-Part	It could be helpful to provide a clear, direct, link from the provisions of Chapter 13 Historic Heritage in considering an application under this rule.	Amend Rule 19.4.10 by adding references so that in considering an application for resource consent under Rule 19.4.10 will have regard to the matters of assessment set out in Policies 3.4.2 -3.4.5.
101.70	Director-General of Conservation	19.4.12 Rule	In-Part	It could be helpful to provide a clear, direct, link from the provisions of Chapter 3 Natural Features and Values in considering an application under this rule.	Amend Rule 19.4.12 by adding references so that in considering an application for a resource consent under Rule 19.4.12 the Council will have regard to the matters of assessment set out in Policies 3.4.2 – 3.4.5.
101.71	Director-General of Conservation	20.1(j) Rule	In-Part	The notable trees related rules appears in various sections, to assist the reader it would be helpful if cross-references to the applicable chapters and rules in relation to notable trees is provided.	Amend Rule 20.1 (j) by considering cross-referencing to notable trees chapters/rules.
101.72	Director-General of Conservation	24.2.5 Rule	In-Part	The addition of a new paragraph under “subdivision:” is requested as topography along the margins has not been provided for.	Include a new sub-clause to Rule 24.2.5 as follows: <u>Topography along the margins of the water bodies which result in increased runoff from adjacent land.</u>
102.00	Christina Paton	8 General Matters	In-Part	There are no maps in the proposed District Plan on the liquefaction high risk factor that has been identified by Horizons Regional Council. Further, this information has not	Include high risk areas of liquefaction on the Planning Maps. The Proposed Plan should remain on the table until all relevant information has been

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				<p>been included in the texts of this proposed District Plan and they are therefore perceived as being incomplete.</p> <p>Would like to see this proposal laid on the table until all relevant information has been provided for public consultation and that adequate explanation is supplied as to why this information was omitted according to instruction from the Horowhenua Councillors. Given that the Christchurch City Council is currently under duress because a similar omission was decided on in the past I fail to see why the Horowhenua District Council can justify a like omission.</p> <p>(See also Submission Point 102.01 - Planning Maps General)</p>	provided for public consultation.
102.01	Christina Paton	Planning Maps	In-Part	<p>There are no maps in the proposed District Plan on the liquefaction high risk factor that has been identified by Horizons Regional Council. Further, this information has not been included in the texts of this proposed District Plan and they are therefore perceived as being incomplete.</p> <p>Would like to see this proposal laid on the table until all relevant information has been provided for public consultation and that adequate explanation is supplied as to why this information was omitted according to instruction from the Horowhenua Councillors. Given that the Christchurch City Council is currently under duress because a similar</p>	Include high risk areas of liquefaction on the Planning Maps. The Proposed Plan should remain on the table until all relevant information has been provided for public consultation.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				omission was decided on in the past I fail to see why the Horowhenua District Council can justify a like omission. (See also Natural Hazards General)	
103.00	Colin Easton	19 General Matters	In-Part	<p>Concern in regards to the use of Land Use Capability (LUC) as a means of identifying land that is class 1 & 2 (identified in the District Plan as being of a special nature that should be protected from subdivision for present and future generations). Class 1 & 2 lands are highly desirable for all types of farming including horticulture. The LUC that identified Class 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 has large areas of which can still be subdivided which should not be allowed.</p> <p>I have a property south of Ridge Road, Foxton of which ½ is classified Class 1 & 2, and the other half 3 & 4. This whole property can however grow anything that is grown in the Opiki area and has a good water table.</p> <p>Furthermore, 52 Hickford Road subdivision was on land classified as being rubbish along with sand country. I own surrounding land which is should be classified as elite soil due to the growing capabilities.</p> <p>Future generations will suffer if the council continues to subdivide good land.</p> <p>Local farmers with years of experience can identify which land is of excellent soil quality and what isn't.</p>	Amend the application of the Land Use Capability system in the Plan. The LUC systems need a complete revaluation of what soils are elite and what are not and only allow subdivision in the non-elite area.
103.01	Colin Easton	19.2(a) Rule	Oppose	Subdivision in Rural Zone should become a	Amend Rule 19.2(a) by making rural

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				discretionary activity, with required notification. There should be consultation with local farmers before subdivision is allowed to go ahead. If notification is required, objections should be heard and justified. For example reverse sensitivity and existing use of the land being safe guarded from complaints by new lifestylers who do not understand what farmers need to do to be productive.	subdivision a discretionary activity with notification required.
103.02	Colin Easton	13 General Matters	In-Part	There need to be a fund to compensate and assist those that have restrictions placed upon private property for the common good and also rates relief. This will make general public realise that there will be a cost attached to these areas.	Amend Section 13 through allowing for the setting up of a fund to compensate and assist those that have restrictions placed upon private property for the common good and also rates relief.
103.03	Colin Easton	General Matters 103	In-Part	Liquefaction needs to be looked at when subdivision is being proposed in certain areas.	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Ensure the Plan requires liquefaction to be looked at when a subdivision is being proposed.
104.00	Bill Huzziff	19.2(a) Rule	Oppose	There is a complete lack of consultation with the rural community when major changes are to take place within the rural parts of the District. These changes, such as subdivisions, have a major impact on surrounding farms. They interfere with and impose restrictions on normal farming activities and also deny rural folk their rights to produce an income and to their enjoyment of living in such an environment.	Amend Rule 19.2(a) by making rural subdivision a discretionary activity with notification required.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				<p>A large amount of land has already been subdivided. The District needs to quantify the costs and benefits of such urban sprawl. It is a requirement under Section 32 of the RMA, for planners to give due consideration to economic outcomes.</p> <p>Many subdivisions are not notified. An exception is the 232 Hickford Road, which had 23 submission submitted against by surrounding farmers and did not go ahead. There is an overabundance of subdivided land within the Horowhenua District and each subdivision has the potential to undermine and destroy the rural way of life. Theoretically there are safeguards set up by the District Council to protect the rural community. But these theoretical safeguards such as reverse sensitivity and existing use have in practice not been safeguards at all. It is for the above reasons that I believe that any subdivision, of whatever type. Should be notified discretionary under the District Plan.</p>	
105.00	Bill Huzziff	19 General Matters	In-Part	<p>Concern in regards to the use of Land Use Capability (LUC) as a means of identifying land that is class 1 & 2 (identified in the District Plan as being of a special nature that should be protected from subdivision for present and future generations). Class 1 & 2 lands are highly desirable for all types of farming and horticulture.</p>	<p>Amend the application of the Land Use Capability system in the Plan. The LUC systems need a complete revaluation of what soils are elite and what are not and only allow subdivision in the non-elite area.</p>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				<p>The LUC system is fundamentally flawed. For my area (Foxton) it fails to identify large areas of land that are superior soils. Of particular note is the farmland between Ridge Road and the Moutua spillway. The District Council has allowed subdivision to take place on these elite soils (e.g. 53 Hickford Road). Despite opposition from farmers the subdivision went ahead. The agent and farmers were aware of the quality of the soil but the LUC system wasn't. The Council is relying too heavily upon the LUC system. A rough and ready guide is not adequate for this purpose.</p>	
106.00	Rosalie Huzziff	13 General Matters	In-Part	<p>It seems completely unfair that property rights are taken away from individuals without compensation for the extra cost involved. Compensation is a well-established principle overseas. If public opinion is used to justify restrictions on private property then surely the duly elected or appointed representatives of the public are duty-bound to assist those that they restrict for the public good. For that reason I believe there is a need for the Council to set up a fund of \$1 million for recompense purposes.</p> <p>This would help those with historic buildings which are difficult to utilise and costly to maintain. In most cases the cheapest option would be to demolish and rebuild but due to historic restriction this is not an option.</p>	Amend Section 13 by allowing the establishment of a fund to compensate and assist those that have restrictions placed upon private property for the common good.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				Similarly, where restrictions are placed on farmland, farmers should be compensated. This fund would establish two important principles: the first being that all restrictions have costs involved. The second is that there is a need to be sure of justifications before restrictions are applied.	
107.00	Rosalie Huzziff	8 General Matter	In-Part	Horizons Regional Council has identified large areas of land, especially in the coastal area, which they believe would have liquefaction problems in the event of a major earthquake. They seem to have taken a broad brush approach to identifying areas rather than presenting a detailed assessment. The combination of high water tables and sandy soils make potential liquefaction very real in the event of an earthquake. Long term planning for urban development in the Foxton area would indicate that the town should head in a northerly direction as this would move development towards lighter drier soils. A revision or urban expansion would, for the Foxton area, would upset plan change 20, 21 and 22 but it is better to require planners to revise their work than have to go through the type of heartache which the people of Christchurch went through.	Include a Map which identifies the liquefaction high risk factor.
107.01	Rosalie Huzziff	19 General Matters	In-Part	All subdivision is currently classified as being a controlled activity. It is in the District Plan that urban development in the Foxton dune field domain should be kept of the dunes but	Amend Section 19 so that subdivision is prohibited in the Foxton dune field domain.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				the land area between dunes would be the land most susceptible to liquefaction. Therefore no residential subdivision should take place in this domain. It should be kept entirely for agricultural use.	
107.02	Rosalie Huzziff	Planning Maps 1, 2, 4, 5, 12, 13, 14 and 15	In-Part	Liquefaction hazard areas should be identified on Planning Maps.' No further subdivision should be permitted within the areas of high risk as published by Horizons Regional Council. In the Foxton area, the town should be headed in a northern area which would involve a revision of planned areas for urban expansion.	Amend Planning Maps 1, 2, 4, 5, 12, 13, 14 and 15 to identify liquefaction hazard areas and revise
108.00	Horowhenua District Council (Planning Department)	15.6.10(a), 15.8.5(b)(i) Rule	In-Part	The number of home occupations permitted per residential site within the Residential Zone is unclear. A total floor area of 50m ² is specified for permitted activities however the proposed rules are unclear whether this size threshold is per home occupation or a cumulative threshold for home occupations on site. The current rule could be interpreted to provide for two or more home occupations on one residential property provided each home occupation is no more than 50m ² . There is a similar issue with the 70m ² size threshold for restricted discretionary activities.	Amend Rules 15.6.10(a) and 15.8.5(b)(i) as follows: 15.6.10(a) A Home occupations shall not exceed 50m ² of total floor area dedicated to this activity. 15.8.5(b)(i) A Home occupations shall not exceed 70m ² of total floor area dedicated to this activity.
108.01	Horowhenua District Council (Planning Department)	19.6.5(a), 19.8.3(b)(i) Rule	In-Part	The number of home occupations permitted per rural site within the Rural Zone is unclear. A total floor area of 50m ² is specified for	Amend Rule 19.6.5(a) and 19.8.3(b)(i) as follows: 19.6.5(a)

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				permitted activities however the proposed rules are unclear whether this size threshold is per home occupation or a cumulative threshold for home occupations on site. The current rule could be interpreted to provide for two or more home occupations on one residential property provided each home occupation is no more than 50m ² . There is a similar issue with the 70m ² size threshold for restricted discretionary activities.	A Home occupations shall not exceed 50m ² of total floor area dedicated to this activity. 19.8.3(b)(i) A Home occupations shall not exceed 70m ² of total floor area dedicated to this activity.
108.02	Horowhenua District Council (Planning Department)	15.6.27(b) Rule	In-Part	The rule specifying the permitted display period for temporary signs allows such signs to be displayed for no more than two months for every calendar year. The reference to a calendar year would allow for a temporary sign erected in the month of November to be continuously displayed through February the following calendar year. This undermines the intent of the provision to permit the display of temporary signs for no more than two months within a 12 month period.	Amend Rule 15.6.27(b) as follows: Any temporary sign shall be displayed for no longer than two (2) calendar months in every calendar year of a <u>12 month period</u> and removed within seven (7) days after the event. Temporary signs do not need to be on the site of the temporary activity.
108.03	Horowhenua District Council (Planning Department)	16.6.4(a)(iv) Rule	In-Part	The rule specifying the permitted display period for temporary signs allows such signs to be displayed for no more than two months for every calendar year. The reference to a calendar year would allow for a temporary sign erected in the month of November to be continuously displayed through February the following calendar year. This undermines the intent of the provision to permit the display of temporary signs for no more than two	Amend Rule 16.6.4(a)(iv) as follows: Any temporary sign shall be displayed for no longer than two (2) calendar months in every calendar year of a <u>12 month period</u> and removed within seven (7) days after the event. Temporary signs do not need to be on the site of the temporary activity.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				months within a 12 month period.	
108.04	Horowhenua District Council (Planning Department)	17.6.5(a)(iv) Rule	In-Part	The rule specifying the permitted display period for temporary signs allows such signs to be displayed for no more than two months for every calendar year. The reference to a calendar year would allow for a temporary sign erected in the month of November to be continuously displayed through February the following calendar year. This undermines the intent of the provision to permit the display of temporary signs for no more than two months within a 12 month period.	Amend Rule 17.6.5(a)(iv) as follows: Any temporary sign shall be displayed for no longer than two (2) calendar months in every calendar year <u>of a 12 month period</u> and removed within seven (7) days after the event. Temporary signs do not need to be on the site of the temporary activity.
108.05	Horowhenua District Council (Planning Department)	19.6.26(c) Rule	In-Part	The rule specifying the permitted display period for temporary signs allows such signs to be displayed for no more than two months for every calendar year. The reference to a calendar year would allow for a temporary sign erected in the month of November to be continuously displayed through February the following calendar year. This undermines the intent of the provision to permit the display of temporary signs for no more than two months within a 12 month period.	Amend Rule 19.6.26(c) as follows: Any temporary sign shall be displayed for no longer than two (2) calendar months in every calendar year <u>of a 12 month period</u> and removed within seven (7) days after the event. Temporary signs do not need to be on the site of the temporary activity.
108.06	Horowhenua District Council (Planning Department)	20.6.18(b) Rule	In-Part	The rule specifying the permitted display period for temporary signs allows such signs to be displayed for no more than two months for every calendar year. The reference to a calendar year would allow for a temporary sign erected in the month of November to be continuously displayed through February the following calendar year. This undermines the	Amend Rule 20.6.18(b) as follows: Any temporary sign shall be displayed for no longer than two (2) calendar months in every calendar year <u>of a 12 month period</u> and removed within seven (7) days after the event. Temporary signs do not need to be on the site of the temporary activity.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				intent of the provision to permit the display of temporary signs for no more than two months within a 12 month period.	
108.07	Horowhenua District Council (Planning Department)	17.6.2(b), 17.6.2(c) Rule	In-Part	The phrasing of Rule 17.6.2 (b) and (c) is not explicit in the spatial area the rule applies to. Parts (b) and (c) refer to areas outside the pedestrian area overlay within the townships of Levin and Foxton but could be interpreted to apply to all areas of the district outside the pedestrian area overlays within Levin and Foxton.	Amend Rule 17.6.2 parts (b) and (c) as follows : (b) <u>In Levin</u> outside the Pedestrian Overlay Area in Levin , the following conditions apply: (c) <u>In Foxton</u> outside the Pedestrian Overlay Area in Foxton , the following conditions apply:
108.08	Horowhenua District Council (Planning Department)	19.6.4(a)(v), 19.6.4(a)(x) Rule	In-Part	The wording of Rule 19.6.4(a)(v) and 19.6.4 (a)(x) does not specify the point at which a building setback from a water body should be measured. This rule could be interpreted in several ways and requires clarity for consistency in its application.	Amend Rule 19.6.4(a)(v) and 19.6.4(a)(x) as follows: (v) 20 metres from <u>the bed of</u> any water body listed in Schedule 12 - Priority Water Bodies. (x) 20 metres from <u>the bed of</u> any water body listed in Schedule 12 - Priority Water Bodies.
108.09	Horowhenua District Council (Planning Department)	15.1(c) Rule	In-Part	The Proposed Plan provides for Visitor accommodation for up to four persons within a residential dwelling unit in the Residential and Rural Zones. The current rules introduce some uncertainty over whether visitor accommodation could be provided in both the principle dwelling unit on site and a family flat and if so whether each can accommodate four persons. The current definition of residential dwelling unit does not assist with the interpretation of the rules regarding visitor accommodation and could be read to	Amend Rule 15.1(c) as follows: Visitor accommodation for up to four persons <u>per site</u> within a <u>any</u> residential dwelling unit <u>and/or family flat</u> .

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				include a family flat. The Plan should be amended to bring greater certainty. The rule should allow visitor accommodation to be provided in different in both dwellings and family flats, however the total number of persons accommodated should not exceed four persons.	
108.10	Horowhenua District Council (Planning Department)	19.1(d) Rule	In-Part	The Proposed Plan provides for Visitor accommodation for up to four persons within a residential dwelling unit in the Residential and Rural Zones. The current rules introduce some uncertainty over whether visitor accommodation could be provided in both the principle dwelling unit on site and a family flat and if so whether each can accommodate four persons. The current definition of residential dwelling unit does not assist with the interpretation of the rules regarding visitor accommodation and could be read to include a family flat. The Plan should be amended to bring greater certainty. The rule should allow visitor accommodation to be provided in different in both dwellings and family flats, however the total number of persons accommodated should not exceed four persons.	Amend Rule 19.1(d) as follows: Visitor accommodation for up to four persons <u>per site</u> within a <u>any</u> residential dwelling unit <u>and/or family flat</u> .
108.11	Horowhenua District Council (Planning Department)	15.4(c) Rule	In-Part	The Proposed Plan provides for Visitor accommodation for up to four persons within a residential dwelling unit in the Residential and Rural Zones. The current rules introduce some uncertainty over whether visitor	Amend Rule 15.4(c) Two or more residential units/ <u>family flats</u> per site.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				accommodation could be provided in both the principle dwelling unit on site and a family flat and if so whether each can accommodate four persons. The current definition of residential dwelling unit does not assist with the interpretation of the rules regarding visitor accommodation and could be read to include a family flat. The Plan should be amended to bring greater certainty. The rule should allow visitor accommodation to be provided in different in both dwellings and family flats, however the total number of persons accommodated should not exceed four persons.	
108.12	Horowhenua District Council (Planning Department)	19.4.2(a) Rule	In-Part	The Proposed Plan is vague on whether a 'family flat' is defined as a residential dwelling unit. There are a number of rules within the Plan that would apply to family flats if they are considered a residential dwelling unit. The Plan should be amended to bring greater certainty to how the Plan is interpreted. The Plan should be amended to specifically exclude 'family flats' from the definition of residential dwelling unit. This would remove the need for family flats to comply with rules relating specifically to residential dwelling units such as outdoor living space requirements. Consequentially there are several rules which would benefit from a specific reference to the 'family flats' so it is clear how the rules are to be interpreted.	Amend Rule 19.4.2(a) as follows: Two or more residential dwelling units/ <u>family flats</u> per site.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested				
108.13	Horowhenua District Council (Planning Department)	19.6.4(b), Rule	In-Part	The Proposed Plan is vague on whether a 'family flat' is defined as a residential dwelling unit. There are a number of rules within the Plan that would apply to family flats if they are considered a residential dwelling unit. The Plan should be amended to bring greater certainty to how the Plan is interpreted. The Plan should be amended to specifically exclude 'family flats' from the definition of residential dwelling unit. This would remove the need for family flats to comply with rules relating specifically to residential dwelling units such as outdoor living space requirements. Consequentially there are several rules which would benefit from a specific reference to the 'family flats' so it is clear how the rules are to be interpreted.	Amend Rule 19.6.4(b) as follows: (b) All residential dwelling units, <u>family flats</u> and sensitive activities shall comply with the following additional setbacks and separation distances: ...				
108.14	Horowhenua District Council (Planning Department)	21-4 Table	In-Part	The Proposed Plan is vague on whether a 'family flat' is defined as a residential dwelling unit. There are a number of rules within the Plan that would apply to family flats if they are considered a residential dwelling unit. The Plan should be amended to bring greater certainty to how the Plan is interpreted. The Plan should be amended to specifically exclude 'family flats' from the definition of residential dwelling unit. This would remove the need for family flats to comply with rules relating specifically to residential dwelling units such as outdoor living space requirements. Consequentially there are	Amend Table 21-4 as follows: <table><tr><th>Activity</th><th>Number of Spaces Required</th></tr><tr><td>Residential Activities</td><td>2 spaces per residential dwelling unit. <u>1 space per family flat</u> 1 space per residential dwelling unit within a Medium Density Development.</td></tr></table>	Activity	Number of Spaces Required	Residential Activities	2 spaces per residential dwelling unit. <u>1 space per family flat</u> 1 space per residential dwelling unit within a Medium Density Development.
Activity	Number of Spaces Required								
Residential Activities	2 spaces per residential dwelling unit. <u>1 space per family flat</u> 1 space per residential dwelling unit within a Medium Density Development.								

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				several rules which would benefit from a specific reference to the 'family flats' so it is clear how the rules are to be interpreted.	
108.15	Horowhenua District Council (Planning Department)	15.6.23(a) Rule	In-Part	The proposed rules for vehicle parking, manoeuvring and loading specifically exclude network utilities on sites less than 200m ² from having to comply with parking, manoeuvring and loading provisions in Chapter 21 of the Proposed Plan. Technically Network Utility sites exceeding 200m ² in size would be caught by this rule and be required to comply with provisions set out in Chapter 21, however there are no specific parking requirements for network utilities so this aspect of the rule is redundant and can be removed.	Amend Rule 15.6.23(a) as follows: All activities, except network utilities on sites less than 200m² , shall be provided with vehicle parking spaces, manoeuvring areas, and loading facilities in accordance with the permitted activity conditions in Chapter 21.
108.16	Horowhenua District Council (Planning Department)	16.6.15(a) Rule	In-Part	The proposed rules for vehicle parking, manoeuvring and loading specifically exclude network utilities on sites less than 200m ² from having to comply with parking, manoeuvring and loading provisions in Chapter 21 of the Proposed Plan. Technically Network Utility sites exceeding 200m ² in size would be caught by this rule and be required to comply with provisions set out in Chapter 21, however there are no specific parking requirements for network utilities so this aspect of the rule is redundant and can be removed.	Amend Rule 16.6.15(a) as follows: All activities, except network utilities on sites less than 200m² , shall be provided with vehicle parking spaces, manoeuvring areas, and loading facilities in accordance with the permitted activity conditions in Chapter 21.
108.17	Horowhenua District Council (Planning	17.6.17(a)(i) Rule	In-Part	The proposed rules for vehicle parking, manoeuvring and loading specifically exclude	Amend Rule 17.6.17(a)(i) as follows: All activities, except network utilities

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
	Department)			network utilities on sites less than 200m ² from having to comply with parking, manoeuvring and loading provisions in Chapter 21 of the Proposed Plan. Technically Network Utility sites exceeding 200m ² in size would be caught by this rule and be required to comply with provisions set out in Chapter 21, however there are no specific parking requirements for network utilities so this aspect of the rule is redundant and can be removed.	on sites less than 200m² , shall be provided with vehicle parking spaces, manoeuvring areas, and loading facilities in accordance with the permitted activity conditions in Chapter 21.
108.18	Horowhenua District Council (Planning Department)	19.6.22(a) Rule	In-Part	The proposed rules for vehicle parking, manoeuvring and loading specifically exclude network utilities on sites less than 200m ² from having to comply with parking, manoeuvring and loading provisions in Chapter 21 of the Proposed Plan. Technically Network Utility sites exceeding 200m ² in size would be caught by this rule and be required to comply with provisions set out in Chapter 21, however there are no specific parking requirements for network utilities so this aspect of the rule is redundant and can be removed.	Amend Rule 17.6.17(a)(i) as follows: All activities, except network utilities on sites less than 200m² , shall be provided with vehicle parking spaces, manoeuvring areas, and loading facilities in accordance with the permitted activity conditions in Chapter 21.
108.19	Horowhenua District Council (Planning Department)	20.6.5(a) Rule	In-Part	The proposed rules for vehicle parking, manoeuvring and loading specifically exclude network utilities on sites less than 200m ² from having to comply with parking, manoeuvring and loading provisions in Chapter 21 of the Proposed Plan. Technically Network Utility sites exceeding 200m ² in size	Amend Rule 17.6.17(a)(i) as follows: All activities, except network utilities on sites less than 200m² , shall be provided with vehicle parking spaces, manoeuvring areas, and loading facilities in accordance with the permitted activity conditions in

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				would be caught by this rule and be required to comply with provisions set out in Chapter 21, however there are no specific parking requirements for network utilities so this aspect of the rule is redundant and can be removed.	Chapter 21.
108.20	Horowhenua District Council (Planning Department)	15.1(j) Rule	In-Part	The Proposed Plan contains rules which would require resource consent for the underground installation of network utilities such as pipes, lines and cables in the Flood Hazard Area. Given that the underground installation of these utilities would not result in any structures above ground that displace flood waters or would be at risk from a flood event the consent requirement would seem unduly onerous, particularly as it may be visually more acceptable to underground these utilities. The Plan should be amended to make the installation of underground network utilities a permitted activity. There would need to be an associated requirement for the ground to be reinstated with no change to the contour so that there was no additional effect on flood water flow paths.	Amend Rule 15.1(j) as follows: <u>(iii) Installation of underground network utilities.</u>
108.21	Horowhenua District Council (Planning Department)	15.6.14 Rule	In-Part	The Proposed Plan contains rules which would require resource consent for the underground installation of network utilities such as pipes, lines and cables in the Flood Hazard Area. Given that the underground installation of these utilities would not result in any structures above ground that displace	Amend Rule 15.6.14 as follows: <u>(c) Within a Flood Hazard Overlay Area, the installation of underground network utilities shall not result in any change to the existing contour of the land once the installation has been completed and earthworks reinstated.</u>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				flood waters or would be at risk from a flood event the consent requirement would seem unduly onerous, particularly as it may be visually more acceptable to underground these utilities. The Plan should be amended to make the installation of underground network utilities a permitted activity. There would need to be an associated requirement for the ground to be reinstated with no change to the contour so that there was no additional effect on flood water flow paths.	
108.22	Horowhenua District Council (Planning Department)	16.1(n) Rule	In-Part	The Proposed Plan contains rules which would require resource consent for the underground installation of network utilities such as pipes, lines and cables in the Flood Hazard Area. Given that the underground installation of these utilities would not result in any structures above ground that displace flood waters or would be at risk from a flood event the consent requirement would seem unduly onerous, particularly as it may be visually more acceptable to underground these utilities. The Plan should be amended to make the utilities a permitted activity. There installation of underground network would need to be an associated requirement for the ground to be reinstated with no change to the contour so that there was no additional effect on flood water flow paths.	Amend Rule 16.1(n) as follows: <u>(iii) Installation of underground network utilities.</u>
108.23	Horowhenua District Council (Planning	16.6.20 Rule	In-Part	The Proposed Plan contains rules which would require resource consent for the	Amend Rule 16.6.20 as follows: <u>(c) Within a Flood Hazard Overlay Area,</u>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
	Department)			underground installation of network utilities such as pipes, lines and cables in the Flood Hazard Area. Given that the underground installation of these utilities would not result in any structures above ground that displace flood waters or would be at risk from a flood event the consent requirement would seem unduly onerous, particularly as it may be visually more acceptable to underground these utilities. The Plan should be amended to make the installation of underground network utilities a permitted activity. There would need to be an associated requirement for the ground to be reinstated with no change to the contour so that there was no additional effect on flood water flow paths.	<u>the installation of underground network utilities shall not result in any change to the existing contour of the land once the installation has been completed and earthworks reinstated.</u>
108.24	Horowhenua District Council (Planning Department)	17.1(p) Rule	In-Part	The Proposed Plan contains rules which would require resource consent for the underground installation of network utilities such as pipes, lines and cables in the Flood Hazard Area. Given that the underground installation of these utilities would not result in any structures above ground that displace flood waters or would be at risk from a flood event the consent requirement would seem unduly onerous, particularly as it may be visually more acceptable to underground these utilities. The Plan should be amended to make the installation of underground network utilities a permitted activity. There would need to be an associated requirement	Amend Rule 17.1(p) as follows: <u>(iii) Installation of underground network utilities.</u>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				for the ground to be reinstated with no change to the contour so that there was no additional effect on flood water flow paths.	
108.25	Horowhenua District Council (Planning Department)	17.6.21 Rule	In-Part	The Proposed Plan contains rules which would require resource consent for the underground installation of network utilities such as pipes, lines and cables in the Flood Hazard Area. Given that the underground installation of these utilities would not result in any structures above ground that displace flood waters or would be at risk from a flood event the consent requirement would seem unduly onerous, particularly as it may be visually more acceptable to underground these utilities. The Plan should be amended to make the installation of underground network utilities a permitted activity. There would need to be an associated requirement for the ground to be reinstated with no change to the contour so that there was no additional effect on flood water flow paths.	<u>Amend Rule 17.6.21 as follows:</u> <u>(c) Within a Flood Hazard Overlay Area, the installation of underground network utilities shall not result in any change to the existing contour of the land once the installation has been completed and earthworks reinstated.</u>
108.26	Horowhenua District Council (Planning Department)	19.1(m) Rule	In-Part	The Proposed Plan contains rules which would require resource consent for the underground installation of network utilities such as pipes, lines and cables in the Flood Hazard Area. Given that the underground installation of these utilities would not result in any structures above ground that displace flood waters or would be at risk from a flood event the consent requirement would seem unduly onerous, particularly as it may be	<u>Amend Rule 19.1(m) as follows:</u> <u>(iv) Installation of underground network utilities.</u>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				visually more acceptable to underground these utilities. The Plan should be amended to make the installation of underground network utilities a permitted activity. There would need to be an associated requirement for the ground to be reinstated with no change to the contour so that there was no additional effect on flood water flow paths.	
108.27	Horowhenua District Council (Planning Department)	19.6.11(c) Rule	In-Part	The Proposed Plan contains rules which would require resource consent for the underground installation of network utilities such as pipes, lines and cables in the Flood Hazard Area. Given that the underground installation of these utilities would not result in any structures above ground that displace flood waters or would be at risk from a flood event the consent requirement would seem unduly onerous, particularly as it may be visually more acceptable to underground these utilities. The Plan should be amended to make the installation of underground network utilities a permitted activity. There would need to be an associated requirement for the ground to be reinstated with no change to the contour so that there was no additional effect on flood water flow paths.	Amend Rule 19.6.11 as follows: <u>(c) Within a Flood Hazard Overlay Area, the installation of underground network utilities shall not result in any change to the existing contour of the land once the installation has been completed and earthworks reinstated.</u>
108.28	Horowhenua District Council (Planning Department)	20.1(g) Rule	In-Part	The Proposed Plan contains rules which would require resource consent for the underground installation of network utilities such as pipes, lines and cables in the Flood Hazard Area. Given that the underground	Amend Rule 20.1(g) as follows: <u>(iii) Installation of underground network utilities.</u>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				installation of these utilities would not result in any structures above ground that displace flood waters or would be at risk from a flood event the consent requirement would seem unduly onerous, particularly as it may be visually more acceptable to underground these utilities. The Plan should be amended to make the installation of underground network utilities a permitted activity. There would need to be an associated requirement for the ground to be reinstated with no change to the contour so that there was no additional effect on flood water flow paths.	
108.29	Horowhenua District Council (Planning Department)	20.6.11 Rule	In-Part	The Proposed Plan contains rules which would require resource consent for the underground installation of network utilities such as pipes, lines and cables in the Flood Hazard Area. Given that the underground installation of these utilities would not result in any structures above ground that displace flood waters or would be at risk from a flood event the consent requirement would seem unduly onerous, particularly as it may be visually more acceptable to underground these utilities. The Plan should be amended to make the installation of underground network utilities a permitted activity. There would need to be an associated requirement for the ground to be reinstated with no change to the contour so that there was no additional effect on flood water flow paths.	Amend Rule 20.6.11 as follows: <u>(c) Within a Flood Hazard Overlay Area, the installation of underground network utilities shall not result in any change to the existing contour of the land once the installation has been completed and earthworks reinstated.</u>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
108.30	Horowhenua District Council (Planning Department)	17.6.2(d)(iii) Rule	In-Part	This rule seeks to ensure that areas of car parking are landscaped to reduce their visual impact. The rule however is unclear on whether this should apply to the scenario where a small portion of the car park extends to the frontage. To bring greater clarity and a level of pragmatism to this rule, a threshold should be introduced so that the landscaping requirement would not apply to car park areas with frontage that are less than the typical length of a car park (6m).	Amend Rule 17.6.2(d)(iii) as follows: The area between <u>the front road boundary</u> and any on-site carpark and the front road boundary <u>with a frontage of more than 6 metres</u> shall include a landscape strip. This landscaping strip shall comply with the following conditions:
108.31	Horowhenua District Council (Planning Department)	17.6.17 Rule	In-Part	The proposed rules would require that the onsite parking requirements would apply to the commercial zoned properties in Waitarere Beach, Manakau and Foxton Beach. With the exception of the commercial zoned land on the corner of Seabury Avenue and Dawick Street, the commercial zoned properties in these settlements are generally small scale properties which if developed commercial would most likely lend themselves to small commercial or retail premises. It is considered that on-street car parking in these areas would be adequate to cater for commercial activities established on these sites and therefore these sites should be made exempt from the on-site parking requirements in the same way that these requirements do not apply to the Pedestrian Overlay areas in Levin, Shannon and Foxton. The site on the corner of Seabury Avenue and	Amend 17.6.17 as follows: Note: Activities within any Pedestrian Overlay Area <u>or within Waitarere Beach, Manakau and Foxton Beach (except for the properties on the corner of Seabury Avenue and Dawick Street legally described as Lots 3 and 4 DP 91336 and Lots 1 and 2 DP 333144)</u> are not required to provide on-site vehicle parking spaces, but where parking is provided compliance is required with the conditions in Chapter 21 (except minimum number of carparks),

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				Dawick Street (legally described as Lots 3 & 4 DP 91336 and Lots 1 & 2 DP 333144) offers a much greater range of commercial opportunities and at a potentially significant scale, for this reason the on-site parking requirements should continue to apply.	
108.32	Horowhenua District Council (Planning Department)	21-4 Table	In-Part	The proposed rules would require that the onsite parking requirements would apply to the commercial zoned properties in Waitarere Beach, Manakau and Foxton Beach. With the exception of the commercial zoned land on the corner of Seabury Avenue and Dawick Street, the commercial zoned properties in these settlements are generally small scale properties which if developed commercial would most likely lend themselves to small commercial or retail premises. It is considered that on-street car parking in these areas would be adequate to cater for commercial activities established on these sites and therefore these sites should be made exempt from the on-site parking requirements in the same way that these requirements do not apply to the Pedestrian Overlay areas in Levin, Shannon and Foxton. The site on the corner of Seabury Avenue and Dawick Street (legally described as Lots 3 & 4 DP 91336 and Lots 1 & 2 DP 333144) offers a much greater range of commercial opportunities and at a potentially significant scale, for this reason the on-site parking	Amend Table 21-4 Note as follows: Note: Parking standards do not apply to <u>sites within:</u> <u>(i) the Commercial Zone Pedestrian Overlay</u> <u>(ii) Commercial Zone in Foxton Beach (except for the properties on the corner of Seabury Avenue and Dawick Street legally described as Lots 3 and 4 DP 91336 and Lots 1 and 2 DP 333144)</u> <u>(iii) Commercial Zone in Waitarere Beach</u> <u>(iv) Commercial Zone in Manakau</u>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested				
				requirements should continue to apply.					
108.33	Horowhenua District Council (Planning Department)	21.4 Table	In-Part	The Proposed Plan requires that two (2) parking spaces are to be provided for each residential unit. This is an increase from the current requirement under the Operative Plan of one (1) space per residential unit. The requirement for two (2) parking spaces is considered to be unduly onerous for the Horowhenua context and would have potential to result in additional areas of hard surfaces to provide appropriate parking spaces which could exacerbate any on-site stormwater disposal issues. The Proposed Plan should be amended to revert back to the current parking requirement of one (1) space per residential dwelling unit.	Amend Table 21.4 as follows: <table><tr><td>Activity</td><td>Number of Spaces Required</td></tr><tr><td>Residential Activities</td><td><u>12</u> spaces per residential dwelling unit.</td></tr></table>	Activity	Number of Spaces Required	Residential Activities	<u>12</u> spaces per residential dwelling unit.
Activity	Number of Spaces Required								
Residential Activities	<u>12</u> spaces per residential dwelling unit.								
108.34	Horowhenua District Council (Planning Department)	16.6.5(e)(iv) Rule	In-Part	The rule exempting certain activities from the permitted noise levels appears in each zone. Each rule refers to 'a normal residential activity'. For the Commercial, Industrial and Open Space zones the rule should be made zone specific by referring to the predominant permitted activity in each respective zone instead of referring to 'residential activity'.	Amend Rule 16.6.5(e)(iv) as follows: Vehicles being driven on a road (within the meaning of Section 2(1) of the Transport Act 1962), or within a site as part of or compatible with a normal residential <u>industrial</u> activity.				
108.35	Horowhenua District Council (Planning Department)	17.6.6(e)(iv) Rule	In-Part	The rule exempting certain activities from the permitted noise levels appears in each zone. Each rule refers to 'a normal residential activity'. For the Commercial, Industrial and Open Space zones the rule should be made zone specific by referring to the predominant permitted activity in each respective zone	Rule 17.6.6(e)(iv) Vehicles being driven on a road (within the meaning of Section 2(1) of the Transport Act 1962), or within a site as part of or compatible with a normal residential <u>commercial</u> activity.				

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				instead of referring to 'residential activity'.	
108.36	Horowhenua District Council (Planning Department)	20.6.7(d)(iv) Rule	In-Part	The rule exempting certain activities from the permitted noise levels appears in each zone. Each rule refers to 'a normal residential activity'. For the Commercial, Industrial and Open Space zones the rule should be made zone specific by referring to the predominant permitted activity in each respective zone instead of referring to 'residential activity'.	Amend Rule 20.6.7(d)(iv) as follows: Vehicles being driven on a road (within the meaning of Section 2(1) of the Transport Act 1962), or within a site as part of or compatible with a normal residential <u>recreation</u> activity.
108.37	Horowhenua District Council (Planning Department)	26 Definitions – New definition “Bed”	Support	To assist with the interpretation of amended Rules 19.6.4(a)(v) and 19.6.4(a)(x) it is also recommended that reference to the Resource Management Act 1991 definition of 'bed' is included in Chapter 26: General Provisions Definitions.	Include definition for “bed” as follows: <u>Bed has the same meaning as in the Resource Management Act 1991.</u>
108.38	Horowhenua District Council (Planning Department)	26 Definitions - Residential Dwelling Unit	In-Part	The Proposed Plan is vague on whether a ‘family flat’ is defined as a residential dwelling unit. The Plan should be amended to specifically exclude ‘family flats’ from the definition of residential dwelling unit. This would remove the need for family flats to comply with rules relating specifically to residential dwelling units such as outdoor living space requirements.	Amend Residential Dwelling Unit definition as follows: Residential Dwelling Unit means a building which accommodates one (1) household unit, and can include a dwelling house, a flat, a home unit, an apartment, or a town house, <u>but excludes a family flat.</u>
108.39	Horowhenua District Council (Planning Department)	26 Definitions - Family Flat	In-Part	The family flat definition does not include a size requirement for a family flat in the Proposed District Plan as it does in the Operative Plan. This size requirement is included in the zone chapter rules. The Greenbelt Residential Chapter sits outside the Proposed Plan and cannot be updated to	Amend Family Flat definition as follows: Family Flat means any detached building which shall be capable of being a self-contained residential unit with kitchen and bathroom facilities, and shall be secondary in scale to any

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				reflect this change at this time. To cover the interim period it is recommended a note be added to the family flat definition to ensure that there will be a size requirement for a family flat in the Greenbelt Residential Zone before the appropriate amendment can be made through the plan variation process.	principal residential dwelling on the site. <u>Note: A Family Flat in the Greenbelt Residential Zone shall be no more than 50m² in maximum gross floor area (plus a covered verandah up to 10m²).</u>
108.40	Horowhenua District Council (Planning Department)	Planning Map 13	In-Part	A section of Edinburgh Terrace, Foxton Beach is displayed as Rural Zone on Planning Map 13. This should be displayed as road reserve to match its actual land use and correct zoning.	Amend Planning Map 13 to identify Lot 4 DP 9897 and Part Lot 3 DP 10243 as Road Reserve.
108.41	Horowhenua District Council (Planning Department)	Planning Map 15	In-Part	There are two properties at 149 and 151 Union Street, Foxton which have split zones. These sites have been developed as rural properties and the residential component does not match this development. Where possible split zones within the Plan have tried to be avoided.	Amend Planning Map 15 to identify the residential parts of 149 and 151 Union Street (Lots 6 and 7 DP 345888) as within the Rural Zone to reflect the existing land use and to give each property a single zone.
108.42	Horowhenua District Council (Planning Department)	Planning Maps 17 and 19	In-Part	A section of Taonui Street, Waitarere Beach is displayed as Rural Zone on Planning Map 17 and 19. This should be displayed as road reserve to reflect its actual land use and correct zoning.	Amend Planning Maps 17 and 19 to identify Lot 14 DP 24470 as Road Reserve.
108.43	Horowhenua District Council (Planning Department)	Planning Map 19	In-Part	Two sections connecting Kahukura Avenue and Park Avenue should both be displayed as road reserve to match the correct zoning of the accessway.	Amend Planning Map 19 to identify Lot 13 DP 42904 and Lot 173 DP 50461 as Road Reserve.
108.44	Horowhenua District Council (Planning Department)	Planning Map 27A	In-Part	A small corner section on the corner of Stanley Street and Salisbury Street, Levin should be displayed as road reserve to reflect	Amend Planning Map 27A to identify Lot 3 DP 21580 as Road Reserve.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				the correct land use.	
108.45	Horowhenua District Council (Planning Department)	Planning Map 29	In-Part	A roadside section on Hokio Beach Road should be zoned as residential to reflect the current land use.	Amend Planning Map 29 to identify Section 1 SO 37969 as within the Residential Zone.
108.46	Horowhenua District Council (Planning Department)	Planning Maps 5, 7, 10, 15A and 27	In-Part	The Council owned cemeteries in the District including Ihakara Gardens are zoned Residential or Rural. Although the cemeteries are proposed to be designated by Horowhenua District Council it is considered that the Proposed Open Space Zone would be the most appropriate underlying zone for these sites. The Open Space zone reflects the limited development opportunities these sites offer and the contribution these spaces can make to open space within the district. The Proposed Planning Maps should amend the zoning of each cemetery.	Amend Planning Maps 5, 7, 10, 15A and 27 to rezone the following cemeteries as Open Space Zone: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rezone Ihakara Gardens (Cemetery), Foxton, (Legally described as Awahou 97B) from Residential to Open Space. • Rezone Mako Mako Road (Old Levin Cemetery), Levin (Legally described as Section 29 Blk Waiopehu SD) from Residential to Open Space • Rezone Avenue Cemetery, Avenue North Road, Levin (Legally described as Lot 3 DP 397828) from Rural to Open Space. • Rezone Foxton Cemetery, Hickford Road, Foxton (Legally described as Sec 614 Town of Foxton & Lot 2 DP 61106) from Rural to Open Space. • Rezone Shannon Cemetery, Brown Street, Shannon (Legally described as Lots 486 & 488 DP 369) from Rural to Open Space.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rezone Koputaroa Cemetery, Koputaroa Road (Legally described as Pt Lot 1 DP 4297) from Rural to Open Space. Rezone Manakau Cemetery, South Manakau Road, Manakau (Legally described as Pt Lot 28A).
108.47	Horowhenua District Council (Planning Department)	19.6.4(c) Rule	In-Part	The Proposed Plan is vague on whether a 'family flat' is defined as a residential dwelling unit. There are a number of rules within the Plan that would apply to family flats if they are considered a residential dwelling unit. The Plan should be amended to bring greater certainty to how the Plan is interpreted. The Plan should be amended to specifically exclude 'family flats' from the definition of residential dwelling unit. This would remove the need for family flats to comply with rules relating specifically to residential dwelling units such as outdoor living space requirements. Consequentially there are several rules which would benefit from a specific reference to the 'family flats' so it is clear how the rules are to be interpreted.	Amend Rule 19.6.4(c) as follows: (c)Any building used for intensive farming activity shall comply with the following setbacks and separation distances: (i) 300 metres from any residential dwelling unit, <u>family flat</u> and other sensitive activities on any other site;
109.00	Charles Rudd (Snr)	A Introduction	In-Part	Amend Maori Values section to reflect: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Muaupoko, Rangitane, Ngati Apa, Ngati Raukawa ki te Tonga. 	No specific relief requested: Inferred: Amend A Introduction as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Muaupoko Ngati Apa Ngati Raukawa

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rangitane • <u>Muaupoko, Rangitane, Ngati Apa, Ngati Raukawa ki te Tonga.</u>
109.01	Charles Rudd (Snr)	A Introduction	In-Part	The submitter seeks amendment to the Statutory Acknowledgement section so that the statement is expressed correctly and reflects the words of the Treaty of Waitangi 1840.	<p>Include the following statement: The treaty settlement is an agreement between the Crown and Maori, which states 'Her Majesty the Queen of England confirms and guarantees to the Chiefs and <u>Tribes of New Zealand and to their respective families and individuals</u> thereof, the full exclusive and undisturbed possession of their Lands and Estates, Forests, Fisheries, and other properties which they may collectively possess, so long as it is their wish and desire to maintain the same in their possession.</p> <p><u>Status of Maori Land in New Zealand:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>1. Maori Customary Land</u> <u>2. Maori Freehold Land</u> <u>3. General Land Owned by Maori</u> <u>4. General Land</u> <u>5. Crown Land</u> <u>6. Crown Land Reserved for Maori</u>
109.02	Charles Rudd (Snr)	1 Introduction	In-Part	<p>Chapter 1, paragraph 2 states: <i>This section recognises that the Council exercises its functions within the tribal boundaries of the following Iwi:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Muaupoko • Ngati Apa 	<p>Amend Chapter 1 Introduction as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Muaupoko • Ngati Apa • Ngati Raukawa • Rangitane

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ngati Raukawa • Rangitane <p>The submitter seeks amendments to this list to reflect the correct order.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Muaupoko</u> • <u>Rangitane</u> • <u>Ngati Apa</u> • <u>Ngati Raukawa ki te Tonga</u>
109.03	Charles Rudd (Snr)	1 Introduction	In-Part	The submitter seeks amendment to Chapter 1 Introduction Statement of Muaupoko to reflect the correct listing of traditional hapu who are active.	<p>Muaupoko have many traditional hapu. Those currently active are: Ngati Pariri, Ngati Hine, Ngati Tamarangi, Ngati Whanokirangi, Ngati Te Ao, Te Ngarue and Punahau.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Ngai te Ngarue</u> • <u>Ngai te Ao</u> • <u>Ngati Tamarangi</u> • <u>Ngati Hine</u> • <u>Ngati Pariri</u> • <u>Ngati Whanokirangi</u> • <u>Punahau</u>
109.04	Charles Rudd (Snr)	General Matters 109	In-Part	<p>The submitter seeks the inclusion and use of Māori place names including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waipunahau = Lake Horowhenua • Waiwiri = Lake Papaitonga/Buller Lake • Waitawa = Forest Lakes 	<p>Amend the District Plan to include references to and use of the following Māori place names</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waipunahau = Lake Horowhenua • Waiwiri = Lake Papaitonga/Buller Lake • Waitawa = Forest Lakes
109.05	Charles Rudd (Snr)	1 Introduction	In-Part	<p>The submitter seeks the deletion of the statement of the recognised Mandated Iwi Authority representing Muaupoko for the following reasons:</p> <p>Misinformation in the proposed document, Muaupoko Tribal Authority Incorporated</p>	<p>Delete the following:</p> <p>At the time of preparing the Proposed District Plan, the Muaupoko Tribal Authority Incorporated is the recognised Mandated Iwi Authority representing Muaupoko for the</p>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				were going through a process at the time of preparing the proposed document, represents only those registered with them, do not represent the Muaupoko tribe, conflicts with sections 6, 7, 8 and 95E of the RMA, Iwi authorities should not get preferential treatment and should be required to make submissions like anyone else.	purposes of the RMA. The Muaupoko Tribal Authority encourages and invites consultation should people wish to know its views and obtain information regarding sites and areas of significance to Muaupoko.
109.06	Charles Rudd (Snr)	General Matters 109	In-Part	The submitter considers that there may be potential issues with Part B, C, D, E and F of the Proposed District Plan and reserves the right to put forth and speak on these issues.	Not specific relief requested.
110.00	W. Fraser	26 Definitions – New definition “Loading”	In-Part	The submitter seeks the inclusion of a definition for ‘Loading’ to provide a definitive explanation of the term.	Include definition for “Loading” as follows: <u>Loading includes loading and unloading of goods and freight.</u>
110.01	W. Fraser	26 Definitions - Sensitive Activities	In-Part	The submitter considers provision should be made to exclude “houses of prostitution” from residential precincts. Also the control on the location and number of liquor stores should be made more definitive. To achieve these exclusions the submitter considers the inclusion of these terms/activities in the “sensitive activities” definition is appropriate.	Amend definition for Sensitive Activities to include 'houses of prostitution' and 'liquor stores' as Sensitive Activities.
110.02	W. Fraser	16.1(b) Rule	In-Part	The submitter considers retail activities should be identified as permitted activities in the Industrial Zone alongside ‘wholesale trade’ activities.	Amend Rule 16.1(b) to include retail activities as permitted activities.
110.03	W. Fraser	16.6.11 Rule	In-Part	The submitter seeks the inclusion of	Amend Rule 16.6.11 to include

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				petroleum and other hazardous chemicals in the waste disposal rule.	reference to petroleum and other hazardous chemicals
110.04	W. Fraser	16 General Matters	In-Part	The submitter considers the Tararua Road Growth Area setbacks that apply from industrial areas to residential area marginal and should be carefully assessed.	No specific relief requested: Inferred: Amend the Tararua Road Growth Area Overlay setback provisions to provide appropriate residential protection from the industrial area.
110.05	W. Fraser	6 General Matters	In-Part	The submitter agrees that large format retailing needs to be planned for, but that a balanced outcome is required where economic advancement is progressed and the lifestyle (and property values) of the adjacent residential precinct are not degraded.	No specific relief request. Inferred: Amend the Commercial Objectives, Policies and Methods to achieve a balance outcome that will not degrade property values or lifestyle of the adjacent residential precinct and at the same time advance the economic well-being.
110.06	W. Fraser	6 General Matters	In-Part	The submitter agrees that large format retailing needs to be planned for, but that a balanced outcome is required where economic advancement is progressed and the lifestyle (and property values) of the adjacent residential precinct are not degraded.	No specific relief request. Inferred: Include a new method that provide for the establishment of a Design Panel or mechanism to study and advise with some authority, Council on the best practice design standards for any new retailing activity.
110.07	W. Fraser	S10 4.5	In-Part	The submitter seeks provision for visitor parking in higher density developments. With more urban infill there will be more isolation if provision is not made for human interaction.	Include provision for visitor parking in higher density developments.
111.00	Mark Dunn	Planning Map 28B	Oppose	Oppose the Medium Density Area on	Amend Planning Map 28B to remove

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				Manchester Street, Levin. All properties identified as within the Medium Density Area excluding 14 Manchester Street, have been subdivided below 700m ² therefore there is no need to change the zoning.	all properties on Manchester Street, Levin that are within the Medium Density Area.
112.00	Shannon Progressive Association	Planning Map 21	Support	Support the rezoning of 39a Margaret Street, Shannon from Residential to Open Space provided this enhances the waterwheel project which Shannon Progressive Association are proceeding with on this site.	Retain the propose rezoning of 39a Margaret Street, Shannon from Residential Zone to Open Space Zone on Planning Map 21.
113.00	Ron & Betty Zanobergen	19.4.7 Rule	Oppose	Oppose Rule 19.4.7. The submitter is concerned that their property being within the Coastal Natural Character and Hazard Area Overlay will result in a decrease in the property value and cause the cost of insurance to increase. Meanwhile Council rates will not decrease. There is also little certainty where a tsunami would effect.	Delete Rule 19.4.7.
113.01	Ron & Betty Zanobergen	Planning Map 36	Oppose	Oppose the inclusion of 59a Reay MacKay Grove, Waikawa Beach within the proposed Coastal Natural Character and Hazard Area.	Amend Planning Map 36 to remove 59a Reay MacKay Grove, Waikawa Beach from within the proposed Coastal Natural Character and Hazard Area.
114.00	Gary Spelman	Planning Map 27A and 28A	Oppose	Oppose the rezoning of properties in the Exeter and Bristol Street, Levin area from Residential to Commercial. The submitter has concerns regarding the impact of commercial rezoning on abutting residential properties. Given the current low projected development, it is questioned whether the rezoning is necessary.	Amend Planning Maps 27A and 28A to remove the proposed rezoning of properties in the Exeter and Bristol Street, Levin area to Commercial and maintain as Residential.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
114.01	Gary Spelman	17 General Matters	In-Part	In the case that Submission point 114.00 is not satisfied, the submitter seeks that the following issues are specified with regard to future commercial developments occurring on a Residential Zone boundary: Single level low profile structure with high degree of articulation; limit on the maximum site coverage with specific setback requirements on the zone boundary; consideration of operational aspects of the planned commercial activity with respect to delivery hours, positioning of extraction and like systems and positioning of off-street parking; hours of operation; noise and vibration; and respect for environment.	Amend Chapter 17 to ensure the following issues are specified with regard to future commercial developments occurring on a Residential Zone boundary: Single level low profile structure with high degree of articulation; limit on the maximum site coverage with specific setback requirements on the zone boundary; consideration of operational aspects of the planned commercial activity with respect to delivery hours, positioning of extraction and like systems and positioning of off-street parking; hours of operation; noise and vibration; and respect for environment.
115.00	Alan McKenna	Planning Map 26	Oppose	Oppose the rezoning of land on State Highway 1 South shown as proposed Industrial. There is adequate industrial land about the area including Tararua Road which should be promoted. Existing use of this land is consented and the status quo works well.	Amend Planning Map 26 to remove the proposed rezoning from Rural to Industrial on the properties south of Levin, State Highway 1, and maintain the current Rural zoning.
116.00	Truebridge Associates Limited	15.1(m) Rule	In-Part	It appears that this section should be moved to discretionary activities as items (i) to (iii) are permitted activities which is not believed to be the intent of the rule.	Delete Rule 15.1(m) as a permitted activity and insert as a discretionary activity.
116.01	Truebridge Associates Limited	15.4(d) Rule	In-Part	This rule should be a controlled activity, not a discretionary activity. This would better promote new development in these areas and would be more in line with	Delete Rule 15.4(d) as a discretionary activity and insert as a controlled activity.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				Central Government desire to enable low cost housing.	
116.02	Truebridge Associates Limited	15.6.9(a)(i) Rule	Oppose	Oppose the permitted height of 1.5m or the top of 0.5m of a 2m fence as it is unduly restrictive.	Delete Rule 15.6.9(a)(i).
116.03	Truebridge Associates Limited	15.7.5(a)(i) Rule	Oppose	This rule is very restrictive and is partly covered by other rules including shape factor, minimum and average lot size, sight configuration and amenity rules which are more relevant. To control such matters at the time of subdivision would require the creation of a consent notice which would require on-going monitoring by the local authority and remove any flexibility of the owner.	Delete Rule 15.7.5(a)(i).
116.04	Truebridge Associates Limited	Table 15-3	In-Part	<p>In order to get more uniform standard infill development in the settlements the title issue date should be related to a standard cool off period not a specific date as is the current situation.</p> <p>A fixed date as opposed to a running fixed period does not fit with aging dwellings or environmental change.</p> <p>A more relevant option would be to have a running cool off period of 10 years from the date of title issue.</p>	Amend Table 15-3 to allow for a running cool off period of 10 years from the date of title issue.
116.05	Truebridge Associates Limited	Table 15-3	In-Part	There are two sizes depending on whether or not there is an existing dwelling on the site. In most cases infill development involves a site that has an existing dwelling and the dwelling is removed which effectively changes the	Amend Table 15-3 to specify one parent lot size of 2025m ² .

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				assessment criteria after consent. Therefore there should be one parent size in order to make the rule clear and unambiguous.	
116.06	Truebridge Associates Limited	Table 15-3	In-Part	There is an inconsistency in the residential lot sizes in this table. In Ohau West and Manakau the minimum lot area is 2000m ² where sewage disposal is not available and in Ohau East the minimum area is 8000m ² . These two areas should be the same, as the rule appears to be based on sewage disposal to ground and in the case of Ohau East the minimum area is considerably more than in the greenbelt residential area which is adjacent to it.	Amend Table 15-3 to specify the minimum area in order of 4000m ² to 5000m ² where a sewage disposal system is not available.
116.07	Truebridge Associates Limited	15.8.9 Rule	In-Part	This rule should be a controlled activity in relation to subdivision and/ or development.	Delete Rule 15.8.9 as matters of discretion and insert as matters of control.
116.08	Truebridge Associates Limited	15.8.9(a) Rule	In-Part	Matters that relate to monitoring after the completion of the consent should be removed as the cost and ability of Council to do this on and on-going basis will be prohibitive and off-putting to residents and ratepayers.	Delete parts of Rule 15.8.9(a) that require on-going monitoring after completion of consent.
116.09	Truebridge Associates Limited	15.8.9(b)(i) Rule	In-Part	A minimum lot area is not needed as the proposed zone will carry requirements under site coverage and amenity for each site that will result in the desired site size. The purpose of this development does not require open space to the same degree as normal residential development and those most likely to utilise this type of development want smaller, more compact, lower cost and	Delete Rule 15.8.9(b)(i).

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				<p>lower maintenance properties. Conditions (ii)-(x) control the lot size so this rule is not needed.</p> <p>All that is needed is for the applicant to show that a sensible permitted dwelling can be accommodated within each lot, along with site amenity.</p> <p>Other district plans (Wellington City and Palmerston North City) do not have minimum lot areas and use other controls to ensure a proper relationship between buildings and amenity.</p>	
116.10	Truebridge Associates Limited	15.8.9(b)(viii) Rule	In-Part	Not required as many people will not want an outside shed and if they do then it is personal choice.	Delete Rule 15.8.9(b)(vii).
116.11	Truebridge Associates Limited	Planning Maps 12, 17, 19, 27, 27A, 27B, 28, 28A, 28B, 29 and 30	In-Part	<p>The submitter considers the proposed areas of medium density overlay are too small within Levin, Waitarere Beach and Foxton Beach and should be extended (as shown on map attached to the submission). Only a few lots within the Levin area will actually be redeveloped, so need a greater coverage to offer the opportunity for new development.</p> <p>Extend the Medium Density Area to promote redevelopment in the existing settlement centres rather than large scale greenfields that require continual extension of Council infrastructure.</p>	Amend Planning Maps 12, 17, 19, 27, 27A, 27B, 28, 28A, 28B, 29 and 30 as marked on attachment to Submission 116.
117.00	New Zealand Historic Places Trust	S2-New	In-Part	The submitter seeks the inclusion of the house located at 947 Koputaroa Road, Levin, formerly located at 41 Bath Street, Levin. This	Include the house located at 947 Koputaroa Road, Levin as a Category 2 registered historic place in Schedule 2.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				house is registered with NZHPT as a Category 2 registered historic place. NZHPT seeks that Council carry out more research in partnership with NZHPT to determine an additional inclusion to Schedule 2.	
117.01	New Zealand Historic Places Trust	S2-General	In-Part	The submitter seek that the nomenclature of Category I and II items is amended to Category 1 and 2 for consistency with NZHPT and relevant legislation.	Amend Schedule 2 to update terms Category I and II to read as Category 1 and 2.
117.02	New Zealand Historic Places Trust	S2-General	In-Part	A number of sites proposed on the schedule are currently being revisited through NZHPT's registration process. NZHPT requests that the following scheduled sites be updated to reflect the current status of these sites. Duncan House, All Saints Church, Nye Homestead Sunnyside, Dwelling, Opiki Suspension Bridge, Tane Flaxmill remains.	Amend Schedule 2 to include a column titled 'New NZHPT Category' and the following sites will be identified using this column with the text ' Under consideration and will confirm at hearing' Duncan House, All Saints Church, Nye Homestead Sunnyside, Dwelling, Opiki Suspension Bridge, Tane Flaxmill remains.
117.03	New Zealand Historic Places Trust	1.3 Methods District Plan	In-Part	The submitter notes that legal case law has determined that holding silent files could be ultra vires which would challenge this method.	No specific relief requested.
117.04	New Zealand Historic Places Trust	4.1.3 Policy	In-Part	The submitter seeks that the Open Space Policy also reflects heritage values of parks, for example parks with memorials .	Amend Policy 4.1.3 to reflect heritage values of parks.
117.05	New Zealand Historic Places Trust	13 General Matters	Support	Support the objectives, policies and methods contained within Chapter 13.	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Retain all objectives, policies and methods in Chapter 13.
117.06	New Zealand Historic Places Trust	15.2(b), 15.3(f), 15.7.2 and 15.8.11	Support	Support enhanced provisions relating to earthquake strengthening of heritage	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Retain Rules 15.2(b), 15.3(f),

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
		Rule		buildings.	15.7.2 and 15.8.11
117.07	New Zealand Historic Places Trust	16.2(d), 16.3(e), 16.7.4 and 16.8.6 Rule	Support	Support enhanced provisions relating to earthquake strengthening of heritage buildings.	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Retain Rules 16.2(d), 16.3(e), 16.7.4 and 16.8.6
117.08	New Zealand Historic Places Trust	17.2(d), 17.3(e), 17.7.4 and 17.8.5 Rule	Support	Support enhanced provisions relating to earthquake strengthening of heritage buildings.	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Retain Rules 17.2(d), 17.3(e), 17.7.4 and 17.8.5
117.09	New Zealand Historic Places Trust	19.2(f), 19.3.4(a), 19.7.8 and 19.8.5 Rule	Support	Support enhanced provisions relating to earthquake strengthening of heritage buildings.	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Retain Rules 19.2(f), 19.3.4(a), 19.7.8 and 19.8.5
117.10	New Zealand Historic Places Trust	20.2(d), 20.3(e), 20.7.4 and 20.8.5 Rule	Support	Support enhanced provisions relating to earthquake strengthening of heritage buildings.	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Retain Rules 20.2(d), 20.3(e), 20.7.4 and 20.8.5.
117.11	New Zealand Historic Places Trust	13.X New Policy	Support	Include a policy which is in line with the ICOMOS Charter (attached to the submission) that would assist in the identification of Historic Heritage Values.	Include a new Policy in Chapter 13 as follows: <u>The assessment of heritage values in the district for listing will be guided by the ICOMOS Charter for Assessing Historic Heritage Values in the District.</u>
117.12	New Zealand Historic Places Trust	13 General Matters	In-Part	The submitter recommends cross referencing the Chapter 13 to the Horowhenua Heritage Strategy, especially in light of its action plans. It is suggested that the Heritage Strategy action plans are listed as methods for this Chapter.	Include cross referencing in Chapter 13 to the Heritage Strategy and include the Strategy action plans as methods.
117.13	New Zealand Historic Places Trust	16.6.9 Rule	Oppose	The submitter considers that this rule could be ultra vires as it could not be enforced.	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Delete Rule 16.6.9.
117.14	New Zealand Historic Places Trust	15.7.5(a)(vi) Rule	In-Part	The submitter is supportive of the inclusion of subdivision rules and the matters of controls, but in addition seeks the inclusion of archaeological sites as not all archaeological	Amend Rule 15.7.5(a) (vi) as follows: Effects on significant sites and features, including natural, cultural, <u>archaeological</u> and historical sites.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				sites are deemed as cultural sites.	
117.15	New Zealand Historic Places Trust	16.7.1(a)(vi) Rule	In-Part	The submitter is supportive of the inclusion of subdivision rules and the matters of controls, but in addition seeks the inclusion of archaeological sites as not all archaeological sites are deemed as cultural sites.	Amend Rule 16.7.1(a) (vi) as follows: Effects on significant sites and features, including natural, cultural, <u>archaeological</u> and historical sites.
117.16	New Zealand Historic Places Trust	17.7.1(a) (vi) Rule	In-Part	The submitter is supportive of the inclusion of subdivision rules and the matters of controls, but in addition seeks the inclusion of archaeological sites as not all archaeological sites are deemed as cultural sites.	Amend Rule 17.7.1(a) (vi) as follows: Effects on significant sites and features, including natural, cultural, <u>archaeological</u> and historical sites.
117.17	New Zealand Historic Places Trust	18.7.1(e) Rule	In-Part	The submitter is supportive of the inclusion of subdivision rules and the matters of controls, but in addition seeks the inclusion of archaeological sites as not all archaeological sites are deemed as cultural sites.	Amend Rule 18.7.1(e) as follows: Effects on significant sites and features, including natural, cultural, <u>archaeological</u> and historical sites.
117.18	New Zealand Historic Places Trust	19.7.1(a)(v) Rule	In-Part	The submitter is supportive of the inclusion of subdivision rules and the matters of controls, but in addition seeks the inclusion of archaeological sites as not all archaeological sites are deemed as cultural sites.	Amend Rule 19.7.1(a) (v) as follows: Effects on significant sites and features, including natural, cultural, <u>archaeological</u> and historical sites.
117.19	New Zealand Historic Places Trust	20.7.1(a)(vi) Rule	In-Part	The submitter is supportive of the inclusion of subdivision rules and the matters of controls, but in addition seeks the inclusion of archaeological sites as not all archaeological sites are deemed as cultural sites.	Amend Rule 20.7.1(vi) as follows: Effects on significant sites and features, including natural, cultural, <u>archaeological</u> and historical sites.
117.20	New Zealand Historic Places Trust	15.4 Rule	In-Part	The submitter seeks the inclusion of subdivision that negatively impacts on heritage values of listed sites in Schedule 2 as a discretionary activity.	Amend Rule 15.4 to include subdivisions that negatively impact on the heritage values of any sites listed in Schedule 2.
117.21	New Zealand	16.4 Rule	In-Part	The submitter seeks the inclusion of	Amend Rule 16.4 to include

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
	Historic Places Trust			subdivision that negatively impacts on heritage values of listed sites in Schedule 2 as a discretionary activity.	subdivisions that negatively impact on the heritage values of any sites listed in Schedule 2.
117.22	New Zealand Historic Places Trust	17.4 Rule	In-Part	The submitter seeks the inclusion of subdivision that negatively impacts on heritage values of listed sites in Schedule 2 as a discretionary activity.	Amend Rule 17.4 to include subdivisions that negatively impact on the heritage values of any sites listed in Schedule 2.
117.23	New Zealand Historic Places Trust	19.4 Rule	In-Part	The submitter seeks the inclusion of subdivision that negatively impacts on heritage values of listed sites in Schedule 2 as a discretionary activity.	Amend Rule 19.4 to include subdivisions that negatively impact on the heritage values of any sites listed in Schedule 2.
117.24	New Zealand Historic Places Trust	20.4 Rule	In-Part	The submitter seeks the inclusion of subdivision that negatively impacts on heritage values of listed sites in Schedule 2 as a discretionary activity.	Amend Rule 20.4 to include subdivisions that negatively impact on the heritage values of any sites listed in Schedule 2.
117.25	New Zealand Historic Places Trust	15 General	In-Part	There are no standards for earthworks within the Residential Zone and this could significantly change the lay and look of the land, and affect the heritage values of sites. This level of permitted earthworks in relation to heritage sites will lead to a loss of heritage values and a potential loss of important archaeological sites.	Amend Chapter 15 to include earthworks rules that apply to historic heritage sites. Any earthworks within these sites should be restricted discretionary or discretionary activities dependent on the effects of the proposed earthworks on the heritage values of the sites.
117.26	New Zealand Historic Places Trust	16 General Matters	In-Part	There are no standards for earthworks on heritage sites and this could affect the heritage values of sites. This could lead to a loss of heritage values and a potential loss of important archaeological sites.	Amend Chapter 16 to include earthworks rules that apply to historic heritage sites. Any earthworks within these sites should be restricted discretionary or discretionary activities dependent on the effects of the proposed earthworks on the heritage values of the sites.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
117.27	New Zealand Historic Places Trust	17 General Matters	In-Part	There are no standards for earthworks on heritage sites and this could affect the heritage values of sites. This could lead to a loss of heritage values and a potential loss of important archaeological sites.	Amend Chapter 17 to include earthworks rules that apply to historic heritage sites. Any earthworks within these sites should be restricted discretionary or discretionary activities dependent on the effects of the proposed earthworks on the heritage values of the sites.
117.28	New Zealand Historic Places Trust	19 General Matters	In-Part	There are no standards for earthworks on heritage sites and this could affect the heritage values of sites. This could lead to a loss of heritage values and a potential loss of important archaeological sites.	Amend Chapter 19 to include earthworks rules that apply to historic heritage sites. Any earthworks within these sites should be restricted discretionary or discretionary activities dependent on the effects of the proposed earthworks on the heritage values of the sites.
117.29	New Zealand Historic Places Trust	13.1 Methods	In-Part	The submitter seeks a collaborative approach to the cultural heritage survey that includes Council, Iwi, a historian and NZHPT to identify new listings that could also inform possibilities for registration under the Historic Places Act. It is recommended that conducting the survey that the New Zealand Archaeological Association Archsite be used as a tool for capturing sites. The submitter seeks that as part of the survey Council has strategies in place to record and list archaeological sites and to adopt layers around archaeologically sensitive areas. As part of the cultural heritage survey, the submitter recommends that best practice	Include as part of Method 13.1 the Council has strategies in place to record and list archaeological sites and to adopt layers around archaeologically sensitive areas. The cultural heritage survey should also develop new objectives, policies and rules for significant archaeological sites in the district.

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
				rules for significant archaeological sites are developed in close consultation with tangata whenua and the NZHPT. Consultation should also occur with landowners.	
117.30	New Zealand Historic Places Trust	20 General Matters	In-Part	There are no standards for earthworks on heritage sites and this could affect the heritage values of sites. This could lead to a loss of heritage values and a potential loss of important archaeological sites.	Amend Chapter 20 to include earthworks rules that apply to historic heritage sites. Any earthworks within these sites should be restricted discretionary or discretionary activities dependent on the effects of the proposed earthworks on the heritage values of the sites.
117.31	New Zealand Historic Places Trust	1.2 Methods District Plan	In-Part	The submitter supports the Council's future investigative cultural heritage survey with Iwi and the New Zealand Historic Places trust to ensure cultural and historic heritage will be captured in the District Plan. As part of this method Historic Places Trust hope that all historic marae of the district can be recognised .	No specific relief requested. Inferred: Retain 1.2 Methods
117.32	New Zealand Historic Places Trust	25.X New	Support	The submitter seeks enhanced recognition of archaeological sites in the District Plan through the inclusion of resource consent and archaeological advice notes.	Include the following in Chapter 25: <u>Recognition and management of historic heritage through the Horowhenua District Council complements the statutory regime administered by the New Zealand Historic Places Trust under the Historic Places Act 1993.</u> <u>Information requirements for resource consents that outline information that must accompany a resource consent</u>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
					<p><u>application affecting and historic building or site. This also includes circumstances where consultation with NZHPT and/or Iwi is required.</u></p> <p><u>Advice Notes identifying consultation requirements with Iwi and/or the NZHPT in the event of an accidental discovery, or circumstances when an Accidental Discovery Protocol will be attached to resource consents relating to development affecting pre 1900 archaeological sites and areas of significance to Maori.</u></p> <p><u>Advice Note: It is possible that archaeological sites may be affected by work authorised under this District Plan. Evidence of archaeological sites may include burnt and fire cracked stones, charcoal, rubbish heaps including shell, bone and/or glass and crockery, ditches, banks, pits, old building foundations, artefacts of Maori and European origin or human burials. The applicant is advised to contact the New Zealand Historic Place Trust if the presence of an archaeological site is suspected. Work affecting archaeological activity, such as earthworks, fencing or landscaping, may modify, damage or destroy any archaeological site(s), an authority</u></p>

Sub. No	Submitter Name	Provision	Support/ In-Part/Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
					<u>(consent) from the New Zealand Historic Places Trust must be obtained for the work to proceed lawfully. The Historic Places Act (1993) contains penalties for unauthorised site damage.</u>
118.00	Peter & Susan Webb	19.6.7(e)(i) Rule	Oppose	Oppose the change in the time period where bird scaring devices shall not operate. Allowing bird scaring devices between sunrise and sunset allows for a longer period which starts earlier and finishes later which will be disruptive to neighbouring properties and could result in consequential detrimental effects on human health and wellbeing and interfere with quality of life.	Amend Rule 19.6.7(e)(i) to restrict the operation of bird scaring devices between 7.00pm and 7.00am and include a right object any use of bird scaring devices that are used in a manner which is unreasonable.

Submitter Index

(Submitters Organised Alphabetically)

Submitter	Submission Number
Alan & Marie Blundell	049
Alan McKenna	115
Allen Little	029
Ann Percy	076
Anne Hunt	010
Anthony Hunt	035
Beverly Fowler	089
Bill Huzziff	104
Bill Huzziff	105
Bruce & Christine Mitchell	066
Carolyn Dawson	048
Charles Rudd (Snr)	109
Charles Wallis	015
Cheryl Mangin	023
Chorus New Zealand Limited	079
Christina Paton	102
Colin Easton	103
Daina Parlovskis	012
Derek Watt	064
Director-General of Conservation	101
Elaine Gradock	005
Ernslaw One Ltd	074
Errol Skelton	021

Submitter	Submission Number
Federated Farmers of New Zealand	096
Foxton Community Board	090
Foxton Historical Society	034
Franklyn Leong & Heather Brown	043
Friends of Strathnaver	057
Future Map Limited, Future Map (No2) Ltd and Future Map (No 3) Ltd	070
Gail Chambers	088
Gary Spelman	114
Genesis Power Ltd	044
Graeme & Joan Petersen	084
Graham & Sonia Broughton	008
Grant & Anne Searle	019
Heather Benning	006
Heirs Partnership	007
Higgins Group Holdings Limited	077
Homestead Group Limited	002
Homestead Group Limited	037
Horizons Regional Council	027
Horowhenua Astronomical Society Inc	026

Submitter	Submission Number
Horowhenua District Council (Community Assets Department)	091
Horowhenua District Council (Planning Department)	108
Horowhenua Farmers' Ratepayer Group	065
Horticulture New Zealand	098
House Movers Section of New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc	040
Ivan Chambers	086
John Hammond	013
JS & MJ Campbell	058
Kathleen Bills	062
KCE Mangahao Ltd	092
Kevin Doncliff	082
Kevin Macmillan	022
KiwiRail	055
Kornelius du Plessis	014
Landlink Ltd	045
Levin Golf Club	033
Lowe Corporation Ltd & Colyer Mair Ltd	097
Lynn & Anthony Straugheir	009
Malcolm Guy	004
Mark Dunn	111
Matthew Thredgold	003

Submitter	Submission Number
McDonald's Restaurants (New Zealand) Ltd	073
Michael White	025
Michele Walls-Bennett & Steven Bailey	069
Muaupoko Co-operative Society	060
New Zealand Defence Force	095
New Zealand Historic Places Trust	117
New Zealand Pork Industry Board	032
New Zealand Wind Energy Association ('NZWEA')	100
NZ Transport Agency	094
Palmerston North City Council	047
Paul Pearce	018
Penelope Brown	017
Peter & Susan Webb	059
Peter & Susan Webb	118
Peter & Vivien Wright	024
Peter & Vivien Wright	028
Peter Everton	030
Peter McMenamin & Helen Fitzgerald	053
Philip Lake	081
Philip Taueki	011

Submitter	Submission Number
Poultry Industry Association of New Zealand (PIANZ) & Egg Producers Federation of New Zealand (EPFNZ)	072
Powerco	041
Progressive Enterprises Ltd	071
Range View Limited & M J Page	038
Rayonier New Zealand Ltd	050
Richard Tingey	061
Robert Kel	020
Robert White	016
Robin Hapi	087
Rod Halliday	056
Ron & Betty Zanobergen	113
Rosalie Huzziff	106
Rosalie Huzziff	107
Rosemarie Saunders	052
Ross & Margaret Hood	083
Shannon Progressive Association	112
Stuart & Jean Marshall	075
Taiao Raukawa Environmental Resource Unit	067
Taupunga Farming Company	063
Te Taitoa Maori o Te Awahou	068

Submitter	Submission Number
Telecom New Zealand Limited	078
The Oil Companies	093
The Surveying Company (Wellington) Limited	031
Todd Energy Ltd	080
Transpower New Zealand Ltd	099
Trucis Investments Ltd	036
Truebridge Associates Limited	116
Vector Gas Limited	042
Vincero Holdings Limited	046
Viv Bold	039
W Fraser	110
Waitarere Progressive & Ratepayers Association	051
Warren Millar	085
Warwick Meyer	054
William Scotson & Maria McKay	001