

APPENDIX E: SUBMISSION ASSESSMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS TABLES

Three Waters

Water Supply Capacity

Thirteen submitters and one further submitter(see below) have raised concerns regarding the capacity of Morrinsville's public water supply and the ability to sustainably service additional development given already frequent water restrictions.

There is concern that the Piako Catchment is already highly allocated and that seasonally, the water demand can place significant pressure on the natural systems from which the town's water supply is drawn which, in turn, can lead to a depletion of the groundwater resource that is vital to neighbouring farming operations within the same catchment. Climate change is expected to result in more frequent, longer, and severe droughts and there is uncertainty regarding the future impact of the changing climate on the availability of surface water and groundwater (through reduced groundwater recharge).

Some of the Submitters want the Council to decline PPC 56 until there is certainty that the additional water demand can be met without further water restrictions on current residents.

Other Submitters want Council to accept PPC 56, but only if it can be demonstrated, robustly, that the public water supply network can be upgraded with adequate capacity to serve the Lockerbie development (taking into account climate change), and that the necessary water-take consents are in place. In this regard, some Submitters want assurance that the full cost of upgrading the network will be covered by the developer.

A number of Submitters have requested that PPC 56 be amended to require compulsory water conservation and demand management measures such as rainwater harvesting and storage, grey water re-use and water metering.

The water supply and the public infrastructure network capacities have been assessed by Council's Utilities Asset Engineer, Santha Agas. His report is attached as Appendix A.

The report describes Morrinsville's water sources (Topehaehae Stream, Scott Road bore, and the Lockerbie bore recently consent by WRC's AUTH142378.01.01), the consented volumes, consent conditions, the work currently being done within MPDC towards commissioning the new production bore and treatment plant within Lockerbie and initiatives to promote the sustainable use of the Council's water resource by putting in place a Water Conservation Strategy, Water Management Plan, and Water Master Plan and the water conservation measures proposed for PPC 56 (metering of new dwellings and rainwater storage tanks).

At Paragraph 29 of his report, he calculates Morrinsville's future water demand (up to 2055) including the development that will be enabled if PPC 56 is approved. He reaches the conclusion that the current allocated water take of 10,000m³ per day is sufficient to supply the demand up to 2055.

He anticipates that the Lockerbie water source with a capacity of 4,000m³ of treated water per day will become available for use in December 2023. In his view, commissioning of the Lockerbie water source will provide more options for deployment of the available water sources within the network and reduce the current supply issues for all of Morrinsville's residents.

He goes on to say that there can be confidence that the proposed changes to the public water supply as summarised above, will be adequate to meet the needs of the Lockerbie development without placing further water restrictions on current residents. However, the report explains the reasons why seasonal water restrictions are unavoidable and will continue to be used to manage seasonal water demand (as is common throughout New Zealand) and why this is not attributable to the proposed Lockerbie expansion. He considers that when the Lockerbie bore is introduced in late 2023, *"the supply risk for present and future customers and water restrictions will be greatly reduced"*.

Santha Agas' report explains ongoing work streams within Council (including a water master plan with a 30-year horizon, water conservation strategy and action plan) and regional collaboration to further improve the understanding of and planning for the District's future water demand in the face of changes in the climate. The report highlights the value of water demand management measures, and states his support for the now proposed provisions that will require compulsory water metering and installation of on-site rainwater storage tanks.

In regard to the sustainability of the Morrinsville water-take, I note that WRC is the authority that has jurisdiction under the RMA to manage water allocation. The WRC's recent (April 2022) consent evaluation report for the Lockerbie water-take (WRC Document #23727380) has considered the potential of the consented Morrinsville water-take to cause drawdown interference on neighbouring bores, or to deplete the aquifer and cause stream depletion. The WRC's evaluation reaches the conclusion that proximal bores will not be affected by the grant of the Morrinsville water-take, that the aquifer recharge regime will not be adversely affected, and that the potential for stream depletion is of no concern. Subject to compliance with the consent conditions, the WRC's evaluation considers that the grant of the water-take will not result in adverse effects on natural systems.

Infrastructure networks and funding

Twelve submitters and one further submitter (see below) have expressed concern regarding the adequacy of Morrinsville's infrastructure, its ability to cope with the increase in demand that will result from the proposed PPC 56 development, and the potential financial burden on ratepayers.

Submitters note that the proposed development will result in significant increases in wastewater flows because of the increase in population, and in stormwater run-off from the roofs of the new buildings, roads and other impermeable surfaces. The Submitters want clarity on the nature of the changes proposed to the infrastructure, how the additional wastewater will be treated and the stormwater disposed of, and who will pay for it?

Most Submitters feel that the town's public infrastructure systems are already at capacity and that PPC 56 should therefore be declined.

The other Submitters want the Council to approve PPC 56, but only if it can be assured that the necessary infrastructure upgrades are put in place and that the town's infrastructure is capable of accommodating the additional demand. The Submitters who are not opposed to approval of PPC 56 want the Council to ensure that the upgrades are fully funded by the developer, that all consents for the existing and upgraded wastewater treatment facilities are in place and that the upgrades have been installed and are fully functional to ensure full compliance with discharge consent conditions.

One Submitter is concerned that the additional stormwater run-off will increase the risk of downstream properties being flooded, and wants the Council to require rainwater storage tanks on all lots in order to mitigate the stormwater run-off.

Another Submitter notes that the Applicant's infrastructure report states that external upgrades of the wastewater reticulation and treatment systems will be required, that MPDC has engaged consultants to provide master planning advice in regard to the upgrades, and that the advice was not yet available at the time of notification of PPC 56. Therefore, the Submitter feels that it will be premature to approve the plan change before the costs of the downstream works have been evaluated and arrangements made to ensure the full cost is covered by the developer. On the other hand, another Submitter notes that the proposed development will likely impact on external infrastructure networks elsewhere that MPDC will need to resolve, but that those issues are not necessarily part of the PPC 56 process.

There is concern from one Submitter regarding the proposed discharge of stormwater from the PPC 56 development, into the stream at Taukoro Road which the Submitter feels is not designed for the purpose of conveying urban stormwater.

Another Submitter, a fellow developer with an interest in the growth of Morrinsville, has requested to be party to any discussions regarding upgrading of the town's infrastructure.

There is also concern from one Submitter that the likely establishment of the proposed 3-waters Authority will put ratepayers at the mercy of a central government entity which will have the power to increase rates without input from ratepayers. In this regard, the Submitter wants the total capital costs and future running costs of infrastructure serving the PPC 56 development to be met by the developer and ring-fenced to prevent the imposition of any future costs on current Morrinsville ratepayers. The Submitter also wants a credible, independent complaints tribunal to be established to hear, rule on, and enforce ratepayers' concerns regarding charges that the 3-waters Authority may see fit to levy.

In regard to wastewater, Santha Agas' report states that the town's current wastewater treatment plant does not have capacity to treat the wastewater from future growth to the required standards, without upgrades. His report describes the work streams currently underway within MPDC to apply for renewal of the WRC consent to discharge treated wastewater to the Piako River, and to carry out the required upgrades. He describes the work currently underway to upgrade the town's wastewater reticulation system and the internal reticulation that the developer will need to install within the PPC 56 area to serve the proposed development. He reaches the conclusion that the planned upgrades to the treatment plant and reticulation system will provide adequate capacity to serve the development that will be enabled if PPC 56 is approved.

In regard to stormwater, Santha Agas explains that there is currently no public stormwater reticulation in operation in the PPC 56 area. The Applicant has WRC consent to discharge stormwater from the East Block to the Piako River. The Applicant will need to seek a new consent from WRC to discharge stormwater from the West Block.

Santha Agas has reviewed the Applicant's Stormwater Management Plan and methodology (primary conveyance through a piped system, a secondary system comprising overland flowpaths and detention devices, with stormwater quality treated through wetlands and raingardens). His conclusion is that the proposed system is in line with MPDC's current stormwater management policy.

Santha Agas concludes that he has confidence that the development that will be enabled if PPC 56 is approved will not have negative impacts on MPDC's water, wastewater and stormwater services, now and into the future.

The mechanism for funding the infrastructure upgrades detailed in Santha Agas' report is explained in the report prepared by Susanne Kampshof (Appendix B). Her report explains that funding mechanisms will be put in place to ensure that costs directly associated with PPC 56 are funded by the developer, and other wider network costs are identified and the costs apportioned appropriately in accordance with MPDC's Development Contributions Policy and the Long Term Plan. Where costs associated with the PPC 56 development will be incurred by MPDC prior to review of the Development Contributions Policy, those costs will be included in a Private Developer Agreement (PDA). Under the terms of the PDA, the developer will pay the estimated additional development contributions upfront when new titles are created.

To this end her report details:

- The works that will solely benefit the PPC 56 development and that will be paid for in full by the Applicant;
- External works already identified by MPDC and that are already included in Council's capital works programme and 2021 Development Contribution Policy for which the pro-rata contribution attributable to the PPC 56 development, will be recovered from the Applicant through development contributions that are payable before new titles for any of the lots within the PPC 56 development can be created;
- Additional works which mainly benefit the PPC 56 development (but also have some wider benefit) that are not currently in MPDC's 2021 Development Contribution Policy. To fund these works, the development contributions policy will need to be updated at the next review in 2024. In the interim the PDA has captured the appropriate contribution of \$1,894 per Household Equivalent Unit required to be paid by the developer prior to creating titles for the development enabled by PPC 56. Under the PDA this additional development contribution will be in place until the Development Contribution Policy is adopted by MPDC in 2024.

Susanne Kampshof's report concludes that funding requirements associated with the PPC 56 development are being managed appropriately. She is confident that there is clarity around the funding requirements and that appropriate mechanisms are in place to recover the costs associated with the PPC 56 development.

In regard to the submission from a fellow developer who wants to be party to any discussions regarding upgrading of the town's infrastructure, my understanding is that the Council is already in discussions with the Submitter and that these discussions will be ongoing as further details of

the proposed development are forthcoming.

In regard to the submission concerning the financial impact of the proposed 3-waters Authority on ratepayers, my response is that the establishment and operation of the proposed 3-waters Authority is fully dependent on a separate process that is outside the scope of this plan change, and that is not able to be influenced by the outcome of this plan change.

In relying on Santha Agas' and Susanne Kampshof's expert assessment, and for the reasons set out in their reports and summarised above, I make the following recommendations on submissions relating to the three-waters.

Submitter/ Further submitter	Point#	Summary of submission	Decision sought	Recommendation
<u>Water supply capacity</u>				
3	Emma Hyde	3.1 Morrinsville runs out of water every year and there have been no improvements even though additional housing has been built at Lockerbie. Provide for adequate water supply, before a further 1,200 houses are built.	Until the town is in a better position to support that many more houses/people, the plan change should be declined.	Reject the request to decline PPC 56, but recommend planning provisions as shown in Appendix F to require that improvements to the water supply are made and that adequate water supply will be available at the time of development of the housing units enabled by PPC 56.
7	Peter Burrell	7.1 The current water supply is inadequate for the existing population, with restrictions already in place, and warnings that they will get worse as the climate changes. The proposed bore in Lockerbie will do little to alleviate the problem.	If not declined, then amend the plan change to prevent an increase in house numbers from that which is currently approved until the water supply can support the present population, all year	Reject the request to decline PPC 56, but recommend planning provisions as shown in Appendix F to require that improvements are made to ensure that the available water supply can support the current population and the increase enabled by PPC

				round, without restrictions.	56, noting that the improvements will enhance the resilience of Morrinsville's water supply but that seasonal water restrictions are unlikely to be able to be avoided.
11	Deborah May	11.1	The town is already on water restrictions.	Decline the plan change.	Reject the request to decline PPC 56 noting that seasonal water restrictions are unlikely to be worsened by the development enabled by PPC 56.
14	Jo Robb	14.1	In view of the increasing water demand and need for more water restrictions, require on-site roof water harvesting and storage in underground tanks supplemented by a reticulated trickle supply, similar to what has worked well in the new St Kilda (Cambridge) subdivision.	Accept the plan change with a requirement for on-site water harvesting and storage, or decline the plan change if these provisions are not incorporated.	Accept the relief sought, and amend the planning provisions as shown in Appendix F to require compulsory installation of on-site rainwater storage tanks.
FS1	Shane Mellow	FS1	<i>Supports the above submission in so far as all new homes should be required to have their own water tanks and filtration system. The tanks can be filled by rainwater and topped up from town supply when needed.</i>	<i>Accept the above submission in part and require all new homes to have their own water tanks and filtration system.</i>	<i>Accept the further submission in support of #14.1 and amend the planning provisions as shown in Appendix F to require compulsory installation of on-site rainwater storage tanks noting that water filtration systems will not be required as the rainwater</i>

					<i>is proposed to be used outdoors for non-potable purposes.</i>
15	Diane Simmons	15.4	Water provision must be improved so more pressure doesn't go on this resource.	Accept the plan change and ensure that water provision is improved.	Accept the relief sought and recommend the planning provisions in Appendix F which require improvements to water provision in order to ensure that the available water supply can support the current and future population.
17	Hamilton Wright	17.4	For the past 50 years, every summer, there are water restrictions in the town. The submitter cannot see the position changing in the next 50 years if Lockerbie goes ahead.	Decline the plan change.	Reject the request to decline PPC 56, but recommend planning provisions as shown in Appendix F that will enhance the resilience of Morrinsville's water supply, noting that seasonal water restrictions are unlikely to be able to be avoided.
22	Roland and Marjorie Latto	22.4	The Council have found water but it is not helping with the water supply.	Decline the plan change.	Reject the request to decline PPC 56, but recommend the planning provisions as shown in Appendix F which require improvements to the water supply in order that adequate water supply will be available at the time of development of the housing units enabled

					by PPC 56.
25	Cassandra Mankelow-Hancock	25.1	MPDC should take the opportunity to be forward thinking and require rain water collection tanks e.g. 1,000 litres to be compulsory with each new build and not rely on a bore that might not sustain the water needed. These don't need to be intrusive; they can be screened or dug into the ground.	Accept, but amend to require rain water collection tanks on each property-either screened on in ground.	Accept the relief sought, and amend the planning provisions as shown in Appendix F to require compulsory installation of on-site rainwater storage tanks.
FS1	Shane Mellow	FS1	<i>Supports the above submission in so far as all new homes should be required to have their own water tanks and filtration system. The tanks can be filled by rainwater and topped up from town supply when needed.</i>	<i>Accept the above submission in part and require all new homes to have their own water tanks and filtration system.</i>	<i>Accept the further submission in support of #25.1 and recommend the planning provisions as shown in Appendix F which require compulsory installation of on-site rainwater storage tanks noting that water filtration systems will not be required as the rainwater is proposed to be used outdoors for non-potable purposes.</i>
29	David & Cheryl Holland	29.3	The infrastructure report covers water supply to the new development. It is well known that there are already water supply issues in Morrinsville. The infrastructure report states that there is insufficient capacity in the existing network to service the plan change area from existing Council infrastructure. To mitigate this, MPDC proposes to install a new	Decline the plan change.	Reject the request to decline PPC 56, for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Details on the timing of the installation of the Lockerbie treatment plant are available and are clarified in Santha Agas' report. • Susanne Kampshof's report shows that

			<p>water treatment plant. No details are provided on the timing and costs of this new plant. There is also no guarantee that the Council will receive consent for this supply from the Regional Council. Hence, the submitter proposes that: Council completes a full feasibility study and costing for the new plant, and the costs for this plant are covered by the developers. No Plan change be approved until this feasibility is complete and consent for the bore extraction and water treatment plant has been granted. The developers cover the cost of this new plant.</p>		<p>funding mechanisms will be put in place to ensure that the costs attributable to the PPC 56 development are recovered from the developer.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The WRC water-take consent for the Lockerbie water extraction is in place.
30	Matamata-Piako District Council	30.50	<p>The issue of water is of concern to Council, and the plan change does not propose any measures to mitigate the effects from the development. Demand for water from reticulated water supply services is an effect of urban subdivision and development. Seasonally, such demand can place significant pressures on the urban water supply network and the natural systems that they draw on.</p>	See Submission Point 30.1	<p>Accept the relief sought and recommend amendments (see Appendix F) to require on-site rainwater storage and water metering similar to that requested. For further detail see #30.1 in the Table titled "Submissions on plan change provisions".</p>
FS1	Shane Mellow	FS1	<p><i>Supports the above submission in so far as all new homes should be required to have their own water tanks and filtration system. The tanks can be filled by rainwater and</i></p>	<p><i>Accept the above submission in part and require all new homes to have their own water tanks</i></p>	<p><i>Accept the further submission in support of #30.50 and recommend the planning provisions as shown in Appendix F</i></p>

			<i>topped up from town supply when needed.</i>	<i>and filtration system.</i>	<i>which require compulsory installation of on-site rainwater storage tanks noting that water filtration systems will not be required as the rainwater is proposed to be used outdoors for non-potable purposes.</i>
33	Val Riches	33.1	The community often runs short of water.	Accept the plan change subject to requiring all buildings to have roof water storage tanks.	Accept the relief sought and recommend changes as shown in Appendix F to require compulsory on-site rainwater storage tanks.
FS1	Shane Mellow	FS1	<i>Supports the above submission in so far as all new homes should be required to have their own water tanks and filtration system. The tanks can be filled by rainwater and topped up from town supply when needed.</i>	<i>Accept the above submission in part and require all new homes to have their own water tanks and filtration system.</i>	<i>Accept the further submission in support of #33.1 and recommend the planning provisions as shown in Appendix F which require on-site rainwater storage tanks noting that water filtration systems will not be required as the rainwater is proposed to be used outdoors for non-potable purposes.</i>
34	Janet Gray	34.2	Morrinsville should lead the rest of NZ by requiring every new build to have its own water tank for toilet flushing, car washing and gardening, thereby relieving some of the pressure on water reticulation in the town.	Accept the plan change with the following amendment: Require every new build to have its own water tank.	Accept the relief sought and recommend changes as shown in Appendix F to require compulsory on-site rainwater storage tanks.

FS1	Shane Mellow	FS1	<p><i>Supports the above submission in so far as all new homes should be required to have their own water tanks and filtration system. The tanks can be filled by rainwater and topped up from town supply when needed.</i></p>	<p><i>Accept the above submission in part and require all new homes to have their own water tanks and filtration system.</i></p>	<p><i>Accept the further submission in support of #34.2 and recommend the planning provisions as shown in Appendix F which require compulsory installation of on-site rainwater storage tanks noting that water filtration systems will not be required as the rainwater is proposed to be used outdoors for non-potable purposes.</i></p>
37	W.E & G.J Bonnar Ltd	37.1	<p>In 2016 farmers had to apply for authorisation to take groundwater. This incurred an annual fee, and a requirement for metering and record- keeping. Waikato Regional Council (WRC) emphasised the need to actively manage freshwater due to increased demand. The NPS-FW directs that over-allocation of water is to be avoided, and the Piako catchment is currently over-allocated. The Lockerbie development will result in a large increase in Morrinsville's population creating a large demand for water. Therefore the groundwater volume that WRC originally authorised for Lockerbie Farm will need to increase significantly. This has huge implications for surrounding farms that use bore water to supply their</p>	<p>Accept the plan change with the following amendment: Require all houses to have water storage tanks thus reducing the water-take for Morrinsville and also reducing the stormwater runoff.</p>	<p>Accept the relief sought and recommend changes as shown in Appendix F to require compulsory on-site rainwater storage tanks, noting that the WRC's evaluation of the Morrinsville water-take consent considers that proximal bores will not be adversely affected by the Lockerbie groundwater extraction.</p>

			farms, cattle and houses, and could significantly deplete the water resource especially during dry seasons (likely to be exacerbated by climate change) with the possibility of having to drill deeper bores to obtain a continuous water supply.		
FS1	Shane Mellow	FS1	<i>Supports the above submission in so far as all new homes should be required to have their own water tanks and filtration system. The tanks can be filled by rainwater and topped up from town supply when needed.</i>	<i>Accept the above submission in part and require all new homes to have their own water tanks and filtration system.</i>	<i>Accept the further submission in support of #37.1 and recommend the planning provisions in Appendix F to require on-site rainwater storage tanks noting that water filtration systems will not be required as the rainwater is proposed to be used outdoors for non-potable purposes.</i>
38	Gord Stewart (Late Submission)	38.1	The submitter notes that the issue of a sustainable water supply over the long term is crucial in the consideration of development such as Lockerbie and others in progress or planned around the District. The submitter notes that climate science shows that, for the east of the North Island, we can expect more frequent, longer and more severe droughts in the years and decades ahead. This changing climate will very likely impact the surface water we rely on (and bore water through reduced groundwater	Decline the plan change until such time as long-term sustainable water supply in the area is assured by proper study and analysis and a proven commitment to water conservation is shown throughout the District through effective programmes for current residents	Decline the request for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MPDC has no jurisdiction over water allocation. Under the RMA it is WRC's responsibility to ensure that the sustainability of water allocation, taking climate change into account, is considered when water-take consents are granted and that the consents are granted only after

		<p>recharge). At this stage we just don't know by how much.</p> <p>Council indicated it is "very aware of the need to assess the longer term security of water" – this in an email from the CEO to the submitter dated 7 September 2020. NIWA is only now beginning to examine the impact of climate change on water supply.</p> <p>A further email from the CEO, dated 8 November 2021, indicated Council is participating in a collaborative project with regional council to better quantify the effects of climate change on our water supply systems (now in its second phase). "We have specifically requested Regional Council to drill down to the Morrinsville system and understand its resilience under appropriate scenarios," it notes.</p> <p>In light of the above, the submitter asks: So will we charge ahead with development while still in the early stages of learning if there is enough water to serve it (as well as serving current residents and businesses)? Surely accepting Proposed Private Plan 56 now would be a classic case of putting the 'cart before the horse'. Council appears to be approving new subdivisions and issuing building permits around the District with insufficient knowledge</p>	<p>and businesses.</p>	<p>proper study and analysis.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WRC has granted MPDC a water-take consent for an adequate volume to support the current and predicted population of Morrinsville until 2055 (see Santha Agas' report). • Santha Agas' report shows that MPDC has a commitment to promoting water conservation and that there are a number of work streams within MPDC to progress this issue. • The recommended amended provisions in Appendix F attest to MPDC's commitment to promote water conservation by means of the proposed provisions that require compulsory rainwater storage tanks and water metering.
--	--	---	------------------------	--

		<p>of what the future will bring.</p> <p>The submitter notes that Waikato Regional Council has indicated that the catchment serving the proposed development is 'highly allocated' and often 'stressed'. At times, Morrinsville has trouble meeting its water needs within environmental limits (i.e. while maintaining adequate residual flow below the dam). The submitter asks: In the search/plans for new water, what are the chances an insufficient (sustainably sourced) supply will be found?</p> <p>In an email to Council dated 1 November 2021, the submitter asked the question: Can Council say with confidence it will have water to serve residents and businesses in 2051? 2071? 2091? To date, the submitter has received no reply.</p> <p>The submitter notes: Correspondence from Council (18 February 2022) indicates a 'Masterplan for Water Supply' including modelling water use per household and various growth strategies is due for completion by mid-2023. In this regard, the submitter asks: Again, is it appropriate for development to continue apace in the absence of important information such as this?</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>The submitter asks: Council indicates a commitment to water conservation as it looks ahead to serving Lockerbie. How much stock can we put in this? MPDC had a water demand management plan prepared for it in 2005 and participated in a region-wide water conservation campaign in the summer of 2008/2009. Beyond this, there has been little attention to water-use efficiency other than a few tips on the website (“Have shorter showers”, “Turn off the tap when brushing your teeth”). The one action taken as needed is water restrictions during times of summer shortage.</p> <p>The submitter states that he has provided Council with five practical action steps for water conservation (effective even in the absence of water meters) in an email to the mayor, CEO and relevant staff on 13 March 2020. No interest was shown in this</p>		
FS3	Gord Stewart	FS3	<i>Supports the above submission</i>	<i>Accept the above submission and require Council to undertake proper study and analysis to determine with confidence that it will have water to serve residents and</i>	<i>Decline the further submission in support of #38.1 for the reasons set out under #38.1 above.</i>

				<i>businesses in the future, prior to the plan change being considered.</i>	
<u>Infrastructure networks and funding</u>					
3	Emma Hyde	3.3	Infrastructure in town is appalling.	Until the town is in a better position to support, that many more houses/people, the plan change should be declined.	Reject the request to decline the plan change but recommend the provisions in Appendix F that will require adequate infrastructure upgrades to support the development enabled by PPC 56.
4	Paige Tanner	4.3	There is a need for additional water infrastructure.	Accept the plan change with amendments to address this issue.	Accept the relief sought and recommend the provisions in Appendix F that will require adequate upgrades of the water infrastructure to support the development enabled by PPC 56.
8	Wayne North	8.1	If the plan change is approved, what infrastructure changes will there be to the three waters: drinking, storm and wastewater? Having the developer provide roads and green space is great, but does not account for the additional requirements on other infrastructure that is also being stretched.	Decline the plan change.	Reject the request to decline the plan change but recommend the provisions in Appendix F that will require adequate infrastructure upgrades to support the development enabled by PPC 56.
9	Dennis Shine	9.2	Infrastructure is already at capacity.	Decline the plan change.	Reject the request to decline the plan change but recommend the

					provisions in Appendix F that will require adequate infrastructure upgrades to support the development enabled by PPC 56.
11	Deborah May	11.2	The town does not have the infrastructure to cope.	Decline the plan change.	Reject the request to decline the plan change but recommend the provisions in Appendix F that will require adequate infrastructure upgrades to support the development enabled by PPC 56.
21	Robert Lowe	21.1	<p>3-Waters: The significant increase in dwellings will result in an increase in: Water and wastewater infrastructure, reticulation and addition of water treatment facilities; Stormwater disposal from so many additional rooftop catchments. The 3-waters Authority is set to become a reality in the near future. Ratepayers will be at the mercy of a central government entity which has the power to increase rates without recourse or objection from current ratepayers. The total cost and future running cost of infrastructure for the development enabled through the plan change should be met by the developers and ring-fenced from</p>	Decline the plan change.	<p>Reject the request to decline the plan change but recommend the provisions in Appendix F that will require adequate infrastructure upgrades to support the development enabled by PPC 56. Reject the submission concerning the financial impact of the proposed 3-waters Authority on ratepayers. The establishment and operation of the proposed 3-waters Authority is fully dependent on a separate process that is outside</p>

			any future cost landed on Morrinsville ratepayers. There must be a credible independent complaints tribunal established to hear, rule and enforce ratepayers' concerns of charges that the 3- waters Authority may see fit to levy.		the scope of this plan change, and that is not able to be influenced by the outcome of this plan change.
22	Roland and Marjorie Latta	22.5	The wastewater needs an improvement.	Decline the plan change.	Reject the request to decline the plan change but recommend the provisions in Appendix F that will require adequate upgrades of the wastewater system to support the development enabled by PPC 56.
22	Roland and Marjorie Latta	22.6	The developers want stormwater to discharge into the stream at Taukoro Road which is not designed for this purpose.	Decline the plan change.	Reject the request to decline the plan change. The discharge of stormwater into the stream referred to by the Submitter, from the future development on the East Block is already authorised under a WRC discharge consent. In granting that consent, WRC has determined that the stream is suitable for conveying urban stormwater (subject to compliance with the WRC consent conditions).

					Future development within the West Block will require an application to WRC for a discharge consent wherein the suitability of the stream to convey the additional urban stormwater, will be assessed by WRC at the time of application for consent.
29	David & Cheryl Holland	29.4	<p>In regard to wastewater, similar to water supply, the infrastructure report states that additional downstream upgrades will be required and that MPDC has engaged consultants to provide master planning advice, which is expected to become available in early 2022.</p> <p>The submitter feels it is therefore premature to grant this plan change before the costs for the downstream work have been evaluated. As this is a big development with significant increases to required capacity, if the development is to go ahead, the developers need to cover the cost of these changes.</p>	Decline the plan change.	Reject the request to decline PPC 56, but recommend the provisions in Appendix F that will require upgrades to the wastewater system to ensure that future demand can be met, and that puts in place the mechanism to ensure that the costs are apportioned appropriately as set out in Susanne Kampshof's report.
33	Val Riches	33.2	The run-off from Lockerbie flows through the submitter's property. During times of much rain, the run-off significantly flows over the submitter's land and floods the driveway. The submitter is	Accept the plan change subject to requiring all buildings to have roof water storage tanks.	Accept the relief sought and recommend the provisions as shown in Appendix F which require compulsory installation of rainwater storage tanks,

			concerned that the extra dwellings will significantly reduce the land area that naturally absorbs the water. The submitter asks what Council will be able to do to the run off? The submitter does not want the run-off to increase.		noting that the Applicant's stormwater methodology requires pre- to post-mitigation of flows, to ensure that downstream flooding effects are not exacerbated.
FS1	Shane Mellow	FS1	<i>Supports the above submission in so far as all new homes should be required to have their own water tanks and filtration system. The tanks can be filled by rainwater and topped up from town supply when needed.</i>	<i>Accept the above submission in part and require all new homes to have their own water tanks and filtration system.</i>	<i>Accept the further submission in support of #33.2 and recommend the planning provisions as shown in Appendix F to require on-site rainwater storage tanks noting that water filtration systems will not be required as the rainwater is proposed to be used outdoors for non-potable purposes.</i>
34	Janet Gray	34.4	The submitter notes there will be infrastructure issues in the wider township for MPDC to resolve but that these are not necessarily part of the Lockerbie Plan Change process.	Not stated.	Accept the submission point noting that external infrastructure upgrades have been identified and funding mechanisms put in place to enable timely implementation of the required upgrades.
35	Anthony Gray	35.1	In support of the plan change provided complete upgrades of sewage treatment plants are undertaken to ensure 100% compliance of additional enhanced resource consents for the additional	Supports the plan change with the following amendments: New resource consents for all	Accept the relief sought in part, noting that work streams within MPDC are progressing to ensure that all consents will be in place, all upgrades

			housing.	existing and additional water plant discharges including sewage; Complete upgrades of treatment plants, and renew and fit new treatment plants for sewage.	required have been identified. Funding mechanisms will be put in place to ensure timely implementation of the required upgrades in accordance with the "triggers" identified in the provisions attached as Appendix F.
36	Sunridge Park	36.7	The submitter, who has significant interest in the growth of Morrinsville, would be prepared to be part of any discussions about the provision of infrastructure.	Overall, it is considered that Council should accept PC56 with the relief sought.	Accept the relief sought noting that MPDC is already in discussions with the Submitter and that discussions regarding the provision of infrastructure will be ongoing as further details of new developments in Morrinsville become known.

Effects on Morrinsville town, density, housing typology and affordability

Fifteen Submitters and two further submitters (see below) have raised concerns in regard to the need for the additional housing, its affordability, the effects that the development will have on the character of the town, the proposed housing density and housing typologies.

Two of the Submitters feel there is no demand for the proposed dwellings, or at least not for the large number of additional dwellings that will be enabled by the plan change and therefore that it should be declined. Another two Submitters are concerned that such a large development will spoil the amenity of residents and their enjoyment of small town living. They want the plan change to be declined, or amended to ensure that the lifestyle of existing residents is not adversely affected. On the other hand, two other Submitters believe the plan change will create employment and opportunities for existing and new businesses and should be approved.

Other Submitters want the plan change to be declined, and the growth of the town as a whole to be considered holistically, including all the support services, rather than a stand alone private plan change for Lockerbie on its own that deals only with housing demand.

One Submitter feels that there has been no holistic planning done for the overall Lockerbie area (including the area to the south that is currently being subdivided), that the development as proposed will ruin the amenity of the existing Lockerbie subdivision, and that the plan change should be declined.

Another Submitter is concerned about the tracking of dirt onto the surrounding roads as a result of earthworks associated with the existing Lockerbie subdivision. The Submitter wants the Council to enforce compulsory wheel wash facilities for all construction vehicles.

Two Submitters want the plan change to be approved but subject to there being adequate provision for affordable housing for first-time home owners. One of these Submitters is concerned that the small lot sizes and higher housing density will not appeal to families and that the development will attract mostly retirees, while the town needs younger couples to help employers fill existing staff shortages.

Another Submitter wants the plan change, if not declined, to give consideration to climate change by requiring a range of measures such as ensuring local sustainable materials only are used in construction, compulsory installation of solar panels and communal solar power systems, siting homes for maximum heating/ cooling to reduce reliance on mechanical ventilation, and enabling the general public to purchase vacant sections (rather than pre-built houses) to create their own sustainable homes.

One Submitter wants the plan change to be approved as applied for and supports the range of housing options and typologies which will cater for all sectors of the community. Another Submitter supports the higher density provided adequate communal recreation space is provided for all the residents.

On the other hand a number of Submitters have concerns regarding the proposed housing density and housing typologies. Some of the Submitters want duplex units to be provided for, but object to the Precinct Overlay that will provide for terrace housing. They feel that the

terrace housing typology is not consistent with the character of Morrinsville or the semi-rural vision that the developer has set for the Lockerbie development and that it will set a precedent for higher density development elsewhere in Morrinsville.

One Submitter is concerned that the small lot sizes will harm the mental health and wellbeing of the residents who will feel locked in and that, in the longer term, the houses will become less desirable with the area ultimately deteriorating into a slum. The Submitter wants the Council to accept the plan change but only after reviewing the socio-economic outcome of the proposed high intensity subdivision and after making changes to ensure the implementation of a mix of housing orientated towards long-term living by single people, couples and families.

The character and urban design of the proposed development, housing density, housing typologies, availability of outdoor recreation space, and connectivity have been reviewed for MPDC by independent senior urban design associate Wayne Bredemeijer. His report is attached as Appendix D.

His report explains that he has worked collaboratively with the Applicant to achieve changes to the plan provisions, prior to and following public notification. With the changes made, he concludes that the residential density is appropriate and that the lower density proposed around the edges of the plan change area will provide an appropriate transition between the adjoining zones and the higher density in the interior of the development area. He considers that the open space network will provide good amenity and that the proposed movement network will provide an appropriate degree of connectivity across all modes of transport. He is satisfied that the density, bulk and location standards, subject to some changes, will result in appropriate amenity outcomes for the public realm, neighbours and residents.

In response to submissions concerning the integration of the development enabled by PPC 56 into its surrounds, he supports (and in fact has recommended) changes to the notified version of the LDAP (moving the stormwater reserve to the Taukoro Road frontage and inclusion of key local roads on specified reserve edges). In response to submissions concerning the effects of the development enabled by PPC 56 on the existing township, adequacy of outdoor living area, and the need to ensure a positive living environment he recommends that the MRZ rules relating to fences and retaining walls and the provisions relating to street activation should also apply to the Residential Zone within the LDAP. To ensure that the provision of key local roads on specified reserve edges as shown on the LDAP is firmly "locked in" he recommends that this requirement should specifically be added to the provisions relating to transport connections (see Appendix F, Rule 9.4.2).

I recommend that the above changes be made and have included these in the recommended provisions (see Appendix F), except:

- I cannot find a clear link within the submissions to justify the inclusion of the MRZ rules relating to primary entrance from the street frontage and clear-glazed street facing window; into the Lockerbie Residential Zone. Given the large minimum lot size (600m²) that will apply to the Lockerbie Residential Zone, I consider that future development on these comparatively large lots will likely include primary entrances from the street frontage and clear-glazed street facing windows without the need for plan rules. However, if the Panel finds that there is scope to include these provisions into the Lockerbie Residential Zone, then I agree that the inclusion of the provisions will create certainty that these development standards will be achieved in the future low-density residential development enabled by PPC 56.

Wayne Bredemeijer disagrees that the development enabled by PPC 56 will have adverse effects on the character of Morrinsville. In his view, the character of Morrinsville (as for any other town) should not be seen as static but rather as evolving over time. He points out that development that has occurred in the past has changed Morrinsville to what it is today. Similarly, future development will continue to influence Morrinsville's character. He considers that the proposed development incorporates and celebrates the site's natural features and integrates well into its context. The proposed open space network will contribute to a sense of place and provide an amenity that can be enjoyed by all members of the community. The proposed housing typologies provide an appropriate addition to the town's housing stock.

He supports the proposed density on the grounds that it makes efficient use of the land and keeps the town more compact, in line with sustainable urban design practice. The plan provisions will ensure useable private open space, and adequate access to public open space.

He considers that the housing typologies provide a range of dwelling types and sizes that will cater for the different demographics and financial circumstances within the community, including for first-time home buyers.

In his view, PPC 56 provides the opportunity to cater for the demand for more compact housing in an integrated way, as opposed to ad-hoc infill in existing low density residential areas where adverse impacts on the established character of the immediate surroundings are often harder to avoid.

Overall he is satisfied that the proposed provisions allow for dwellings:

- With a massing that responds appropriately to the surrounding private and public realm, including consideration of overshadowing, outlook, and passive surveillance; and:
- Which will have an appropriate degree of residential amenity, taking into account functionality, solar orientation, privacy, and indoor-outdoor relationship.

In relying in part on Wayne Bredemeijer's expert assessment, and for the reasons set out in his report and summarised above, supplemented by the evidence of other experts and my own assessment where matters are within my area of expertise I make the following recommendations on submissions relating to the demand for housing, character and urban design of the proposed development, housing density, housing typologies, availability of outdoor recreation space, and connectivity:

Submitter/ Further submitter		Point#	Summary of submission	Decision sought	Recommendation
11	Deborah May	11.4	The town does not need more sections - there are 68 for sale now that are not selling.	Decline the plan change.	Reject the relief sought. Both the Applicant's residential growth assessment and MPDC's Draft Housing Assessment confirm that there is a demand for additional residential zoned land.
29	David & Cheryl Holland	29.5	According the developers own report, only 800 new properties are required by 2038. Therefore, all 1,200 homes proposed are not required.	Decline the plan change.	Reject the relief sought. MPDC's Housing Assessment predicts a future demand for an additional 1,600 residential units (or 1,900 units if the 20% margin recommended by the NPD-UD is applied) in Morrinsville over the 33 year period 2022 - 2055.
1	Dianne McKinnon	1.1	Analyse the lifestyle and environmental impacts of a larger population on residents' enjoyment of the benefits of small town living.	If not declined, amend the plan change to take into account effects on residents' enjoyment of small town living.	Reject the relief sought. Both the Applicant's and MPDC's assessments predict that Morrinsville's population will grow,

					independent of whether PPC 56 is approved or not.
4	Paige Tanner	4.1	The growth of Morrinsville and expansion of Lockerbie is supported, but more needs to be done to ensure the rest of the town does not suffer from having such an increased population.	Accept the plan change with amendments to address this issue.	Accept the request to approve PPC 56. Reject the relief sought. Both the Applicant's and MPDC's assessments predict that Morrinsville's population will grow, independent of whether PPC 56 is approved or not.
9	Dennis Shine	9.1	This will ruin the nice Lockerbie subdivision. There has been no future planning for the township itself.	Decline the plan change.	Reject the request to decline the plan change, but accept the relief sought in part. The Lockerbie subdivision and PPC 56 have been holistically master planned in an integrated manner as described in the evidence of Morne Hugo, Wayne Bredemeijer, GD Jones and Kathryn Drew. However, to achieve better integration with the surrounding township, the MRZ

					fencing and retaining wall provisions should also apply to the Lockerbie Residential Zone, as recommended in Appendix F.
10	Michael Hagarty	10.1	Fantastic opportunity for local business to grow with the times and the potential for new business opportunities, adding to local employment. Also an increased focus on reliable work-time friendly public transport will be needed.	Accept the plan change.	Accept the relief sought, noting that provision for public transport is outside the scope of, and unable to be influenced by PPC 56.
25	Cassandra Mankelow-Hancock	25.2	With the first stage of Lockerbie it was disappointing to see dirt/mud coming off site and ending up on all the roads around Morrinsville. The submitter would like to see compulsory wheel wash requirements for all trade/excavation vehicles coming off the site while it is being developed. MPDC also need to be better at enforcing requirements.	Not stated.	Note the submission point. The effects of future earthworks will be managed through standard conditions to be imposed at the time of granting earthworks consents for future development with the plan change area. This will include compulsory wheel wash facilities when justified.
26	Morrinsville Chamber of Commerce	26.1	The Morrinsville Chamber of Commerce supports the plan change as proposed	Accept the plan change.	Accept the relief sought, noting that changes, as shown in Appendix F are recommended to be

					made to the plan provisions as notified.
27	Mandy Crockett	27.1	Further consideration needs to be given as to the effects on the existing township and residents and a plan/proposal should be provided as to the growth of the town as a whole and not just increased housing development. Doctors, dentists and schools are already under pressure.	Decline the plan change.	Reject the request to decline the plan change, but accept the relief sought in part. The future growth of Morrinsville as a whole has been considered under Plan Change 47 as a result of which the site was placed in the Future Residential Policy Area Overlay. However, effects on the existing township can be mitigated by changes to the LDAP and by applying the fencing and retaining wall standards to the Lockerbie Residential Zone, as recommended in Appendix F.
29	David & Cheryl Holland	29.8	Any significant increase in the number of residences in the town needs to be considered holistically as part of an overall master plan for the town and the overall district plan rather than this private plan change on its own.	Decline the plan change.	Reject the relief sought. The future growth of Morrinsville as a whole has been considered under Plan Change 47 as a result of which the

					site was placed in the Future Residential Policy Area Overlay.
1	Dianne McKinnon	1.2	<p>Give consideration to climate change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Put measures in place to ensure each home is built with the most sustainable materials. • Question whether the relentless use of concrete is sustainable to the country. • Put specifications in place to ensure sustainable power - i.e. solar panels. • Require rain water storage. • Stipulate roofing colours to assist with heat reflection given the rapidly warming planet. • Encourage the use of NZ and local products. • Give consideration to the impact of additional impervious surfacing (roads/ driveways) on stormwater disposal in light of future climate-change induced storms. • Provide communal solar power systems to power electric cars and bikes. • Require homes to be sited for maximum heating/ cooling to reduce reliance on artificial means. • For affordability and sustainability, require homes to be built to comfortable standards as opposed to over-large homes with expensive 	If not declined, give careful consideration to the issues raised in the submission and amend the plan change accordingly.	Accept the relief sought in part by requiring rainwater storage tanks, ensuring appropriate stormwater management, and setting bulk and location controls to ensure dwellings are appropriately orientated; as set out in the recommended plan provisions (Appendix F). Given the current state of building technology, the remaining changes requested by the Submitter are considered to be aspirational and are not supported.

			<p>imported items.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enable the general public to purchase land to create their own sustainable homes, before big companies buy-up large chunks of the development and then add their own inflated prices, ideas, and unsustainable values at maximum profit. 		
FS2	Shane Mellow	FS2	<i>Supports the above submission in so far as all new homes should be required to have solar power generation</i>	<i>Accept the submission in part and require all new homes to have solar power generation</i>	<i>Reject the relief sought as mandatory solar power generation, given the state of technology and cost implications, versus the need to ensure housing affordability, is not considered appropriate. Installation of solar panels should be the home owner's choice based on individual financial circumstances.</i>
4	Paige Tanner	4.4	The new houses need to be affordable, not \$1 million homes that most of Morrinsville can't afford, locking current residents out of the town. Given the large scale of developing 1,200 houses, there is no reason why the homes should be expensive.	Accept the plan change but place an affordable price cap on new housing builds in Lockerbie, or ensure there is a decent supply of homes that have to be under a certain	Accept the request to approve the plan change but reject the relief sought to place a mandatory affordability cap on new builds. The price points are determined by

				price tag for first home buyers.	market demand and are unable to be influenced by the plan change.
6	Dayne Horne, Marco Boats	6.1	<p>Make more housing affordable only to first-time home buyers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The small section/ high density housing is unlikely to appeal to families. • Investors or retirees will likely buy the proposed housing typologies. • While retirees will bring money into the area and rentals may attract some younger people the submitter, as a local business owner, want some of the higher density housing to be available only to first time home buyers in order to bring younger, driven people into the area. This will create a great opportunity for employers in Morrinsville given the current staff shortages. • Additional housing will create an opportunity to attract disgruntled Aucklanders, sick of lockdowns but currently impeded by a lack of available housing, into the area. 	Accept the plan change but amend to make a “decent chunk” of the development available to first-time home buyers only.	However, it is understood that the Applicant is currently experiencing significant market demand from first time home buyers for affordable housing and that providing for this demand is a driver for PPC 56, as explained in the evidence of GD Jones.
12	Karen Chandler	12.2	Unaffordable housing.	Decline the plan change.	Decline the relief sought on the grounds that the price points for the proposed houses are determined by market demand and are unable to be influenced by the

					plan change.
4	Paige Tanner	4.5	Duplex and townhouses should not be provided for, these are better suited to Hamilton	Accept the plan change but do not allow the building of duplexes or terraced homes or townhouses - single homes only.	Accept the request to approve the plan change but reject the relief sought. The proposed housing typologies will provide choice in the local market. PPC 56 provides the opportunity to plan for the proposed typologies in an integrated way thereby ensuring that higher densities are offset by proximity to public open space.
FS4	Karen Semmens	FS5	<i>The Submitter supports all submissions that oppose the proposed housing density, especially without adequate parking.</i>	<i>Accept all submissions that oppose the proposed housing density, especially without adequate parking.</i>	<i>Reject the further submission opposing housing density for the reasons set out under #4.5 above. In regard to on-site parking, the NPS-UD prevents the imposition of minimum on-site parking standards in the District Plan and recommends that parking demand be managed through parking management plans.</i>

9	Dennis Shine	9.3	Those who already purchased in the early stages of Lockerbie didn't sign up for the estate to be so densely developed. With purchasing in the early stages no one mentioned a possibility of future dense housing with terrace housing etc.	Decline the plan change.	Reject the relief sought. The proposed housing typologies will provide choice in the local market. PPC 56 provides the opportunity to plan for the proposed typologies in an integrated way thereby ensuring higher densities are offset by proximity to public open space.
FS4	Karen Semmens	FS5	<i>The Submitter supports all submissions that oppose the proposed housing density, especially without adequate parking.</i>	<i>Accept all submissions that oppose the proposed housing density, especially without adequate parking.</i>	<i>Reject the further submission opposing housing density for the reasons set out under #9.3 above. In regard to on-site parking, the NPS-UD prevents the imposition of minimum on-site parking standards within the District Plan and recommends that parking demand be managed through parking management plans.</i>
15	Diane Simmons	15.3	The submitter supports a range of types	Accept and ensure a	Accept the relief

			of dwellings to cater to differing financial situations especially for first-home buyers.	range of dwellings to cater to differing financial situations especially for first-home buyers.	sought and provide for a range of dwellings as set out in the provisions attached as Appendix F.
16	Fran Adamski	16.2	The submitter supports the use of semi-detached and terraced accommodation, but it must compensate by increasing the surrounding outdoor living area. That is, the outdoor area must be an equivalent amount per residence/apartment compared to normal housing and become shared. The standard of living is then maintained with a lower cost for each home build.	Accept the plan change with the following amendment: Increase the land area for semi-detached and terrace units, such that the land per residence is more than 350 m ² (e.g. duplex is > 700 m ²).	Accept the request to approve the plan change and accept the relief sought in part. Expert urban design assessment has shown that the proposed density is justified, given the proximity and access to adequate public open space. However, the changes to the LDAP, additional street activation provisions, and applying the fencing/retaining wall standards to the Lockerbie Residential Zone as recommended in Appendix F will enhance the visual relationship with open spaces and improve the connection of

					residents with communal open space.
FS4	Karen Semmens	FS5	<i>The Submitter supports all submissions that oppose the proposed housing density, especially without adequate parking.</i>	<i>Accept all submissions that oppose the proposed housing density, especially without adequate parking.</i>	<i>Reject the further submission opposing housing density for the reasons set out under #16.2 above. In regard to on-site parking, the NPS-UD prevents the imposition of minimum on-site parking standards in the District Plan and recommends that parking demand be managed through parking management plans.</i>
16	Fran Adamski	16.3	The overall intensity proposed needs to be carefully considered. The extremely small sections will cause mental and wellbeing harm to residents, who will feel confined and locked in. When the houses are no longer new, they will become less desirable resulting in a slum situation in 10-20 years. An assessment of the future socio-economic outlook for such a residential area should be considered.	Accept the plan change with the following amendment: A vision of the future socio-economic outlook of a high intensity subdivision should be reviewed. Changes to create a mix of housing orientated for long-term living by single people, couples and families, will be	Accept the request to approve the plan change but reject the relief sought on the grounds that independent expert urban design assessment has concluded that the planning provisions in Appendix F already cater for an appropriate range of typologies. The author is satisfied

				beneficial.	that the design provides for good residential amenity.
FS4	Karen Semmens	FS5	<i>The Submitter supports all submissions that oppose the proposed housing density, especially without adequate parking.</i>	<i>Accept all submissions that oppose the proposed housing density, especially without adequate parking.</i>	<i>Reject the further submission opposing housing density for the reasons set out under #16.3 above. In regard to on-site parking, the NPS-UD prevents the imposition of minimum on-site parking standards in the District Plan and recommends that parking demand be managed through parking management plans.</i>
20	Michelle Lemay	20.1	<p>The submitter is the owner of 33 Lockerbie Street within Lockerbie Estate. The submitter supports the change in the current Rural Zone to Residential Zone and Medium Residential Zone but objects to the Precinct Overlay which will permit terrace housing, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Morrinsville is a rural township with rural charm and character. Terrace housing belongs in a city environment which is far more sympathetic to such high density housing. Allowing terrace housing in 	Accept the plan change, but decline the Lockerbie Precinct Overlay.	Accept the request to approve the plan change but reject the relief sought on the grounds that independent expert urban design assessment has concluded that the development enabled by the Precinct overlay is appropriate as it provides for the sustainable use of

			<p>Morrinsville will dramatically change the nature of the town. High density housing is not justified in a small Waikato town.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Lockerbie Estate developers have promoted their housing development as a semi-rural environment. The planned Lockerbie Precinct flies in the face of such claims and is more about revenue than creating a positive living environment. • Creating the Precinct Overlay will set a precedent for future developments in Morrinsville and possibly similar towns in the Waikato. This type of development should not be encouraged as it will become the norm rather than the exception, which will ultimately reduce the range of housing options available to new home builders. 		<p>the land and a compact urban form as part of an integrated design that enables higher density to be offset by access and proximity to public open space thereby creating a positive living environment. Approval of the Precinct will not set a general precedent for other areas because the Precinct has been master planned as part of the comprehensive LDAP.</p>
FS4	Karen Semmens	FS5	<p><i>The Submitter supports all submissions that oppose the proposed housing density, especially without adequate parking.</i></p>	<p><i>Accept all submissions that oppose the proposed housing density, especially without adequate parking.</i></p>	<p><i>Reject the further submission opposing the housing density for the reasons set out under #20.1 above. In regard to on-site parking, the NPS-UD prevents the imposition of minimum on-site parking standards in the District Plan and recommends that</i></p>

					<i>parking demand be managed through parking management plans.</i>
24	Ron & Robyn Johnston	24.2	Provide larger sections in which people can install tanks to collect rainwater for use in gardens, which would also help the town's infrastructure. Larger sections mean children have room to play outside. Also, roads need to be wider.	Accept the plan change subject to the amendment as stated.	Accept the request to approve PPC 56 and to require compulsory installation of rainwater storage tanks. Decline the request to provide for larger sections on the grounds that independent expert urban design assessment has concluded that the proposed density within a master planned development that provides easy access to adequate public open space, is an efficient use of land,
FS1	Shane Mellow	FS1	<i>Supports the above submission in so far as all new homes should be required to have their own water tanks and filtration system. The tanks can be filled by rainwater and topped up from town supply when needed.</i>	<i>Accept the above submission in part and require all new homes to have their own water tanks and filtration system.</i>	<i>Accept the further submission and require onsite rainwater storage tanks as provided for in the recommended provisions (see Appendix F).</i>

FS4	Karen Semmens	FS5	<p><i>The Submitter supports all submissions that oppose the proposed housing density, especially without adequate parking.</i></p>	<p><i>Accept all submissions that oppose the proposed housing density, especially without adequate parking.</i></p>	<p><i>Reject the further submission opposing housing density for the reasons set out under #24.2 above. In regard to on-site parking, the NPS-UD prevents the imposition of minimum on-site parking standards in the District Plan and recommends that parking demand be managed through parking management plans.</i></p>
12	Karen Chandler	12.23	<p>In regard to “Appendix C - Section 32 Assessment”: <i>Preferred option</i> <i>Option 3 is the most efficient way of ensuring District Plan integrity, giving the community surety over intended environmental outcomes for the site and providing for the growth of Morrinsville Economic – most expedient in terms of up-front costs, and flexible in terms of reducing future regulatory costs. Provides certain signal to the market of forthcoming dwellings in the area. Will result in quickest delivery to alleviate housing supply and affordability issues. Similarly, positive economic effects to existing service providers in Morrinsville, critical mass for new</i></p>	<p><i>Decline the plan change</i></p>	<p><i>Reject the relief sought. Independent expert assessment has concluded that the proposed mix of Residential and Medium Density Residential zoning within the proposed master planned development is the preferred option.</i></p>

			<p><i>services in the area based on whole-of-site zoning and likely yield.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Submitter does not see how Option 3 will alleviate housing supply and affordability issues? 		
15	Diane Simmons	15.2	Provide walking and cycling tracks and green spaces to ensure Lockerbie is a healthy place to live.	Accept the plan change and amend to ensure that walking and cycling tracks and green spaces are provided.	Accept the request to approve PPC 56 and accept the relief sought in part. Independent expert assessment has concluded that the plan change provides for adequate walking and cycling tracks and green spaces to ensure Lockerbie is a healthy place to live. However, the changes to the LDAP, additional street activation provisions, and applying the fencing/retaining wall standards to the Lockerbie Residential Zone as recommended in Appendix F will enhance the visual relationship with open spaces and improve the

					connection residents communal space.	of with open
--	--	--	--	--	---	--------------------

Transportation related submissions

Fifteen submitters (see below) have raised concerns in regard to transportation and parking. Of the fifteen Submitters seven want the plan change to be declined, and eight want the plan change to be approved subject to amendments.

One Submitter feels that the increase in traffic associated with the proposed development is unacceptable and that the plan change should be declined.

Three Submitters want the internal roads to be widened with more space provided for parking, and/or that parking restrictions are used, to ensure the safety of kids and pedestrians and to provide safe passage for emergency vehicles.

Four Submitters are concerned with the lack of parking elsewhere in town, and that this will be worsened if PPC 56 is approved. Three of the Submitters are especially concerned with the lack of parking in the town centre. One of the Submitters wants the Council to undertake a parking assessment and provide dedicated parking for town centre workers, with parking limits applied to the remaining public parking spaces.

In regard to cycling, one Submitter is satisfied that safe cycling within Lockerbie is provided for by the plan change. However, the Submitter wants safe cycling routes to be integrated within the rest of the town and between Morrinsville and Te Aroha. Another Submitter wants Council to commit to encouraging cycling for short trips to school, work, around town, and visiting friends. In order for this to occur the Submitter wants new development areas such as Lockerbie to focus their transport networks on providing equitable transport choices that encourage a higher level of safety for vulnerable road users. Accordingly, the Submitter wants the plan change to be approved but the roading network designed to encourage active modes of transport over private motor vehicle use.

One Submitter is concerned about the increase in traffic at the George Street/ Coronation Road intersection and wants a roundabout to be constructed at the intersection to mitigate traffic safety concerns. Another Submitter feels that it is imperative that a roundabout be built at the Hangawera/ Taukoro/ Morrinsville-Tahuna Road intersection.

Another Submitter feels that, while the Applicant has adequately assessed the traffic impact of the proposed development on the local road connections, the “downstream” effects on the wider network have not been considered. The Submitter is especially concerned with the increase in traffic on Seales Road and its connection with State Highway 26, and the Snell Street/ Avenue Road North route and its intersection with State Highway 26. The Submitter is concerned about the accuracy of the Applicant’s traffic assessment and wants this to be independently reviewed.

One of the Submitters has raised concerns regarding the suitability of Taukoro Road, a rural road carrying farming orientated traffic such as tractors and harvesters, to be used to convey urban traffic from the plan change area. The Submitter opposes the plan change on traffic safety grounds and, in addition, wants provision to be made for public transport to serve the proposed development.

Another submitter wants the first proposed access road serving the plan change area from the Taukoro Road/ Tahuna Road intersection, to be removed, for traffic safety reasons.

Transportation related matters have been assessed for the Council by independent transport engineers Alastair Black and Vinish Prakash. Their report is attached as Appendix C.

In regard to the submissions concerning cycling connections, their report states that they are satisfied that PPC 56 provides for an appropriate internal shared path network with connections along Morrinsville-Tahuna and Taukoro Road and that connectivity with the wider network beyond the PPC 56 area is outside the scope of the plan change. They note that MPDC has funding allocated for shared path improvements but that details of the improvements have not yet been identified. They recommend that MPDC engage with Bike Waikato when developing the cycling implementation plan in order to ensure that the needs of the cycling community are understood and incorporated into future cycling projects.

In relation to the design of road intersections and shared path connections, they advise that these details will be addressed for consistency with accepted guidelines and design standards, at the time of future resource consents and engineering plan approval.

Regarding the George Street/ Coronation Road intersection, they agree with the Submitters that PPC 56 will add additional traffic to the intersection. They undertook an assessment of the traffic effects on the intersection and reached the conclusion that implementing a right-turn bay is an acceptable treatment to address the increase in traffic and associated increase in the predicted crash risk at the intersection. They note that implementing the right-turn bay will be included in the Private Developer Agreement (PDA). In making this recommendation, they note that a roundabout as requested by the Submitter is likely to produce the safest form of intersection. However, the proposed right-turn bay is proportionate to the increased crash risk and hence the appropriate mitigation.

In regard to the submissions citing concerns about the potential increase in parking demand around the Morrinsville town centre, their opinion is that PPC 56 does not directly affect town centre parking, because of the 2 km distance between the plan change area and the town centre. They note that the NPS-UD requires MPDC to remove minimum parking standards from the District Plan. They consider that parking management within the town centre is the responsibility of MPDC and is beyond the scope of PPC 56. They understand that MPDC is in the process of developing a Comprehensive Parking Management Plan for Morrinsville and that the initial work indicates that there is sufficient capacity within the wider town centre area to accommodate the anticipated parking demand, but more effective management of the parking supply is required to optimise its utilisation.

In response to concerns from Submitters that internal roads are too narrow and street parking inadequate, they state that their assessment shows that the road cross-sections and recessed parking bays are acceptable, including for emergency service access.

They have assessed the effects of the additional traffic from the proposal on the surrounding road network, particularly the State Highway 26 intersections with Seales Road, and Avenue Road North/ Avenue Road South. They note that Waka Kotahi did not raise any concerns in regard to the effects of PPC 56 on the state highway network. They point out that the proposed PPC 56 development has multiple access points into the surrounding road network to distribute trips across the local road network. In their view, the proposed urbanisation of Taukoro Road and Morrinsville-Tahuna Road is appropriate for the increase in traffic and the proposal provides multiple points of access to distribute trips across the local road network. For the above reasons they disagree with submissions regarding traffic effects on the wider road network, and consider that the effects will be appropriately managed to be acceptable.

In regard to traffic safety concerns relating to Taukoro Road, they are satisfied that the proposed road cross-section is appropriate for the volume and mix of traffic expected, and that sight distance deficiencies at the proposed intersections with the plan change area can be addressed during the detailed design and urbanisation of Taukoro Road.

They agree with the Submitter's request that a roundabout be implemented at the Morrinsville-Tahuna Road/ Taukoro Road/ Hangawera Road intersection and point out that this has been provided for under the proposed plan provisions.

In regard to concerns about the adequacy of the Applicant's ITA, they state that they agree with the assessment in the ITA and consider that the proposed plan change provisions manage the effects of the additional traffic to an acceptable level.

In regard to a submission citing lack of public transport, they note that public transport services are the responsibility of the WRC and are subject to demand and funding. WRC did not provide a submission in response to public notification of PC56.

In relying on Alastair Black and Vinish Prakash's expert assessment, and for the reasons set out in their report and summarised above, I make the following recommendations on submissions relating to transportation related matters:

Submitter/ Further submitter		Point#	Summary of submission	Decision sought	Recommendation
3	Emma Hyde	3.3.1	There is a lack of car parking.	Until the town is in a better position to support, that many more houses/ people, the plan change should be declined.	Reject the submission point noting that the provision of parking beyond the plan change area is outside the scope of PPC 56.

4	Paige Tanner	4.3.1	There is a need for more parking.	Accept the plan change with amendments to address this issue.	Accept the request to approve the plan change, noting that car parking in Morrinsville will be managed by MPDC through a Comprehensive Parking Management Plan.
11	Deborah May	11.2.1	There is lack of parking in town	Decline the plan change.	Reject the relief sought noting that the provision of parking beyond the plan change area is outside the scope of PPC 56.
12	Karen Chandler	12.1	Increase in traffic	Decline	Reject the request to decline the plan change and approve PPC 56 subject to the provisions shown in Appendix F that will manage traffic effects to be acceptable.
16	Fran Adamski	16.1	Internal Roads need to be wider to accommodate traffic and parking, particularly in high density areas. There is an increased risk to children when parking is limited. The vehicles will block or partially block the road if they are parked on lawns, causing the risk. Drivers may not be able to see around the parked vehicles.	Accept the plan change with the following amendment: Internal Roads should all be two lanes and allow for continuous parking along one side. The	Accept the request to approve PPC 56, but reject the request to omit recessed street parking on the basis that the proposed road cross-sections are considered to be an acceptable

				parking should not be recessed into the road verge.	standard.
17	Hamilton Wright	17.2	Parking is already hard now, will be worse with more cars.	Decline the plan change.	Reject the relief sought noting that the provision of parking beyond the plan change area is outside the scope of PPC 56.
18	Daniel Compton	18.1	The George St/Coronation Rd intersection is already very busy and quite dangerous between 3 - 3:30pm with traffic from kids and parents. Adding more traffic on George St will increase the pressure here and will be more likely to result in an accident.	Accept the plan change with the following amendment: Add a roundabout at the Coronation Rd/George St intersection, along with improved crossing facilities.	Accept the submission in part, and as an alternative to a roundabout, require that a right-turn bay be implemented at the Coronation Rd/George St intersection.
18	Daniel Compton	18.2	In the Morrinsville CBD area, parking is already stretched to its limit. Adding another 1,200 households will likely push it too far.	Accept the plan change with the following amendment: Undertake an assessment of how much of the parking spaces in town are being used by workers in the town vs visiting traffic. If there is a high proportion of workers parking in the main town	Accept the request to approve the plan change, noting that car parking in Morrinsville will be managed by MPDC though a Comprehensive Parking Management Plan.

				parking spots, consider providing more parking out of the main parking areas, and adding parking limits and enforcement of (say) 4 hours in the prime parking spots.	
19	Steve Southall	19.1	The plan appears to support a reasonable level of safe cycling within Lockerbie through the provision of 3m wide shared paths, but once outside the precinct there is nothing but roads and footpaths. To avoid traffic and parking congestion in the Morrinsville town centre, adequate and safe cycleways should run between Lockerbie and the town centre, which in turn requires a 30kph speed limit and an increased level of traffic calming and zebra crossings.	Accept the plan change and amend to integrate safe cycling within Morrinsville and to Te Aroha.	Accept the request to approve the plan change, noting that the integration of the PPC 56 cycling paths with the wider network is outside the scope of the plan change and will be addressed by MPDC through their cycling improvement programme.
19	Steve Southall	19.2	The proposed cycleway between Morrinsville and Te Aroha should be brought forward. With the Hauraki Cycle Trail already a feature, the Matamata-Piako District needs to be much more cycle-friendly. Lockerbie will hugely increase the pool of recreational cyclists, and day trips from Morrinsville to the new Te Aroha spa facilities will be very popular. These need to be planned-in now, rather than tacked on as an afterthought, years down the track.	Accept the plan change and amend to integrate safe cycling within Morrinsville and to Te Aroha.	Accept the request to approve the plan change, noting that the integration of the PPC 56 cycling paths with the wider network such as between Morrinsville and Te Aroha is outside the scope of the plan change and will be addressed by MPDC through

					funding allocated in the Long Term Plan for cycling and pedestrian improvements.
22	Roland and Marjorie Latto	22.1	The town does not have parking in the town centre to accommodate additional development.	Decline the plan change.	Reject the request to decline the plan change noting that the provision of parking beyond the plan change area is outside the scope of PPC 56.
22	Roland and Marjorie Latto	22.2	The roads in Lockerbie are so narrow that parking is not safe outside houses.	Decline the plan change.	Reject the request to decline the plan change noting that independent transport engineering assessment considers that the proposed road cross-sections are to an acceptable standard.
24	Ron & Robyn Johnston	24.1	The submitter wants the first proposed road on the right, going down Taukoro Road from the Tahuna Road Intersection, to be removed, for the following reasons: The proposed road is opposite the submitter's property boundary and visibility is not always the best, for example first thing in morning with the sun coming up and on foggy days, traffic travelling on Taukoro Road towards Tahuna Road up over the brow of the	Accept the plan change subject to the amendment as stated.	Accept the request to approve the plan change but reject the relief sought on the basis that independent engineering assessment supports multiple access points to distribute vehicle trips across the road network and

			<p>hill could be dangerous for vehicles exiting/entering this road (eg several times the submitter has pulled out of the driveway and then a vehicle appears behind from nowhere). Removing this road altogether would be the better option as the submitter thinks that the connection/road from Morrinsville-Tahuna Road would service this area of the subdivision and will also eliminate the problem of vehicles doing "wheelies" from the Tahuna Rd/Taukoro Rd intersection and disappearing into the sub-division.</p>		<p>considers that safe sight distances at intersections can be achieved through detail design and through lowering speed limits in response to the future urbanisation of Taukoro Road.</p>
25	Cassandra Mankelow-Hancock	25.3	<p>The submitter would like MPDC to reconsider the width of the streets in the development. There is a concern about emergency vehicles being able to access locations where narrow streets are lined on both sides with vehicles from dwellings. Alternatively if the street width remains at the minimum then MPDC should consider the use of broken yellow lines so that if a car parks on one side there can't be one parked directly opposite it.</p>	<p>Accept, but amend to require increased street widths.</p>	<p>Accept the request to approve PPC 56, but reject the request to increase street widths on the basis that the proposed road cross-sections are considered to be an acceptable standard.</p>
29	David & Cheryl Holland	29.1	<p>A traffic assessment was submitted which discusses connection to local roads and the changes required to these connections. However, it does not cover the downstream effects of this traffic increase and the mitigation required. For example: there will be large increases in traffic on Fairway Drive onto Studholme street which are covered. However, not</p>	<p>Decline the plan change.</p>	<p>Reject the request noting that an independent engineering review of the ITA has been undertaken. The review has considered traffic effects on the wider</p>

			<p>covered are the consequential increases in traffic into the centre of Morrinsville, onto Seales Road and the interchange to SH26, and onto Snell Street and Avenue Road North and its interface with SH26.</p> <p>The latter is currently a temporary roundabout. The Traffic Assessment needs to be expanded to cover this and look at the mitigation required. The submitter would also have more faith in the traffic assessment if it could at least be accurate in the public transport section. There are 7 buses daily to Hamilton, not the 2 stated in the report. Getting basic facts like this wrong leads to doubt in all the other numbers presented. As a result, the submitter would like the developers to pay for an independent peer review of the traffic report.</p>		<p>road network and has concluded that the traffic effects will be managed to be acceptable.</p>
29	David & Cheryl Holland	29.6	<p>No consideration has been given to the current lack of parking in the town centre.</p>	<p>Decline the plan change.</p>	<p>Reject the relief sought, noting that the provision of parking beyond the plan change area is outside the scope of PPC 56.</p>
31	Ben & Justine Cameron	31.2	<p>The submitters are also concerned about the width, formation and safety of Taukoro Road given that it services rural properties and vehicles such as tankers, tractors, harvesters, stock trucks etc frequent it. Urban traffic does often not fit well with rural traffic unless there are</p>	<p>Decline the plan change in its current form.</p>	<p>Reject the relief sought, noting that independent transport engineering assessment considers that the proposed Taukoro</p>

			<p>sufficient safety measures, including sufficient width and formation, safe crossing locations and good separation and demarcation between footpaths, shared paths and carriageways. The submitters therefore oppose the proposal insofar that it relates to traffic safety and would like to see more detail on the road formation and shared pathways as proposed. Such traffic safety should include proposals for public transportation. The submitters would welcome pre-hearing discussions.</p>		<p>Road cross-section is adequate to ensure the safety of the users, taking into account the mix of rural and urban traffic. In regard to public transportation, this is a matter outside the scope of the plan change.</p>
32	Bike Waikato	32.1	<p>Bike Waikato supports the need to provide affordable and accessible housing for everyone in our communities. They also believe that newly developing areas of our towns and cities can help encourage a transition in transport behaviours. Approximately one-third of vehicle trips in New Zealand are under 2km, an easy distance that can be covered on foot or by cycle.</p> <p>Bike Waikato wants to see Councils in the Waikato commit to encouraging people to leave their cars at home and jump on a bike for the short trips to school, work, around town, and visiting friends. In order for this to occur new development areas such as the Lockerbie Development Area should focus their transport networks on providing equitable transport choices that encourage a higher level of safety</p>	<p>Accept the plan change with the following amendments: While it is understandable that the specifics of roading design and layout will be approved at subdivision time, Bike Waikato suggests the plan change requires the development to follow the current best practices in accessible street design. They suggest that the plan change require the roading</p>	<p>Accept the request to approve the plan change, noting that path crossings and intersection design are matters to be considered at the detailed design and engineering plan approval stages of the proposed development.</p>

		<p>for vulnerable road users.</p> <p>The Integrated Transport Assessment completed by CKL states that "No crashes were reported that involved pedestrians or cyclists. As such, no specific road safety issues have been identified in relation to the subject site." This comment is concerning, that CKL would only suggest improvements to encourage measures to make walking and cycling safer if someone had previously been injured or killed. MPDC should be requiring best practice street design that prevents any deaths or injuries on the road network.</p> <p>It is concerning that a new development does little to encourage future transport behaviour changes. While there is a proposal to provide a shared path network around the development, this does little to connect people on bikes safely to their front door. If the suggestion, by CKL, is that cyclists will share the road with motorised vehicles, then the road environments should be designed to prevent harm from occurring to those users.</p> <p>While Bike Waikato does not want to prevent new developments from occurring, and encourages making affordable housing available to more members of our communities, they do believe MPDC can think about the future users of these communities and the measures needed that will in turn help</p>	<p>networks to be designed to encourage active modes of transport over private motor vehicle use.</p> <p>They suggest that in addition to meeting RITS requirements, the road form and function shall provide safe accessible routes for people on bikes and be designed to reduce the risk to all users.</p> <p>Intersections and path crossing points should also be designed to give priority to vulnerable users living in and accessing the development.</p>	
--	--	---	---	--

			New Zealand meet its climate change objectives.		
34	Janet Gray	34.3	<p>With the amount of traffic turning onto Taukoro Road, the submitter believes it is imperative that a roundabout be built at the Hangawera/ Taukoro/ Tahuna Road intersection.</p> <p>In addition, the submitter notes there will be parking issues in the wider township for MPDC to resolve but that these are not necessarily part of the Lockerbie Plan Change process.</p>	<p>Accept the plan change with the following amendment: Require a roundabout at the Hangawera/ Taukoro/ Tahuna Road intersection.</p>	<p>Accept the relief sought and provide for the implementation of a roundabout at the Hangawera/Taukoro/ Morrinsville-Tahuna Road intersection within the recommended provisions attached as Appendix F.</p>
12	Karen Chandler	12.24	<p>In regard to “Appendix E – Integrated Transportation Assessment” (extracts quoted below), the Submitter comments as follows:</p> <p><i>Road Safety</i></p> <p><i>3.3.1 A search was made of the New Zealand Transport Agency’s Crash Analysis System for all crashes that had been reported over the last five years within the vicinity of the site. The search area included George Street and Cobham Drive north of Stirling Drive, Studholme Street between Rushton Road and Goodwin Avenue and Taukoro Road from the site to Morrinsville-Tahuna Road.</i></p> <p><i>3.3.2 The search found that six crashes</i></p>	<p>Decline the plan change</p>	<p>Reject the relief sought. Independent transport engineering assessment considers that the traffic effects (including effects on the wider road network) can be managed appropriately, accessibility for emergency vehicles is enabled, and that the intersection design and appropriate speed limits can be considered at the</p>

		<p><i>had been reported within the study area, none of which resulted in any injuries.</i></p> <p><i>3.3.3 Overall, the reported crashes occurred for a variety of reasons and in different locations. No crashes were reported that involved pedestrians or cyclists. As such, no specific road safety issues have been identified in relation to the subject site.</i></p> <p><i>3.3.4 It is noted that the visibility at the Morrinsville-Tahuna Road intersection with Taukoro Road does not meet AUSTROADs standards. It may be appropriate to reduce the speed limits at the intersection once a connection from the site to Taukoro Road is established. This is addressed further in this report.</i></p> <p><i>Public Transport</i></p> <p><i>4.2.1 There are no public transport services in the Morrinsville area except for the twice daily service to/from Hamilton. The nearest bus stop for this service is approximately 1.2km south of the site within central Morrinsville.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• Only 6 crashes doesn't mean that, that will continue when you add a further 1,200 "dwellings". The area has limited crashes due to low volume. An increase in the volume will no doubt increase crashes. Considering Morrinsville has a</i> 		<p><i>detail design stage commensurate with the future urbanisation of Morrinsville-Tahuna and Taukoro Roads.</i></p>
--	--	--	--	---

		<p>limited resource for medical care as it stands this is not a good situation to be in. St Johns has limited resource now. Has any research been done into how long it takes for an ambulance to get to Morrinsville when called?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“It may be appropriate”</i> – what does “may be” mean? Either it will or it won’t. If it does not meet the standard, then “maybe” is not an option. • There is no public transport within the area as per report so what is being planned? Is it expected that these 1,200 people will drive into town and try finding parking to catch the bus which is on a limited timetable? • How many people currently use the “Main Roads” to commute to Hamilton and Auckland? There are two major roads that users could drive on, to commute to Hamilton and these roads are troublesome i.e. SH 26, Matuku Road (Peat Soils), Piako Road (uneven service for the most part). • Perhaps locating a development closer to the rail network would make more sense in the “long term” or actually investing in “public transport” would be a good idea. • The report is robust with statistics and data. However, it does not show 		
--	--	---	--	--

			what the downward impacts are of extra traffic i.e. parking within Morrinsville, limited future planning and consideration for public transport improvements.		
12	Karen Chandler	12.25	In regard to "Appendix L – Morrinsville Residential Growth Assessment", the assessment summary states that most people will commute to Hamilton for work. In light of the above, the Submitter questions that developing the north of Morrinsville will be of benefit. This will drive traffic volumes to go through Morrinsville. Development should rather be within the south end of Morrinsville which is closer to rail and the existing bus station.	Decline plan change	Reject the relief sought. Independent engineering assessment has shown that traffic effects on the wider road network can be managed to be acceptable.

Adequacy of retail and support services

Fifteen submitters have raised concerns in regard to the lack of capacity to serve the additional population enabled by the plan change, in the existing retail offering in town, educational facilities, medical facilities, emergency services, and electricity supply.

Seven submissions relate to the capacity of existing educational facilities. Six of the Submitters consider that the existing schools (especially primary schools and in particular the David Street School) are already at capacity, that the plan change should be declined until there are adequate educational facilities to serve the needs of the 1,200 additional households that will be enabled by the plan change, or if approved the plan change should be subject to an investigation into future primary school sites. The submission from the seventh Submitter, the Department of Education, explains that the Ministry is responsible for the upgrading of existing schools and development of new schools to meet increased demand. The Ministry estimates that the additional 1,200 households enabled by the plan change could potentially increase the number of students by an additional 350 primary and 180 high-school aged students. The Ministry acknowledges that there is some existing capacity in the local schooling network but is concerned that the scale of the development enabled by the plan change combined with other local private plan changes also in the pipeline, will place pressure on local schools, especially David Street School. The Ministry has not yet identified a requirement for additional educational facilities within the plan change area, but wants the plan provisions to be amended to provide for educational facilities in the MRZ, subject to resource consent as a Restricted-Discretionary Activity.

Eight Submitters have expressed concern regarding the lack of retail facilities in Morrinsville, especially supermarkets, to cope with the increased demand that will stem from the additional 1,200 households that will be enabled if the plan change is approved. The Submitters want the plan change to be declined until there is more capacity in the existing retail offering or if approved then provision must simultaneously be made for more shops, especially supermarkets, to cope with the likely increase in demand. One Submitter has suggested a separate shopping area within the Lockerbie development. One Submitter has suggested a "4-Square" type convenience store, and another wants provision for more large-format retail offerings and better support for the golf course that is currently under-utilised.

Seven Submitters have concerns regarding the ability of the medical and emergency services sectors to cope with the increase in demand if the plan change is approved. The Submitters note that the two existing medical centres in town are already running at capacity, doctors are fully booked with long wait times, emergency services are already stretched, and even if more facilities are built there will still be a lack of qualified doctors and emergency and medical staff to operate the new facilities. The Submitters want the plan change to be declined until more medical facilities are available or, if approved then the Council must simultaneously investigate how it can assist the medical sector to attract more staff and find additional space to serve the increase in the community that will be enabled by the plan change.

One Submitter is under the impression that the power grid is already running at capacity to the point where Lockerbie has to use diesel generators. The Submitter wants clarification of any potential network capacity constraints and assurance that an adequate power supply can be made available to serve the proposed expansion.

Having reviewed the submissions and in relying on expert evidence as stated in the table below, I consider that these submissions are outside the scope of PPC 56 and cannot be influenced by the outcome of PPC 56.

I make the following recommendations on submissions relating to the capacity of retail and support services:

Submitter/ Further submitter		Point#	Summary of submission	Decision sought	Recommendation
3	Emma Hyde	3.2	Morrinsville schools are already full. Ensure there is adequate capacity in schools and the college before additional development takes place.	Until the town is in a better position to support, that many more houses/people, the plan change should be declined.	Reject the request to decline the plan change on the grounds that the responsibility to provide school facilities and recruit teachers to meet the demand rests with the Ministry of Education (see their submission below) and is outside the scope of the plan change request. The Ministry estimates that the development that will be enabled by PPC 56 will result in a requirement to accommodate an additional 350 primary school students and 180 high school-aged students. The Ministry has not yet identified a
5	Alicia Crozier	5.1	Questions whether the existing schools can support the educational needs of the extra children the 1,200 houses will bring in (on top of the houses that have already received consent).	Decline the plan change until there are more educational facilities.	
12	Karen Chandler	12.4	Lack of schooling – David Street school is nearing full capacity from an enrolment perspective. Building new classrooms may alleviate, although teachers are needed for those classrooms and teachers are in short supply across NZ. Only a few schools in Morrinsville will have room. What are the current projections for teachers and growth within the current schools? Intermediate Level schooling locations is extremely limited – nothing in the plan indicates that this will improve. Childcare: How many children can the proposed Lockerbie childcare centre	Decline the plan change.	

			accommodate, when will it be built and how many teachers are required?		current requirement for additional educational facilities within the plan change area, but has requested that the provisions be altered to provide for educational facilities in the plan change area as a Restricted-Discretionary Activity. I support the Ministry's submission.
17	Hamilton Wright	17.3	No capacity in existing schools.	Decline the plan change.	The Lockerbie Childcare Centre is consented to accommodate 85 children, staffed by a maximum of 13 full-time equivalents. The recommended plan change provisions provide for additional childcare facilities subject to consent under the Restricted-Discretionary class. Beyond providing for future educational facilities through the recommended plan provisions there is
22	Roland and Marjorie Latto	22.3	The schools do not have space to increase capacity to accommodate new pupils.	Decline the plan change.	

					nothing else that the plan change can do to influence the timely provision of educational facilities to meet the future demand.
18	Daniel Compton	18.4	The primary school system is already stretched. The submitter is not sure how it could accommodate another 1,200 households.	Accept the plan change with the following amendment: Investigate development for future primary school sites.	Accept the request to approve the plan change, but reject the relief sought noting that the development of future primary school sites is the responsibility of the Ministry of Education and is beyond the scope of the plan change.
23	Ministry of Education	23.1	The Ministry has responsibility for all education property owned by the Crown. This involves managing the existing property portfolio, upgrading and improving the portfolio, purchasing and constructing new property to meet increased demand, identifying and disposing of surplus State school sector property and managing teacher and caretaker housing. The Ministry is therefore a considerable stakeholder in terms of activities that may impact on educational facilities and assets in the Matamata-Piako District. The proposed site is located near a	The Ministry is neutral on the proposed plan change if the relief sought can be incorporated.	Accept the Ministry's submission in part and make changes to the recommended plan provisions as detailed under #23.6 (see the table titled "Submissions on plan change provisions").

			<p>number of schools in Morrinsville and due to the additional 1,200 dwellings proposed with this plan change, there is the potential for the development to increase the number of students in the area by approximately 350 primary school students and 180 high school-aged students. The Ministry acknowledges that Lockerbie Estate has engaged with the Ministry and confirms that while there is some existing capacity within the local schooling network, the scale of this additional development, especially if combined with local private plan changes also in the pipeline, will place pressure on local schools, especially David Street School. The Ministry has some reservations about its ability to service education requirements for these additional dwellings in a timely fashion.</p> <p>However, while the Ministry has not yet identified a current requirement for additional educational facilities within the plan change area, the Ministry submits that specific provision should be made within the Proposed new "Section 17 Medium Density Residential Zone" to enable educational facilities within this zone and to recognise the important role that educational facilities play within the communities that they serve.</p>		
3	Emma Hyde	3.4	There is a lack of supermarkets.	Until the town is in a better position to support that many	Reject the request to decline the plan change for the

				more houses/people, the plan change should be declined.	following reasons:
5	Alicia Crozier	5.4	Questions whether the supermarkets, which over the last couple of years have struggled with town demand, will be able to cope with the influx of new residents taking into account the likely ongoing disruption to the country's supply chain.	Decline the plan change until there are more supermarkets.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To cater for local retail demand, the Applicant plans (subject to resource consent) to provide a neighbourhood retail centre within the Lockerbie subdivision to the south of the plan change area. The planned centre is to comprise a small supermarket and five convenience retail units; • Beyond providing land for the development of a convenience retail offering to meet local demand, the plan change is not able to directly influence the provision, number, and quality of retail offerings to serve the wider catchment; • MPDC's Business Development
7	Peter Burrell	7.2	While the population increases, the shopping facilities have not kept pace and supermarkets etc are inadequate now, with little improvement proposed in the foreseeable future.	Not stated.	
12	Karen Chandler	12.5	There are only two supermarkets within Morrinsville which lack the size to support extra people. Stock levels are low, and parking is impossible. Pick-up time slots are currently booked out in advance. More people moving into the area will add extra pressure. Lack of retail: Nothing in the plan change suggests improving the retail space within Morrinsville i.e. bigger department stores (Mitre 10, The Warehouse). Morrinsville struggles to support the growth now and adding 1,200 additional dwellings without considering this, is irresponsible. When will the café/ neighbourhood centre be built? What is being done to support the Golf course? It is under utilised as it is.	Decline the plan change.	
29	David & Cheryl Holland	29.7	No consideration has been given to the	Decline the plan	

			<p>current poor supermarket facilities in town.</p>	<p>change.</p>	<p>Capacity and Demand Assessment (May 2022) prepared under the NPS-UD shows that there is likely sufficient capacity to meet the projected long-term demand for business zoned land within the Morrinsville Business Zone that is centrally located to serve the wider catchment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is noted that the proposed increase in Morrinsville's population enabled by PPC 56 is likely to act as a catalyst to improve the retail offering for the town as a whole, as set out in the evidence of Timothy Heath and GD Jones. In this sense, the population growth enabled by PPC 56 will over time have a positive,
--	--	--	---	----------------	--

					rather than negative, effect on the residents' access to retail facilities.
4	Paige Tanner	4.2	There is a need for more shops (even a separate shopping area in Lockerbie, for example)	Accept the plan change with amendments to address this issue	Accept the request to approve PPC 56, noting that the proposed
15	Diane Simmons	15.1	Provide for more shops (a "4-Square"-type convenience store).	Accept the plan change and amend to provide more shops.	neighbourhood retail centre to the south of the plan change area will provide a local convenience shopping area which is likely to include a "4-Square"-type convenience store.
28	Chris Pritchard	28.1	Need supermarkets and more shops to cope with increase in households.	Accept the plan change subject to the amendments as stated.	Accept the request to approve the plan change, noting that beyond providing land for retail development to serve the local catchment, the plan change is not able to directly influence the number of supermarkets and shops to serve the wider catchment.
5	Alicia Crozier	5.2	Questions whether the existing medical centres, which are already running at capacity and putting strain on doctors,	Decline the plan change until there are more medical	Reject the request to decline the plan change noting that:

			nurses and support staff, can handle the extra influx of patients.	facilities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Applicant plans (subject to resource consent under a separate RMA process) to provide for the development of a medical centre within the Lockerbie Neighbourhood Centre to the south of the plan change area. • Beyond providing land for a medical centre to meet the needs of the local catchment, the plan change is not able to directly influence the availability of doctors and medical staff to serve the additional demand. Market forces alone (supply and demand) will determine the availability of medical staff and facilities. • The potential for
11	Deborah May	11.3	The doctors are already fully booked with wait times of over a week	Decline the plan change.	
12	Karen Chandler	12.3	Lack of medical services within Morrinsville. There are two medical clinics which struggle to service the current community. Supporting additional facilities would help, although as with schooling you need the workers i.e. doctors and nurses.	Decline the plan change.	
17	Hamilton Wright	17.1	No expansion should be allowed because there are no doctors to serve the increase in demand for medical facilities.	Decline the plan change.	

					<p>additional strain on the existing medical facilities is not an effect of PPC 56. Population growth in Morrinsville is predicted to occur. If PPC 56 is not approved, growth will need to be accommodated elsewhere in Morrinsville, but will still result in the same pressure on medical facilities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As for the retail offering, the increase in population enabled by PPC 56 and associated increase in demand has the potential to act as a catalyst for the improvement of medical facilities for the whole of the town, as set out in the evidence of Timothy Heath.
18	Daniel Compton	18.3	The Morrinsville Medical Centre is	Accept the plan	Accept the request to

			already stretched with the number of patients it has to service. The submitter fears that adding more households will push it beyond its capacity.	change with the following amendment: Investigate how the Council can support Morrinsville Medical Centre to get more staff and space to serve the community.	approve the plan change noting that the relief sought is beyond the scope of the plan change. The Submitter is invited to progress the relief that he seeks through other planning processes such as through making submissions to the LTP.
34	Janet Gray	34.5	The submitter notes there will be pressure on the town's medical facilities to resolve but that these are not necessarily part of the Lockerbie Plan Change process.	Not stated.	Accept the submission. As stated previously, it is agreed that resolving pressure on the town's medical facilities is beyond the scope of the plan change.
5	Alicia Crozier	5.3	Questions whether the already stressed and over-worked emergency services will be able to cope with the added pressure the 1,200 new homes will bring.	Decline the plan change until there is more capacity in the emergency services.	Reject the request to decline the plan change. The potential for additional strain on existing emergency services is not an effect of PPC 56. Population growth in Morrinsville is predicted to occur. If PPC 56 is not approved, growth will

					need to be accommodated elsewhere in Morrinsville, but will still result in the same pressure on emergency services.
6	Dayne Horne, Marco Boats	6.2	The submitter understands that the power grid is running at capacity to the point where Lockerbie already has to use diesel generators which is not an appropriate long term option. If there are capacity constraints, then where will the extra power come from to the serve the proposed expansion?	Not stated.	Reject the submission point. I am not aware of Lockerbie using diesel power generators to support electricity supply. As stated in the evidence of Dean Morris, PowerCo has confirmed through consultation that there is sufficient supply for around 450 lots within the Plan Change Area. Residential development above this threshold will require an upgrade which is currently undergoing planning and development.

Miscellaneous Submission Points (reverse-sensitivity, productive capacity of soils, and amateur radio activities)

Four Submitters (see below) are concerned with reverse-sensitivity effects and the loss of productive farm land should the plan change be approved.

One Submitter notes that the development area comprises productive land which should be preserved to grow food rather than the proposed urban development and therefore that the plan change should be declined.

Three Submitters are concerned with potential reverse-sensitivity effects.

One of the three Submitters owns a neighbouring property on Taukoro Road, directly opposite the plan change area and runs a business from the premises which involves frequent truck and digger movements. The Submitter wants confirmation, as their property will still be classed as rural, that their business would not be affected in any way by the plan change and that future residents within the plan change area on the opposite side of Taukoro Road could not complain about the effects of the business.

The two other Submitters are neighbouring farmers.

One of the two neighbouring farmers want the proposed Lockerbie development to have regard to the established neighbouring farm businesses that will continue to operate in Taukoro Road in the vicinity of the proposed residential development that will be enabled if the plan change is approved. The Submitter wants consideration to be given to how farming activities can be supported to continue to operate, once Lockerbie has been established. Issues already causing concern include drawing large amounts of water from the aquifer, and town people not being used to the effects of farming such as barking dogs, fertiliser and silage spreading, and harvesters and planters working late into the night. The Submitter wants the plan change to be approved subject to reverse sensitivity provisions for those dwellings closest to the boundaries of Lockerbie whereby new owners must be made aware of the potential nuisance effects of normal farming activities.

The other neighbouring farmers (the Camerons) who have made a submission own the adjoining farm to the east. The Camerons generally support the expansion of Morrinsville, providing that facilities such as public transport, schools, community facilities and infrastructure are in place. The Submitter wants to learn how MPDC will provide these facilities on a wider scale for the growing population. The Submitter also supports some of the proposed LDAP, including the proposed local community facilities such as the reserve spaces, retirement village, and the small community commercial and education precincts as these will strengthen the community "feel" and help to integrate the new development into Morrinsville. The Submitter also supports the pedestrian linkages throughout the development area, and the connection to Morrinsville-Tahuna Road via the proposed roundabout.

However the Camerons have concerns regarding the effects of having urban neighbours. Their farming operation includes permitted farming activities such as livestock grazing, fertiliser spreading including some chicken manure, effluent application via irrigator, cropping, harvesting, spraying etc, which generate odour, noise and dust. The ability to continue with these operations, uninterrupted (while also within the bounds of

the District Plan) is imperative to the economics of their farm.

The Camerons note that the adjacent Parkwood development has already been built along their southern farm boundary, and there have been issues with rubbish being dumped over the boundary fence, trespassing, and a residential neighbour being upset by the cows in the adjoining paddock. The Lockerbie development will bring many more urban neighbours along their boundary, many of whom will not be accustomed to farming practices. Their concern is that the same issues will arise as those from Parkwood residents, including lack of privacy, potential effects on stock safety, loss of security, trespassing and in particular there will be reverse sensitivity by urban dwellers with only a 7-wire boundary fence on the common/shared boundary.

The Camerons are concerned that there is no detail as to how the developer proposes that these effects would be mitigated thus ensuring that the adjoining farming operation can continue to operate. They therefore oppose the proposal insofar that it relates to the urban/rural edge treatment and seek that measures be incorporated into the proposed plan change to require increased setbacks, screening, fencing and if possible, some form of no-complaints covenant along the common boundary. A reserve buffer along the shared boundary would also be a potential option. Further to this, they seek certainty that denser development in close proximity to the shared urban/ rural boundary would not occur over and above that proposed. For all of the above reasons, they want the Council to decline the plan change in its current form.

I have been advised by Kathryn Drew and Counsel for MPDC that the Applicant is engaging with the Camerons with a view to reaching agreement that may resolve their concerns. I understand that parties will provide an update on the status of the Camerons' submission at the hearing, if not earlier. It is my understanding that the discussions include provision for private "no complaints" covenants to protect the Camerons from reverse-sensitivity which, in my view, is the preferred approach. I include commentary below in regard to the Camerons' submission. If agreement is not reached between the Applicant and the Camerons, I will have more to say in regard to their submission, at the hearing.

The fifth submission, in regard to amateur radio activities, seeks Permitted Activity status for masts and associated antennae with a height up to 20m.

Having reviewed the submissions and in part relying on expert evidence where stated, noting that final assessment of the Camerons' submission is pending, I make the following recommendations on submissions relating to reverse-sensitivity, the productive capacity of the soils and provision for amateur radio activities:

Submitter/ Further submitter	Point#	Summary of submission	Decision sought	Recommendation
22	Roland and Marjorie Latto	22.7 The land is good land which could produce food.	Decline the plan change.	Reject the request to decline the plan change, noting it is acknowledged that the site comprises high quality soils that will be lost to food production. However, the existing Morrinsville urban area is surrounded by high quality soils in all directions. In order for Morrinsville to expand, it is inevitable that high quality soils will as a consequence be lost to urban development. To contain the loss of high quality soils, the District Plan has earmarked the plan change site for future residential zoning, to provide a way for future urban development to occur in order that the remaining resource of high quality soils surrounding

					<p>Morrinsville can justifiably be protected from future loss to urban development. This approach of protecting the soil resource to the extent possible, by consolidating future urban growth in areas earmarked for future development is a policy outcome of the District Plan (see Objective 2.4.1 O1 and Policy P4 quoted below)</p> <p>O1: <i>To avoid inappropriate residential and rural-residential growth in the rural environment so as to protect the use of the District's rural land resource for rural production.</i></p> <p>P4: <i>To identify potential areas for future residential development which should be protected from new subdivision and development which may</i></p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<i>compromise the future intended use.</i>
24	Ron & Robyn Johnston	24.3	The submitter currently runs a business from home (15 Taukoro Road) which involves trucks and diggers. These enter & exit the property several times a day. The submitter wants confirmation, as their property will still be classed as rural, that the business would not be affected in any way by the plan change, and that no one on the residential side of Taukoro Road could complain about the business.	Not stated.	Reject the relief sought (confirmation that residential neighbours could not complain about the operation of the Submitter's business), noting that the plan change cannot guarantee that the new residential neighbours will not complain about the business. However, potential reverse-sensitivity effects will be appropriately managed by means of the larger minimum lot size. In addition it is standard practice for MPDC, at the time of subdivision, to impose "no complaints" consent notices on the titles of new lots where there is a risk that reverse-sensitivity effects may arise. It is acknowledged

					that the Submitter's business will not be subject to the plan change provisions. Rather, the operation of the Submitter's business will continue to be governed by the Rural Zone provisions (or conditions of a resource consent if the business were established under a resource consent), unaffected by the outcome of PPC 56.
34	Janet Gray	34.1	The submitter notes that the plan change will double the population of Morrinsville in a short time-frame. Therefore, the development needs to be done properly, having regard to the well-established neighbouring farm businesses which have been, and will continue to operate in Taukoro Road in the immediate vicinity of the development. Consideration must be given as to how farming activities can be supported to continue to operate, once Lockerbie Estate has been established. Issues already causing concern include drawing large amounts of water from the aquifer, and town's people not used to the effects of farming such as barking	Accept the plan change with the following amendments: Reverse sensitivity provisions should be incorporated for those dwellings closest to the boundaries of Lockerbie whereby new owners must be made aware of the potential nuisance effects of normal farming activities.	Accept the submission noting that the proposed provisions in Appendix F will manage reverse-sensitivity effects by means of the larger minimum lot size and building setbacks for properties adjoining the Rural Zone. In addition it is standard practice for MPDC, at the time of subdivision, to impose "no

			dogs, fertiliser and silage spreading, and harvesters and planters working late into the night.		complaints” consent notices on the titles of new lots where there is a risk that reverse-sensitivity effects may arise.
31	Ben & Justine Cameron	31.1	<p>The submitters own the adjoining farm to the east. They generally support the expansion of Morrinsville, providing that facilities such as public transport, schools, community facilities and infrastructure can be provided. They are interested to learn how MPDC will provide these facilities on a wider scale for the growing population. They also support some of the proposed Lockerbie Development Plan, including the proposed local community facilities such as the reserve spaces, retirement village, and the small community commercial and education precincts as they believe that these will strengthen the community feel and help to integrate the new development into Morrinsville. They also support the pedestrian linkages throughout, and the connection to Morrinsville-Tahuna Road via roundabout.</p> <p>However they have concerns regarding the effects of having urban neighbours. Their farming operation includes permitted farming activities such as livestock grazing, fertiliser spreading including some chicken manure, effluent application via irrigator, cropping,</p>	Decline the plan change in its current form.	<p>Acknowledge the Submitter’s support for the expansion of Morrinsville, the proposed reserves, pedestrian and road linkages, and the planned community facilities within Lockerbie Estate. Matters relating to public transport, schools, community facilities and infrastructure have been addressed under other similar submission points and the same comments apply here.</p> <p>Acknowledge the potential for reverse-sensitivity effects to arise in relation to the Submitter’s established farming activities as a result of the development</p>

		<p>harvesting, spraying etc, which generate odour, noise and dust. The ability to continue with these operations, uninterrupted (while also within the bounds of the District Plan) is imperative to the economics of the farm.</p> <p>The adjacent Parkwood development has already built along their southern boundary, and there have been issues with rubbish coming over the boundary fence, trespassing and a resident being upset by the cows being in the paddock when it was not convenient for them.</p> <p>The Lockerbie development will create many urban neighbours along their boundary, many of whom will not be accustomed to farming practices. Their concern is that the same issues will arise as that from Parkwood residents, including lack of privacy, potential effects on stock safety, loss of security, trespassing and in particular there will be reverse sensitivity by urban dwellers as they go about their dairy farming operation with only a 7-wire boundary fence on the common/shared boundary.</p> <p>There is no detail as to how the developer proposes that these effects would be mitigated and thus ensuring that their farming operation can continue to operate. They therefore oppose the proposal insofar that it relates to the edge treatment and seek that measures be incorporated into the proposed plan change / rules to require increased</p>		<p>enabled by the plan change.</p> <p>Accept the relief sought and recommend that the provisions in Appendix F that will manage reverse-sensitivity effects by means of the larger minimum lot size and building setbacks for properties adjoining the Rural Zone, be approved.</p> <p>Note in addition that it is standard practice for MPDC, at the time of subdivision, to impose “no complaints” consent notices on the titles of new lots where there is a risk that reverse-sensitivity effects may arise. However, the preference is for private “no complaints” covenants to be agreed with the Applicant to protect the Submitter from reverse-sensitivity</p>
--	--	---	--	---

			setbacks, screening, fencing and if possible, some form of no-complaints covenant along their common boundary. A reserve buffer along their shared boundary would also be a potential option. Further to this, they seek certainty that denser development in close proximity to their shared boundary would not occur over and above that proposed (700m ² sections). Greater density results in more people exposed to their farming operation, and therefore greater likelihood of the aforementioned effects to occur. The submitters would welcome pre-hearing discussions.		effects in this instance where the interface with the adjoining farm land is extensive and vulnerable with minimal fence/ buffer protection.
13	David King, President, Waikato VHF Group Inc	13.1	<p>In regard to amateur radio activities, the Submitter wants submission ID 40396 to MPDC Plan Change 53 (Settlements Zone) from NZART et. al. be applied to Plan Change 56 to ensure that Amateur Radio Activities are accepted at Lockerbie Estate i.e:</p> <p>That the following rules set by the Christchurch City Council for Amateur Radio Activities (11.7.1, Rule P3) be incorporated into the Lockerbie Plan Change:</p> <p><i>11.7.1 Permitted activities - Communications facilities</i> <i>Rule P3 Amateur Radio Activities</i> <i>a) The top of any utility structure is less than 20 metres above ground level.</i> <i>b) Any antenna other than a simple wire</i></p>	Amend the plan change provisions by providing for amateur radio installations up to 20m in height under Permitted Activity Status.	Decline the relief sought. The Submitter wants his submission to provide for amateur radio activities in the MPDC Settlement Zones, to also be accepted for the plan change so that Permitted Activity status will apply to amateur radio installations subject to performance standards including masts of up to 20m in height with associated supports and guy wires,

		<p><i>dipole shall meet the following criteria:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>i. Any of the elements making up the antenna shall not exceed 0.08m in diameter and 14.9m in length;</i> <i>ii. For horizontal HF yagi or loop antenna the boom length shall not exceed 13m;</i> <i>iii. No part of the antenna, utility structure or guy wires shall overhang the property boundary; and</i> <i>iv. Simple wire dipoles shall not overhang property boundaries.</i> <p><i>c) Any dish antenna shall:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>i. Be less than 5 metres in diameter/width;</i> <i>ii. Be pivoted less than 4 metres above the ground; and</i> <i>iii. If located in any Residential Zone, meet the minimum setback and daylight recession plane standards in Chapter 14.</i> 	<p>antennae and wiring. While acceptable in the Settlement Zone, I consider that Permitted Activity Status for installations of the scale proposed in the submission is inappropriate in the PPC 56 area, which has a different urban quality, density, and amenity compared to the Settlement Zone. For example, the minimum lot size in the Settlement Zone is 1,000m² for serviced lots and 2,500m² where lots are not connected to reticulated services. Lots in the Settlement Zones are generally much larger than the minimum permitted size. The character of the Settlement Zones can best be described as rural-residential comprising hobby farming activities,</p>
--	--	--	--

					<p>accessory rural-style buildings (some of which have a utilitarian rather than residential style), and large separation between dwellings. PPC 56, in contrast will provide for a medium density environment with minimum lot sizes ranging from 325m², 200m² for duplexes, and 150m² for terraced housing. The buildings have minimal separation with permitted side and rear yards of 1.5m, and 0m at common walls between adjoining duplexes and terraced housing. The maximum permitted building height is 9m. Once established, the character of the plan change area will be that of a medium density urban environment comprising</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>harmoniously designed residential units in close proximity, with intervening open space corridors.</p> <p>The proposed over-height utilitarian masts and associated wiring will be incongruous with the building style, character and amenity of the development that will be enabled by PPC 56. Permitted Activity status for the installations is not appropriate in the plan change area, and, as an unintended consequence will set an inappropriate permitted baseline for over-height structures.</p> <p>I note that my assessment above, is supported by Wayne Bredemeijer's urban design assessment (see Appendix D).</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

Submissions on plan change provisions

Five submitters and one further submitter (see below) have made submissions specific to the notified plan change provisions (objectives and policies and the proposed rules).

Included are extensive submissions by Council on a wide range of the proposed rules. With the exception of a request to include rules requiring compulsory on-site rainwater storage and water metering, the remaining submissions from the Council predominantly seek clarification, consistency, and alignment with the Planning Standards. The changes to the notified provisions recommended by Kathryn Drew (Attachment 1 to her evidence) are the result of engagement with the Council post notification and are understood to largely (if not fully) address the Council's concerns.

The Ministry of Education's submissions seek changes to the objectives and policies to provide for educational facilities in the MRZ, and a rule change that will enable educational facilities to be consented under the Restricted-Discretionary class (as opposed to Non-Complying).

The bulk of the remaining submissions have a focus on the density provisions.

A small number of submissions seek to correct typographical and grammatical errors.

Based on my review, I make the following recommendations on submissions relating to the plan change provisions as notified:

Submitter/ Further submitter	Point#	Summary of submission	Decision sought	Recommendation
Issues, Objectives and Policies				
12	Karen Chandler	12.6 The Submitter disagrees with the following Issue statement in the proposed plan change provisions: <i>17.1 Medium Density Residential Zone Issues</i> <i>It is intended that by enabling increased densities in these areas, the zone will play a key role in minimising urban sprawl and increasing housing supply with more affordable options in the</i>	Decline the plan change	Decline the relief sought and recommend that the plan change be approved, noting: • The term "it is intended that by enabling increased densities..." means "the outcome

		<p><i>district.</i> The Submitter questions the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “It is intended that” means that it may not happen i.e. minimising urban sprawl may not happen? • How is expanding Lockerbie minimising “Urban Sprawl” expanding Lockerbie is increasing the sprawl? • How is this development going to provide “more affordable options in the District”? For whom? • How many people within the current development are from “within the district”? • What is the definition of “affordable”? Research the submitter has conducted shows that current prices for property within the Lockerbie development range from mid-\$800k to over \$900k. As stated in the plan change (see Appendix 1 – Demographic Profile within Appendix L – Morrinsville Residential Growth Assessment prepared by Property Economics) the average household median income is \$69k. Using an average salary of \$65k for a couple with two children it is estimated a buyer could borrow up to \$780,576. With a 20% deposit of \$195,144, a buyer could afford a property up to \$975,720 (based on a 30-year term). The median age in Morrinsville (as per 		<p>sought by enabling increased densities...” and is appropriate terminology commonly used to explain issues underlying plan changes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expanding Lockerbie is minimising urban sprawl by concentrating urban expansion in one area, at medium density so as to avoid ad hoc urban development in multiple locations along the periphery of Morrinsville and at low density that withdraws more land to house the same number of people. • More affordable housing options are provided by means of the different housing typologies that enable dwellings to
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>Appendix L – Morrinsville Residential Growth Assessment prepared by Property Economics), is 41.6. So, what demographic area within the “district” is this development for?</p>		<p>be provided at different price points. In addition, the increased housing supply will ensure that house prices do not increase artificially due to a lack of housing supply as explained in the evidence of Timothy Heath and GD Jones.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The housing enabled by PPC 56 will serve both the District and those immigrating from other areas. The term “within the district” is used in the context of “located within the district” as opposed to residents from the district. • The evidence of GD Jones explains that house and land packages in Stages 1 and 2 of Lockerbie have sold in the range \$499,000 to above
--	--	--	---	--	--

					\$ 1,000,000. The development will cater for a diverse demographic range of the population within and outside of the District.
12	Karen Chandler	12.11	<p><i>MRZ-02 To ensure residential development produces good on-site amenity and good quality urban design that enhances our communities.</i></p> <p>In regard to the proposed Objective, the Submitter asks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What on site amenities are in scope? • How is this going to “Enhance” our community? • How are you going to know if you have met this objective? 	Decline the plan change	<p>Decline the relief sought and recommend that the plan change be approved, noting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The “on-site amenity” refers to plan provisions aimed at ensuring private outdoor recreation space, sunlight penetration, protection of outlook, and separation from neighbours. • The community will benefit by access to an inter-connected public open space network. • The objective will be met if the development enabled by PPC 56 meets the plan

					provisions and is in accordance with the LDAP.
12	Karen Chandler	12.7	<p>The Submitter questions Objective MRZ-03 in the proposed plan change provisions for the reasons outlined below:</p> <p><i>MRZ-03 A range of housing types and densities are available to meet the needs of the community.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Needs of which community? What methods have been used to gauge the needs of the community? Where are these results i.e., what has the “community” said? 	Decline the plan change	<p>Decline the relief sought and recommend that the plan change be approved. The evidence of GD Jones explains how the needs of the community have been gauged, namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> That the range of housing typologies enables people to upsize or downsize their house without having to leave the area; Experience through selling 330 sections to date in Morrinsville, confirms the market demand for medium density housing; Emerging trends whereby people are increasingly attracted to the amenity and

					<p>character of semi-rural towns, while favouring smaller sections with less maintenance issues.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anticipated further changes towards a more compact urban form during the 10 - 20 year implementation framework, driven by national policy directives.
12	Karen Chandler	12.8	<p>The Submitter questions Objective MRZ-04 in the proposed plan change provisions for the reasons outlined below:</p> <p><i>MRZ-04 To ensure that the design and appearance of buildings and sites provides good urban design, certainty for residents and integrates with the surrounding townscape.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The surrounding “townscape” is rural - so how is this objective going to be met? What does “good urban design” look like? • How does the 325m² net lot area align with MRZ-04 i.e. “Integrates with the surrounding townscape”? The surrounding area is Rural - the size differences will not “Integrate”. 	Decline the plan change	<p>Decline the relief sought.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The term “townscape” refers to the plan change area, not the neighbouring Rural Zone. “Good urban design” outcomes are explained in the evidence of Morne Hugo and Wayne Bredemeijer. It includes incorporating key site features into the township design, easy access to public

					<p>open space, a well connected movement system, human-scaled block sizes, a well defined public/private realm, and active reserve edges with good surveillance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 325m² net lot area “integrates” in the sense that these size lots are “buffered” by 600m² sized lots which in turn adjoin the similar-sized adjoining urban development to the south, east and west of the plan change area.
12	Karen Chandler	12.9 & 12.10	<p>The Submitter questions Objective MRZ-07 in the proposed plan change provisions for the reasons outlined below:</p> <p><i><u>MRZ07</u> Residential buildings make efficient use of water and energy resources through access to sunlight and daylight.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How can the building make efficient use of water and energy when there are no provisions for any of the new occupants to implement solar and/or 	Decline the plan change	<p>Accept the relief sought in part and recommend changes as shown in Appendix F to require the compulsory installation of rainwater storage tanks. The proposed provisions in Appendix F will</p>

			<p>water tanks? Hence the Objective will not be met as the new 1,200 lots will be dependent on the already overstretched resources i.e. water.</p>		<p>ensure access to sunlight and daylight and changes are not recommended. Mandatory solar power generation, given the current state of technology and cost implications, versus the need to ensure housing affordability, is not considered appropriate.</p>
FS1	Shane Mellow	FS1	<p><i>Supports the above submission in so far as all new homes should be required to have their own water tanks and filtration system. The tanks can be filled by rainwater and topped up from town supply when needed.</i></p>	<p><i>Accept the above submission in part and require all new homes to have their own water tanks and filtration system.</i></p>	<p><i>Accept the further submission in support of #12.9 and #12.10 in part and recommend that compulsory rainwater storage tanks be required. Decline the request that filtration systems be required because the rainwater is intended for non-potable outdoor use only.</i></p>
FS2	Shane Mellow	FS2	<p><i>Supports the above submission in so far as all new homes should be required to have solar power generation.</i></p>	<p><i>Accept the above submission in part and require all new homes to have solar power generation.</i></p>	<p><i>Decline the further submission in support of #12.9 and #12.10 on the basis that mandatory solar power generation,</i></p>

					<i>given the state of technology and cost implications, versus the need to ensure housing affordability, is not considered appropriate.</i>
12	Karen Chandler	12.11	<p>In regard to the proposed Objectives, the Submitter asks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will the community know that the plan change objectives have been met? • What are the criteria for “meeting” each objective and how are these going to be monitored? 	Decline the plan change	<p>Reject the relief sought and recommend that the plan change be approved noting that the objectives are the outcomes that are sought and, the policies are the paths to be followed to achieve the outcomes. The policies in turn are implemented through the rules. Thus, it follows that if the rules are implemented, then the outcomes will be achieved. In addition, s35 RMA requires MPDC to monitor the efficiency and effectiveness of the policies and rules in its District Plan and to take action where this is shown to be</p>

					necessary.
23	Ministry of Education	23.2	Amend Objective MRZ-06 as follows: <u>Objective MRZ-O6</u> <i>Land-use, subdivision and infrastructure are planned in an integrated manner that does not compromise the supply and capacity of public services including educational facilities.</i>	The Ministry is neutral on the proposed plan change if the relief as outlined can be incorporated.	Acknowledge the Ministry's neutral stance. Recommend that the relief sought be rejected on the grounds that the current wording of MRZ-06 is all encompassing, including educational facilities. To specifically mention educational facilities tends to indicate an unjustified elevated status above other public services.
23	Ministry of Education	23.3	Add a new policy as follows: <u>Policy MRZ-P8</u> <i>To provide for public services including educational facilities as an integrated component of the Medium Density Residential Zone to enable people to provide for their social, economic and cultural wellbeing, and for their health and safety, while maintaining and enhancing the character and amenity values of the zone.</i>	The Ministry is neutral on the proposed plan change if the relief as outlined can be incorporated.	Acknowledge the Ministry's neutral stance. Recommend that the relief sought be rejected on the grounds that the outcome sought is already implicit in Objective MRZ-06 (i.e. land-use, subdivision and infrastructure are planned in an integrated manner that does not compromise the supply and capacity

					of public services).
36	Sunridge Park	36.1	Correct the following typographical error in the wording of Policy MRZ-P5: <i>“To ensure the adverse effects on the amenity values of the locality are minimised including the a effects of noise, glare, odour, dust, smoke, fumes and other nuisances, and the effects on traffic, parking, and transport.”</i>	Accept the plan change with the amendment requested.	Accept the relief sought and recommend that the correction be made as shown in the provisions attached as Appendix F.
Proposed Plan Change Rules					
12	Karen Chandler	12.12	In regard to the Subdivision Activity Table: <i>6.1 Activity Table</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lockerbie should be considered Rural/Residential. If there is to be a new Zone, then it shouldn't be specific to Lockerbie. 	Decline the plan change	Reject the relief sought and recommend that the plan change be approved. PPC 56 will introduce a new Medium Residential Zone into the District Plan. At this stage, the Medium Residential Zone provisions will apply only to Lockerbie. However, there is the option for MPDC, over time, to apply (through a separate plan change) the Medium Residential Zone and its associated provisions to other areas in the District as and when that is considered

					appropriate.
12	Karen Chandler	12.14	In regard to the Subdivision Activity Table 6.3.12: <i>6.3.12 Lockerbie Development Area Plan</i> The provisions should apply to all Development Area Plans, not just Lockerbie.	Decline the plan change	Reject the relief sought and recommend that the plan change be approved. The LDAP is in essence a bespoke master plan which, amongst other key elements provides for the PREC. There is currently no other Development Area Plan in the District Plan to which these provisions could apply. In future, there is the option for MPDC to include other bespoke Development Area Plans through separate plan changes.
12	Karen Chandler	12.15	In regard to the Subdivision Activity Table 6.3.13: <i>6.3.13 Medium Density Residential Zone and PREC-1 - Lockerbie</i> The provisions should apply to all Development Area Plans, not just Lockerbie.	Decline the plan change	
12	Karen Chandler	12.13	In regard to the Subdivision Activity Table 6.1.2(b): <i>6.1.2(b) Residential Minimum Lot size 450m² net site area (excluding the Residential Zone within the Lockerbie Development Area Plan see Rule 6.3.12)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No exclusions should be allowed – residential is residential and it 	Decline the plan change	Reject the relief sought and recommend that the plan change be approved. The exclusion is justified. It requires lots in the LDAP that adjoin the Rural Zone to comply with a larger

			should be static across the district not “excluding” any development.		minimum lot size of 600m ² to mitigate reverse-sensitivity effects.
12	Karen Chandler	12.16	<p>In regard to Section 9.4: 9.4 Lockerbie Development Area Plan Description and Purpose Statement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – <i>An integrated public amenity area that provides for a well-functioning neighbourhood and supports increased intensification. This includes:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ <i>An open space and reserves network that integrates with the existing wetland and stream network.</i> ◦ <i>A walking and cycling network that runs through the Development Area Plan and connects to the recreation and other amenity in the existing Lockerbie Estate development.</i> ◦ <i>A neighbourhood park located in the medium density precinct core area.</i> ◦ <i>Provision for a storage facility, subject to resource consent approval.</i> • How are these “Amenity Areas” expected to help the development provide a “functioning” neighbourhood? • What other amenities are planned i.e. shops, cafes, doctors etc? • Morrinsville Township is getting 	Decline the plan change	<p>Decline the submission and recommend that the plan change be approved, noting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The term “public amenity areas” refers to the proposed open space network and the connected walking and cycling tracks that will provide a well-functioning neighbourhood by providing easy access to open space and good connections within the neighbourhood. • A neighbourhood retail and medical centre is planned within the Lockerbie subdivision to the south of the plan change site. • The submissions

			<p>bigger and is currently insufficient at supporting the population i.e. there is a lack of parking. Supermarket supplies are limited with a very small selection for the community to choose from. Access to medical treatment is very difficult with the current population. What are plans for these areas within Lockerbie? Putting an extra 1,200 or so people within the far end of town will only add to the issues within town if additional shops etc are not considered and implemented.</p>		<p>concerning lack of retail, parking, schooling, and medical facilities have been assessed under #12.3 - #12.5.</p>
12	Karen Chandler	12.17	<p>In regard to Rule 9.4.3: <i>9.4.3 Transport Connections - Subdivision and development within the LDAP shall incorporate the following connections and upgrades:</i> <i>c) Provide for a roundabout to be constructed at the Morrinsville-Tahuna Road/Taukoro Road/Hangawera Road intersection.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What will the speed limit be? It is difficult to see out of Hangawera Road at present. How is this going to be improved, especially when turning right out of Hangawera Road. 	Decline the plan change	<p>Reject the request to decline the plan change and recommend that the plan change be approved subject to the provisions attached as Appendix F including provision for a roundabout at the Morrinsville-Tahuna Road/Taukoro Road/Hangawera Road intersection. The evidence of Michael Hall and Vinish Prakash explains that safe sight distances and appropriate speed</p>

					control at the roundabout will be considered under separate processes at the detail design stage of the proposed development.
12	Karen Chandler	12.18	<p>In regard to 9.4.6(e): <i>9.4.6 Wastewater - Subdivision and development within the LDAP will require the following wastewater infrastructure and design considerations:</i> e) <i>A further connection will be required to service the lower south-western catchment</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When will this be completed? Before or after the building of houses? 	Decline the plan change	Reject the request to decline the plan change and recommend that the plan change be approved subject to the provisions attached as Appendix F noting that the triggers for works in Section 9.4.9 of the recommended provisions specify that the connections will be installed prior to completion of the first stage of the development enabled by the plan change.
12	Karen Chandler	12.19	<p>In regard to 9.4.6(f): <i>9.4.6 Wastewater - Subdivision and development within the LDAP will require the following wastewater infrastructure and design considerations:</i></p>	Decline the plan change	Reject the request to decline the plan change and recommend that the plan change be approved subject to

			<p><i>f) Potential pump station upgrade works at Allen Street pump station.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This should be a condition i.e, “have to do it” rather than “potentially doing it” 		<p>the provisions attached as Appendix F noting that the use of the term “potential” is appropriate as there is currently uncertainty as to whether upgrade works will be required as set out in the evidence of Santha Agas. The triggers for works in Section 9.4.9 of the recommended provisions (Appendix F) require the timely implementation of the upgrades, if necessary.</p>
12	Karen Chandler	12.20	<p>In regard to 9.4.6(g) and (h):</p> <p><i>9.4.6 Wastewater - Subdivision and development within the LDAP will require the following wastewater infrastructure and design considerations:</i></p> <p><i>g) Reticulation upgrade works to the MPDC wastewater network to service the LDAP.</i></p> <p><i>h) Increased treatment capacity at the Morrinsville Wastewater Treatment Plant.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What upgrade/increased treatment work? Who will pay for this? Existing 	Decline the plan change	<p>Reject the request to decline the plan change and recommend that the plan change be approved subject to the provisions attached as Appendix F noting that the scope of works and equitable funding mechanism are explained in the evidence of Santha</p>

			ratepayers?		Agas and Susanne Kampshof.
12	Karen Chandler	12.21	<p>In regard to 9.4.7: <i>9.4.7 Water - Subdivision and development within the LDAP will require the following water infrastructure and design considerations:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why is this development not looking at ways to preserve the water i.e. re-use this in some way? • Why can't homeowners collect rainwater via tanks? • Why would we spend millions of dollars on upgrades/treatments to existing water assets? • How do the water reforms affect this proposal? 	Decline the plan change	<p>Accept the relief sought in part and recommend changes to provisions attached as Appendix F to require compulsory installation of on-site rainwater storage tanks.</p> <p>Reject the request to decline the plan change noting that the evidence of Santha Agas explains the reasons why upgrades to the public water supply system are required and the measures being taken by MPDC in regard to water efficiency and conservation to align with national and regional policy directives.</p>
FS1	Shane Mellow	FS1	<p><i>Supports the above submission in so far as all new homes should be required to have their own water tanks and filtration system. The tanks can be filled by rainwater and topped up from town supply when needed.</i></p>	<p><i>Accept the above submission in part and require all new homes to have their own water tanks and filtration system.</i></p>	<p><i>Accept the further submission in support of #12.21 in part and recommend changes to the provisions attached</i></p>

					as Appendix F to require compulsory installation of on-site rainwater storage tanks, noting that filtration is not recommended as the rainwater tanks are proposed to be used for non-potable purposes only.
12	Karen Chandler	12.22	<p>In regard to 9.4.8: <i>9.4.8 Stormwater - Subdivision and development within the Lockerbie Development Area Plan will require the following stormwater infrastructure and design considerations:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why is this development not looking at ways to preserve the water i.e. re-use this in some way? • Why can't homeowners collect rainwater via tanks? • Why would we spend millions of dollars on upgrades/treatments to existing water assets? • How does the water reforms affect this proposal? 	Decline the plan change	Accept the relief sought in part and recommend changes to the provisions attached as Appendix F to require compulsory installation of on-site rainwater storage tanks. Reject the request to decline the plan change noting that the evidence of Santha Agas explains the reasons why upgrades to the public water supply system are required and the measures being taken by MPDC in regard to water efficiency and conservation to align

					with national and regional policy directives.
FS1	Shane Mellow	FS1	<i>Supports the above submission in so far as all new homes should be required to have their own water tanks and filtration system. The tanks can be filled by rainwater and topped up from town supply when needed.</i>	<i>Accept the above submission in part and require all new homes to have their own water tanks and filtration system.</i>	<i>Accept the further submission in support of #12.22 in part and recommend changes to the provisions attached as Appendix F to require compulsory installation of on-site rainwater storage tanks, noting that filtration is not recommended as the rainwater tanks are proposed to be used for non-potable purposes only.</i>
23	Ministry of Education	23.4	17.4 Activity Status Rules Restricted Discretionary Activities Add as follows: <i>MRZ- R(12)</i> <i>Educational Facilities General Performance Standards Refer Rules MRZ-R1(1) to MRZ-R1(5)</i>	The Ministry is neutral on the proposed plan change if the relief as outlined can be incorporated.	Acknowledge the Ministry's neutral stance, recommend that the relief sought be accepted and recommend changes as shown in Appendix F to provide for educational facilities as a RDIS in the MRZ. Note that there is an error in the rule set attached to Kathryn

					<p>Drew's evidence (Attachment 1) where educational facilities is shown as a DIS. This is recommended to be corrected as shown in Appendix F noting that consequential renumbering of the rule set will be required.</p> <p>The reason for accepting the relief sought by the Ministry is that it is agreed that the definition of "educational facilities" limits the nature of activities sufficiently so that there is enough certainty regarding potential effects that may arise from establishing educational facilities in the MRZ, meaning RDIS activity status is appropriate.</p>
23	Ministry of Education	23.5	<p>Matters of Discretion for Educational Facilities</p> <p>Add the following:</p> <p><i>Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters:</i></p>	The Ministry is neutral on the proposed plan change if the relief as outlined can be incorporated.	Acknowledge the Ministry's neutral stance, recommend that the relief sought

			<p>a) <i>The extent to which it is necessary to locate the activity in the zone;</i></p> <p>b) <i>Reverse sensitivity effects of adjacent activities;</i></p> <p>c) <i>The extent to which the activity may adversely impact on the transport network;</i></p> <p>d) <i>The extent to which the activity may adversely impact on the streetscape and the amenity of the neighbourhood;</i></p> <p>e) <i>The extent to which the activity may adversely impact on the noise environment.</i></p>		<p>be accepted and recommend changes as shown in Appendix F to include the matters of discretion that will apply to the assessment of resource consents for educational facilities in the MRZ. Add water conservation measures as an additional matter for discretion.</p>
23	Ministry of Education	23.6	<p>Delete as follows:</p> <p>MRZ-R(17) Educational Facilities</p>	<p>The Ministry is neutral on the proposed plan change if the relief as outlined can be incorporated.</p>	<p>Acknowledge the Ministry's neutral stance. For the reasons as set out under #23.4, recommend that the relief sought be accepted and recommend that the changes as shown in Appendix F be made to delete educational facilities from the list of NC Activities in the notified version.</p>
29	David & Cheryl Holland	29.2	<p>Several changes are requested to the District Plan rules for this development <u>only</u>. Amongst these are:</p>	<p>Decline the plan change.</p>	<p>Reject the request to decline the plan change and recommend that the</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase height limit from 9m to 10m; • Reduce setback limits for properties; • Maximum building coverage increase. <p>These (and other) changes are specifically proposed for this development and not for the rest of the District. The beneficiaries are the developers of the site as they will increase their potential profit. These should be rejected and if desired these changes should be made with a review of the whole District Plan so that, if there is a need to make these changes, they are made for the District as a whole.</p>		<p>plan change be approved subject the provisions in Appendix F. The reasons are that PPC 56 has been holistically master planned as a medium density residential area buffered by lower density residential development. Therefore it is appropriate that PPC 56 be subject to bespoke standards that differ from those applied to the rest of the Residential Zone.</p>
30	Matamata-Piako District Council	30.1	<p>The issue of water is of concern to Council, and it is opposed to not have any measures in place to mitigate the effects from development. Demand for water from reticulated water supply services is an effect of urban subdivision and development. Seasonally, such demand can place significant pressures on the urban water supply network and the natural systems that they draw on. Developing infrastructure to service new development can have both positive and adverse effects on natural and physical resources, ecosystems, and amenity values (eg water bodies). Infrastructure</p>	<p>Amend as follows: Add the following standard or similar and renumber for all activities within the Lockerbie Development Plan Area: <i>MRZ-R1(5) Water Conservation within the Lockerbie Development Plan Area</i> <i>(a) All new or relocated</i></p>	<p>Accept the relief sought in part and recommend alternative provisions with a similar intent as set out below: <i>MRZ-R1(5) Water Conservation Within the Lockerbie Development Plan Area</i> <i>All new or relocated residential buildings</i></p>

		<p>servicing and design should promote sustainable management solutions and work with natural features in the environment such as water bodies and incorporating where possible elements into the design of development.</p> <p>Water meters encourage people to use water wisely, and a fairer way of sharing cost of water because those who use less pay less. Reducing demand means less water needs to be treated, which saves money, and has a longer term impact on how much money needs to be spent on new treatment plants, pipes, and reservoirs.</p> <p>Water meters will not only assist in helping to conserve water but will also avoid Council breaching resource consents and avoid unnecessary investment in water supply.</p>	<p><i>residential buildings where potable public water supply is available to a residential building must be fitted with one of the following:</i></p> <p><i>(i) rainwater storage tanks with a minimum capacity of 10,000 litres for the supply of non-potable water for outdoor uses; or</i></p> <p><i>(ii) rainwater storage tanks with a minimum capacity of 4,000 litres for the supply of non-potable water for outdoor areas, and a greywater re-use system for outdoor</i></p>	<p>where potable public water supply is available to a residential building must be fitted with one of the following:</p> <p>(i) rainwater storage tanks with a minimum capacity of 5,000 litres for the supply of non-potable water for outdoor use for lots that have a standalone residential unit; or</p> <p>(ii) rainwater storage tanks with a minimum capacity of 2,000 litres for the supply of non-potable water for outdoor use for each residential unit attached to a duplex (4,000 litres or terrace housing (10,000 litres for 5 residential units).</p> <p>(Refer to section 6.14 of the</p>
--	--	---	--	---

				<p><i>irrigation. The greywater re-use system shall re-use all water from bathrooms (excluding toilets) and laundry washing machines.</i></p> <p><i>(b) The greywater re-use system must be installed to meet the Requirements under the Matamata-Piako District Council Development Manual</i></p> <p>Add a new section 6.14 as follows or similar to the Matamata-Piako District Council Development Manual</p> <p><i>Section 6.14 Rainwater storage tanks 1. The greywater</i></p>	<p>Development Manual)</p> <p>Section 6.14 Rainwater storage tanks 1. The rainwater</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---

				<p><i>re-use system must be installed to meet the following requirements</i></p> <p><i>a) there are safe setback distances from property boundaries;</i></p> <p><i>b) the device uses water from a single residential building only;</i></p> <p><i>c) the irrigation shall be sub-surface and suited to the soil type and slopes;</i></p> <p><i>d) the greywater is not stored in any way, or treated other than primary screening or filtration;</i></p> <p><i>e) the diversion device has a switching or selection facility so that greywater can be easily</i></p>	<p>storage tanks must be installed so that there are safe setback distances from property boundaries.</p> <p>2. Where a development will contain more than one residential unit, e.g. a retirement home or village or a multi-unit residential development, a common rainwater storage facility with a volume of 2,000 litres per residential unit can be provided so long as access to operate and maintain the facility is secured via an easement or it is located within an area of 'common property'.</p> <p>3. Separation</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---

				<p><i>diverted back to sewer;</i></p> <p><i>f) some form of non-storage surge attenuation is installed as part of the diversion system;</i></p> <p><i>g) a coarse filter for screening out solids and oils/greases;</i></p> <p><i>h) no risk of cross contamination between greywater and drinking water supplies; and</i></p> <p><i>i) in case of sewage backflow, greywater system will shut off in times of sewage backflow.</i></p> <p><i>2. The greywater irrigation system must be installed by an approved installer who</i></p>	<p><i>and/or backflow prevention between potable and non-potable systems will be required in residential situations to ensure that public health is not compromised by cross contamination from the use of non-potable water.</i></p> <p><i>4. No outdoor taps shall be connected to the potable public water supply.</i></p>
--	--	--	--	---	---

				<p><i>must produce an installer's certificate demonstrating that the system meets requirements and will be installed correctly.</i></p> <p><i>3. A greywater installer's certificate must be provided with the building consent application and the greywater diversion device must be installed by a licensed plumber who has a greywater installer's certificate from the manufacturer and the system will be inspected and verified by a building inspector. Greywater re-use system set up and maintenance</i></p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p><i>instructions must be added to the Land Information Memorandum for every property installing such a device.</i></p> <p><i>4. All new or relocated residential buildings where a rainwater storage tank supplies toilets must be fitted with separate plumbing, including backflow prevention devices, for these non-potable uses to prevent cross contamination of drinking water. Non potable water pipes between the rainwater tank and outlets (toilets and outdoor taps) shall be clearly labelled and</i></p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

				<p><i>coloured to differentiate them from potable water pipes and there shall be permanent non-drinking water signage over outdoor taps connected to rainwater tanks. Roof gutters are required to have leaf guards or screens and mosquito screens on all rain water tank vents. A restricted top- up from the public potable water supply will be provided to the tank to ensure that sufficient water to flush toilets is available.</i></p> <p><i>5. Where a development will contain more than one residential</i></p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

				<p><i>building, e.g. a retirement home or village or a multi-unit residential development, a common rainwater storage facility with a volume of 10,000 litres per household unit can be provided so long as access to operate and maintain the facility is secured via an easement or it is located within an area of 'common property'.</i></p> <p><i>6. In both rainwater storage tanks and greywater re-use systems, backflow prevention must comply with the legislative requirements of the Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand</i></p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

				<p><i>2005 (revised 2008), in particular, where connections to a potable water supply exist.</i></p> <p><i>7. Separation and/or backflow prevention between potable and non-potable systems will be required in residential situations to ensure that public health is not compromised by cross contamination from the use of non-potable water.</i></p> <p><i>8. No outdoor taps shall be connected to the potable public water supply.</i></p> <p>Add the following standard for the subdivision of land in 6.3.12 (i)(b)</p> <p><i>(b) Every subdivision within the Lockerbie</i></p>	<p>b) Every subdivision within the Lockerbie</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p><i>Development Plan Area shall put in place a water meter for each individual residential unit.</i></p> <p>As an alternative, the above to be inserted in under “9.4.7 Water Conservation Methods” as part of the Lockerbie Development Plan Area.</p>	<p><i>Development Plan Area shall put in place a water meter for each individual residential unit.</i></p> <p><i>9.4.8 Water Conservation Methods Refer to MRZ-R1(5) Water Conservation within the Lockerbie Development Plan Area Refer to MRZ-R1(5) Water Conservation within the Lockerbie Development Plan Area Refer to Rules 6.3.12(i)(b), 6.3.13(i) and 3.1.10</i></p> <p>The reasons for recommending the alternative provisions above are that these measures are in line with MPDC’s Water Conservation</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---

					Strategy as outlined in the evidence of Santha Agas.
<i>Shane Mellow</i>	<i>FS1</i>	<i>Supports the above submission in so far as all new homes should be required to have their own water tanks and filtration system. The tanks can be filled by rainwater and topped up from town supply when needed.</i>	<i>Accept the above submission in part and require all new homes to have their own water tanks and filtration system.</i>	<i>Accept the further submission in support of #30.1 in part and recommend changes to the provisions attached as Appendix F to require compulsory installation of on-site water storage tanks, noting that filtration is not recommended as the rainwater tanks are proposed to be used for non-potable purposes only.</i>	
Matamata-Piako District Council	30.2	General to MRZ- Medium Density Residential Zone. Consistency with the NZ Planning Standards.	Outline all definitions that are used in the chapter with Italic wording.	Accept the relief sought and recommend that all definitions are outlined in Italic text, as shown in Appendix F, noting that the change is required to align with the Planning Standards.	
Matamata-Piako District Council	30.3	For consistency with the NZ Planning Standards, Restricted Discretionary Activities should relate to 'Matters of Discretion' and Discretionary Activities &	Amend in relation to all RDIS and DIS and NC rules.	Accept the relief sought and recommend that the changes as shown in	

			<p>Non-complying should relate to 'Assessment Criteria' not to performance or activity performance standards.</p> <p>It is noted that the existing plan relates to all matters of discretion being called assessment criteria – therefore could change to this and undertake an admin change when the plan is fully compliant with the standards.</p>		Appendix F be made, noting that the changes are required to align with the Planning Standards.
Matamata-Piako District Council	30.4	For consistency with the NZ Planning Standards, the identification of Precincts needs to refer to the set way of writing Precinct.	Where a rule relates to Precincts amend to refer to <i>PREC1</i> -.	Accept the relief sought and recommend that the changes as shown in Appendix F be made, noting that the changes are required to align with the Planning Standards.	
Matamata-Piako District Council	30.5	<u>MRZ-R(1) Outdoor Living</u> Clarify wording.	Reword as follows: "----- <i>Except that this space may be reduced by the same amount-area where balconies, decks and conservatories are provided -----</i> ".	Accept the relief sought and make the change as requested (see Appendix F), for purposes of clarification.	
Matamata-Piako District Council	30.6	<u>MRZ-R(1) Outdoor Living Space (iii)</u> Imposing a limit on the height of decks is likely to trigger several resource consent applications. Therefore it is proposed to delete a limit on the height of a deck.	Reword as follows or similar " <i>Be located to the north, east or west of the unit. Except where balconies are</i> "	Accept the relief sought and make the following change with similar intent: <i>Be located to the north, east or west of</i>	

				<p><i>provided this area shall be at ground level and may include decks up to 1m above ground level except where balconies are provided that are connected with the rest of the outdoor living space”.</i></p>	<p><i>the unit. Except where balconies are provided this area shall be at ground level and may include decks up to 1m above ground except where balconies are provided that are connected with the rest of the outdoor living space”.</i></p> <p>The reason for accepting the change is for clarity, and to avoid unintended consequences.</p>
Matamata-Piako District Council	30.7	<p><u>MRZ-R(3) Home Business – Activity Performance Standards (v)</u> The amenity from of a 10m² display area of goods is not conducive to a medium residential zone.</p>	<p>Reword as follows: “A maximum area of 610m² for the display of goods for sale in addition to (iv)”.</p>	<p>Accept the relief sought and make the change as requested (see Appendix F), as the smaller area for advertising is more consistent with the amenity of the MRZ.</p>	
Matamata-Piako District Council	30.8	<p><u>MRZ-PREC1-R(4)</u> Delete (v) as this is a repeat of the general standards and clarify the wording to new (vi).</p>	<p>Delete (v) Reword (vi) as follows: “No yard or height relative to boundary rules shall apply <i>at common (shared) walls; and</i>”...</p>	<p>Accept the relief sought and make the change as requested (see Appendix F), for purposes of clarification and consistency. Note consequential</p>	

				renumbering .
Matamata-Piako District Council	30.9	<u>MRZ-R(6)</u> Performance standards are not required for demolition.	Delete general performance standards for MRZ-R(6)	Accept the relief sought and delete general performance standards for MRZ-R(6) (see Appendix F), as there are no standards applicable to a demolition activity.
Matamata-Piako District Council	30.10	<u>MRZ-R(9)(vi)</u> Need to ensure this aligns with the NES-FW.	Not stated.	Reject the submission point. The NES-FW deals with the functions of regional councils (see NES-FW Regulation 5).
Matamata-Piako District Council	30.11	<u>MRZ-R(9) Exclusion bullet point 2:</u> Need to clearly outline that the earthworks are associated with a building consent.	Reword as follows: <i>“are for the removal of topsoil for building foundations and/or driveways associated with an approved building consent, or”...</i>	Accept the relief sought and make the change as requested (see Appendix F), for clarification and to avoid unintended consequences.
Matamata-Piako District Council	30.12	<u>Restricted Discretionary Activities Preamble</u> Need to include reference to MRZ-R1(5) to provide for consistency throughout the plan.	Reword as follows: <i>“All restricted discretionary activities must comply with the general and relevant activity specific performance</i>	Accept the relief sought and make the change as requested (see Appendix F), for clarification and consistency.

				<i>standards. The general performance standards are listed in MRZ-R1(1) to MRZ-R1(4)-(6). The activity specific standards are identified in the following activity rules."</i>	
Matamata-Piako District Council	30.13	<u>MRZ-R(11) Duplex Dwelling</u> Need to include reference to earthworks for consideration as a RD.		Reword as follows: General Performance Standards <i>"Refer Rules MRZ-R1(1) to MRZ-R1(6) and MRZ-R(9)".</i>	Accept the relief sought and make the change as requested (see Appendix F), to ensure that reference to earthworks are provided for.
Matamata-Piako District Council	30.14	<u>MRZ-R(11) Duplex Dwelling (iii)</u> Clarify wording.		Reword as follows: <i>"----- Except that this space may be reduced by the same amount-area where balconies, decks and conservatories are provided -----"</i>	Accept the relief sought and make the change as requested (see Appendix F), for clarification.
Matamata-Piako District Council	30.15	<u>MRZ-R(11) Duplex Dwelling (v)</u> Repeated rule from general performance standards – all other performance standards are not listed here.		Delete rule MRZ-R(11)(v)	For consistency, accept the relief sought and make the change as requested, for consistency. For clarity, add new

					<p>Clause: <i>“(iv) Except where balconies are provided this area shall be at ground level and may include decks that are connected to the outdoor living space.”</i> and amend Clause (vii) as follows: <i>“(vii) No yard or height in relation to boundary rules shall apply to new internal boundary between the units and at common (shared) walls;”</i> (See Appendix F).</p>
Matamata-Piako District Council	30.16	<u>MRZ-R(11) Duplex Dwelling</u> For clarity reference should be made to identify that title cannot be sought for until the framing of a duplex is completed.	Add in the following or similar where duplex standards are referred to: <i>“(viii) Refer to rule 6.3.13 (ii)”.</i>	Accept the relief sought and make the change as requested (see Appendix F), for clarity. Note a consequential change in numbering to 6.3.13(iii)	
Matamata-Piako District Council	30.17	<u>MRZ-R(12)</u> Clarify wording.	Reword as follows: <i>“Any permitted activity -----”</i>	Accept the relief sought and make the change as requested (see Appendix F), for clarification.	

Matamata-Piako District Council	30.18	<u>MRZ-R(13) to MRZ-R(16)</u> Provide for the consideration of earthworks. Also as there is a cleanfill rule within the activity table it is suggested that there could be a conflict with the earthworks rule for the Lockerbie Development Plan Area (LDAP). It is therefore suggested that an exclusion be provided in activity table 2.2.9.2 to exclude the LDAP.	Amend as follows: 1. Add into the assessment criteria (worded as general performance standards) <i>“MRZ-R(9)”</i> 2. <i>“Rule 2.2.9.2 Cleanfill activities involving the deposit of 1000m³ or more of material (as measured compacted in place) except for those areas covered by the Lockerbie Development Plan Area (see rule MRZ-R(9))”.</i>	Accept the relief sought and make the changes as requested (see Appendix F), to provide for consideration of earthworks and to avoid conflict with Rule 2.2.9.2.
Matamata-Piako District Council	30.19	<u>PREC-R(3) One residential unit on lots less than 325m²</u> Consistency of terminology.	Reword as follows: <i>“The minimum lot size shall not be less than 273m² net site area”.</i>	Accept the relief sought and make the changes as requested (see Appendix F), for consistency.
Matamata-Piako District Council	30.20	<u>PREC-R(4) Duplex Dwellings</u> General performance standard MRZ-R1(4) Interface between public and private has not been included within the standards for assessment – Council considers this is one of the key matters	Reword as follows: <i>“Refer Rules MRZ-R1(1) to MRZ-R1(3) and MRZ-R1(5).”</i>	Accept the relief sought and make the changes as requested (see Appendix F), to ensure all applicable

			to be considered for medium residential density housing.		standards are referenced.
Matamata-Piako District Council	30.21	<u>PREC-R(4) Duplex Dwellings (v)</u> Repeated rule from general performance standards – all other performance standards are not listed here.	Delete rule PREC-R(4)(v).	Accept the relief sought and delete reference to Clause (v) as requested (see Appendix F), for consistency. Note a consequential change in numbering.	
Matamata-Piako District Council	30.22	<u>PREC-R(4) Duplex Dwellings (vii)</u> Reword to relate to common (shared) walls only for no height and yard requirements.	Reword as follows: <i>“(vii) No yard or height relative to boundary rules shall apply at common (shared) walls; and”</i>	Accept the relief sought and recommend the change as requested (see Appendix F), for clarity.	
Matamata-Piako District Council	30.23	<u>PREC-R(5) Terraced Housing</u> General performance standard MRZ-R1(4) Interface between public and private has not been included within the standards for assessment – Council considers this is one of the key matters to be considered for medium residential density housing.	Reword as follows: <i>“Refer Rules MRZ-R1(1) to MRZ-R1(35) and MRZ-R1(5).”</i>	Accept the relief sought and make the change as requested (see Appendix F), to ensure that all relevant standards are captured. Note a consequential change in numbering.	
Matamata-Piako District Council	30.24	<u>PREC-R(5) Terraced Housing (iii)</u> Repeated rule from general performance standards – all other performance standards are not listed here.	Delete PREC-R(5)(iii)	Accept the relief sought and make the change as requested (see Appendix F), for consistency. Note a	

					consequential change in numbering.
Matamata-Piako District Council	30.25	<u>PREC-R(5) Terraced Housing (v)</u> Inconsistency as General Performance Standards require 50% building coverage.	Either delete rule or delete reference to MRZ-R1(3)	Accept the relief sought (noting a consequential change in numbering) and recommend amending the provision as follows: <i>“55% except where adjoining a reserve width of more than 20m whereby building coverage shall not exceed 60%”.</i> In addition change the maximum permitted coverage in MRZ-R1(3) from 50% to 55% (see Appendix F). The change will eliminate potential inconsistency and will allow an increase in coverage predominantly to account for the change in the definition of “coverage” - see #30.49.	

Matamata-Piako District Council	30.26	<u>PREC-R(5) Terraced Housing (vii)</u> Reword to relate to common shared walls only for no height and yard requirements.	Reword as follows: “(vii) No yard or height relative to boundary rules shall apply at common (shared) walls; and ”....	Accept the relief sought (noting a consequential change in numbering) and make the change as requested (see Appendix F), for clarification.
Matamata-Piako District Council	30.27	<u>Discretionary Activities</u> Requires meeting all the performance and activity specific standards – these matters should be identified as Assessment Criteria therefore it is unnecessary to include the first paragraph.	Delete first paragraph under the heading “ <i>Discretionary Activities</i> ”.	Accept the relief sought and make the change as requested (see Appendix F), for clarification.
Matamata-Piako District Council	30.28	<u>PREC (6) – Any permitted or controlled activity -----</u> Consistency of terminology as there are no controlled activities.	Delete reference to “ <i>controlled activity</i> ”.	Accept the relief sought and make the change as requested (see Appendix F), for consistency.
Matamata-Piako District Council	30.29	<u>PREC (6) – Any permitted or controlled activity -----</u> <u>General Performance Standards</u> No reference to activity related performance standards (assessment criteria).	Amend to ensure activity related and specific standards apply.	Accept the relief sought and make the change as requested (see Appendix F), to ensure that all relevant standards are captured.
Matamata-Piako District Council	30.30	<u>PREC-1(7) Retirement Village</u> Need to ensure earthworks standard is considered as part of any application.	Amend as follows: “Refer Rules MRZ-R1(1) to MRZ-R1(5) and MRZ-R(9) ”.	Accept the relief sought (noting a consequential change in numbering) and make the change as requested (see

				Appendix F), to ensure that the earthworks standards are captured.
Matamata-Piako District Council	30.31	<u>PREC-1(8)</u> Council considers that the Lockerbie Development Plan Area (LDPA) should be abided by therefore it is appropriate to identify that any development that does not meet the LDAP shall be a non-complying activity.	Add the following: <i>“PREC1-(11) Development not in accordance with the Lockerbie Development Plan Area.”</i>	Accept the relief sought and make the change as requested (see Appendix F), to clarify that development that is not in accordance with the LDAP is treated as a Non-Complying Activity.
Matamata-Piako District Council	30.32	<u>MRZ-R1(2) Building Envelope</u> To clarify the intent of the height in relation to boundary rule and to ensure it can be consistently interpreted a diagram needs to be provided to show how the maximum height rule works.	Amend as follows: Insert height diagram.	Accept the relief sought and insert a height diagram (see Appendix F), for consistency in interpretation.
		(b)(ii) Height to boundary should apply except for the internal (common) boundaries.	<i>“(ii) For common walls of duplex or terrace housing”</i>	Accept the relief sought and make the change as requested (see Appendix F), for clarification.
		Yards – consistency of terminology – bulletpoint 2 should relate to accessory buildings.	<i>“It is proposed to site the accessory-a building ----”</i>	Accept the relief sought and make the change as requested (see Appendix F), for clarification and consistency.
		consistency of terminology – bulletpoint 2 (v) should relate to accessory buildings.	<i>“(v) No more than one accessory building is -----”</i>	Accept the relief sought and make the change as requested

				(see Appendix F), for clarification and consistency.
Matamata-Piako District Council	30.33	<p><u>MRZ-R1(4) Interface between public and private (d),(e) and (f)(iv)</u> Clarify terminology & correct typo.</p>	<p>Reword as follows: “(d) -----. For corner sties sites with two transport corridor-street frontages, and/or where one street frontage and a reserve on the other frontage this is required on both street frontages”.</p> <p>“(e)Maximum fence heights – Front and side boundary fences or walls located forward of the front building-line wall of the dwelling residential unit”</p>	<p>For clarification, accept the relief sought and recommend wording similar to that requested, with similar intent, as shown in Appendix F.</p> <p>Accept the relief sought and make changes to Clause (e) (see Appendix F) as requested and in addition insert standards to control retaining wall height and design where erected in combination with fences.</p> <p>The reason for the additional changes is that the combination of retaining walls and fences was not envisaged or addressed in the notification version</p>

				<p>“(f)(iv) -----expect except -----”</p>	<p>of the plan provisions.</p> <p>Accept the relief sought and make the change as requested, in order to correct a minor typographical error.</p>
Matamata-Piako District Council	30.34	<p><u>MRZ-R2(1)</u> Clarification, terminology and correct typo. Reword heading to relate to Matters of Discretion and reword (a) to include any specific standards as Matters of Discretion.</p>	<p>Reword as follows: “MRZ R2(1) General Assessment Criteria Matters of Discretion</p> <p>(a) <i>The extent of non-compliance with any performance standards or activity specific standards and the degree to which this adversely affects the amenity and character of the site and surrounding area;</i></p> <p>(g) <i>The extent to which</i></p>	<p>Accept the relief sought and make the change as requested, for clarification, consistency with the Planning Standards and to correct a minor typographical error.</p>	

				landscaping and screening is uses-used to mitigate adverse visual effects; and..”	
			The development principles have been identified in Appendix 9 and it is considered that these principles apply to any applications for development as well as subdivision.	Add the following: <i>“The extent to which the subdivision and development principles in 6.3.13 are met.”</i>	Accept the relief sought and make a change with similar intent, to ensure that consideration of the development principles applies to all applications for development and subdivision. Note the recommended change to apply the “principles” as “matters of discretion” (Rule 6.3.13(v).
Matamata-Piako District Council	30.35	<u>MRZ-R2(2) Restricted Assessment Criteria – Duplex Dwelling</u> Clarification and terminology: Reword heading to relate to matters of Discretion and delete “Note” under heading. Reword to require as additional Matters of discretion to consider all matters (via general performance standards and specific activity standards	Reword as follows: “MRZ R2(2) <i>Restricted Discretionary Matters of Discretion Assessment Criteria – Duplex Dwelling</i> Note: These specific	Accept the relief sought and make the change as requested, for clarification, for consistency in the use of terminology, and to avoid repetition.	

			which need to be headed up in the rules as Matters of Discretion).	<i>Restricted Discretionary Assessment criteria apply in addition to all other general assessment criteria and other assessment criteria resulting from the rule mechanisms that apply to the activity</i> <i>In addition to -----“</i>	
Matamata-Piako District Council	30.36	<u>MRZ-R2(3) Restricted Assessment Criteria – Terrace Housing</u> Clarification and terminology. Rule MRR2(1) provides the rule to consider all performance standards or activity related standards as submitted above in item 30.35- Note: that under item 30.3 above this submission requests that standards applying to RDIS are Matters of Discretion.	Reword as follows: “MRZ R2(3) <i>Restricted Discretionary Matters of Discretion Assessment Criteria – Terrace Housing</i> <i>Note: These specific Restricted Discretionary Assessment criteria apply in addition to all other general assessment criteria and other assessment criteria resulting from the rule mechanisms that apply to the activity.”</i>	Accept the relief sought and make the change as requested, for clarification, for consistency in the use of terminology, and to avoid repetition. In addition to #30.33, recommend the following change to Clause MRZ-R2(3)(b) to include consideration of the relationship between fences and public spaces: “(b) the extent to which building design <i>and fencing</i>	

					<i>provides for informal surveillance by locating doors, windows and other openings associated with living areas so they overlook and interact with public spaces, and having entrances facing the transport corridor and ensuring that an active visual relationship is maintained”;</i>
Matamata-Piako District Council	30.37	<u>5.2.2A Medium Residential Density Zone (ii)</u> Clarification to ensure medium residential density zone is provided for.	“(ii) Residential activities The noise level (LA _{eq}) as measured at any point within the boundary of an adjacent residential or medium density residential zoned site must not exceed the following:---“	Accept the relief sought and make the change as requested, for clarification.	
Matamata-Piako District Council	30.38	<u>6.2.4 Development Suitability</u> Amend area to align with rule as 7.5m by 15m is 112.5m ² – more effective to identify the rule as 113 m ² minimum so compliance is achieved	Reword 6.2.4 (i) as follows: “Each lot ----- must contain a minimum of 112	Accept the relief sought and make the change as requested, to ensure that compliance can	

				<i>113 m² rectangular area of land -----"</i>	be achieved.
Matamata-Piako District Council	30.39	<p><u>6.3.12 Lockerbie Development Plan Area</u> Clarification and Terminology as no controlled activities exist for LDAP – need to relate to Restricted Discretionary Activities.</p> <p>It is unclear as to what rule 6.1.2(j) relates to – needs clarification.</p>	<p>Reword as follows:</p> <p>(i) <i>Additional performance standards for subdivision using Rule 6.1.2(j).</i> <i>UNCLEAR what this reference is to and need to clarify</i></p> <p>a) <i>The minimum lot size shall be 600m².</i></p> <p>(ii) <i>Controlled Assessment Criteria Matters of Discretion</i> <i>See Section 6.4-6.5</i></p> <p>(iii) <i>Non-compliance Subdivision that fails to comply with the additional controlled standards in 6.3.12(i) above shall be non-complying</i></p>	<p>Accept the relief sought and, for clarification, amend 6.3.12 to read:</p> <p>(i) <i>Additional standards for subdivision in the Residential Zone using Rule 6.1.2(j),</i></p> <p>(a) <i>The minimum lot size shall be 600m².</i></p> <p>(b) <i>Every subdivision within the Lockerbie Development Area Plan shall put in place a water meter for each individual residential unit.</i></p> <p>(ii) <i>Matters of Discretion</i> <i>See Section 6.5</i></p> <p>(iii) <i>Non-compliance</i></p>	

				activity.	Subdivision that fails to comply with the additional controlled standards in 6.3.12(i) above shall be a non-complying activity.
Matamata-Piako District Council	30.40	<p><u>6.1.13 Medium Density Residential Zone and PREC1- Lockerbie</u> Clarification to require appropriate width of lots and making it clear this relates to terrace housing.</p>	<p>Reword as follows: “(i)(b) Minimum lot width of (front and rear boundary) for 25% of front sites shall be 13.5m in the Medium Density Residential Zone (excluding PREC1- Lockerbie).</p> <p>(iii)(b)(ii) A condition of the land use consent will be that the records of title for each adjoining Terrace House is to be legally held together under the same ownership, on a voluntary basis, and shall not be separately disposed of until the framing</p>	<p>Accept the relief sought and make the change as requested, for clarification. (See Appendix F)</p> <p>Note a consequential change in numbering.</p> <p>Accept the relief sought and make changes with a similar intent as shown below, for the purposes of clarification:</p> <p>b) For terraced housing a land use consent must be obtained Where lots less than 200m² are</p>	

				<p>for each <i>residential unit Terrace House</i> is completed.”</p>	<p><i>proposed a concurrent land use consent for terraced housing must be obtained; and:</i></p> <p>(i) <i>A legal mechanism shall also be registered on the title for those lots specifying compliance with the land use consent.</i></p> <p>(ii) <i>A condition of the land use consent will be that the records of title for each adjoining residential unit is to be legally held together under the same ownership, on a voluntary basis, and shall not be separately disposed of</i></p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<i>until the framing for each residential unit is completed.</i>
Matamata-Piako District Council	30.41	<u>6.3 Structure Plan Areas (Restricted Discretionary Activity)</u> Clarification – add in reference to Development Plan Areas.	Reword as follows: (i) <i>Additional Performance Standards</i> <i>Compliance with the relevant Structure Plan or Development Area Plan for subdivision within the following areas:</i>	Accept the relief sought and make the change as requested (see Appendix F), for clarification.	
Matamata-Piako District Council	30.42	<u>6.5.4 Structure Plan Areas and Development Plan Areas</u> Clarification of wording and adding in reference for the user.	Reword as follows: <i>“The assessment of effects shall be restricted to and conditions may be imposed in respect of the following matters within the following Structure and Development Area Plan areas or as identified within this plan.</i> -----	Accept the relief sought and make the changes as requested (see Appendix F), for clarification.	

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lockerbie Development Area Plan – Refer to Medium Density Residential Zone and 6.3.13, Appendix 9.4 and Lockerbie Development Plan Area.” 	
Matamata-Piako District Council	30.43	<u>Appendix 9: Schedule of Works - 9.4 Lockerbie Development Area Plan</u> Within the Description and Purpose Statement, second bullet point, last point it identifies the provisions for a storage facility, subject to resource consent. This is also identified within MRZ-R(20) as a non-complying activity. It is not appropriate to anticipate such an activity for a non-complying activity resource consent application within and amongst medium residential density provisions. The applicant had the opportunity to plan for a business area within the development, which would have been more appropriate than considering a non-complying activity which is an activity that isn't provided for.	Delete: “Provision for a storage facility, subject to resource consent approval”	Accept the relief sought and delete the sentence as requested (see Appendix F) for the following reason: It is not appropriate to “enable and provide for” an activity with Non-Complying Activity status within the rule framework.	
Matamata-Piako District Council	30.44	<u>Appendix 9: 9.4.2 Additional Standards</u>	Amend: To either	Accept the relief	

			<p><u>for Subdivision or Development</u> This section is specifically dealing with the design of subdivision and development and should be included in the standards for development and subdivision, otherwise it is considered that these may get lost. Alternatively clear references need to be made within the activity rules and subdivision rules to refer to.</p>	<p>include section 9.4 into the rules for development and subdivision or to include references within the Activity Rules and Subdivision Rules to “Refer to Appendix 9.4”</p>	<p>sought and recommend that these matters be included as Matters of Discretion in Rule 6.3.13(v) (see Appendix F). Note consequential change in numbering.</p>
Matamata-Piako District Council	30.45	<p><u>Appendix 9: 9.4.3 Transport Connections</u> Section 9.4.3 identifies the LDPA connections and upgrades. Council is concerned that due to the size of the development additional traffic could result in adverse safety effects on the surrounding road network, in particular along the Coronation Road corridor and the intersection with George Street. Council requests that a detailed safety assessment is provided. The safety assessment should also identify any mitigation required to minimise the safety effects on Coronation Road and at the Coronation Road/George Street intersection.</p>	<p>That a Safety Assessment be undertaken, and any works required as a result of the LDPA be identified as works to be undertaken and/or a Trigger for Works within the LDPA.</p>	<p>Accept the request and recommend changes as requested (see Appendix F) to reflect the agreement reached by Council and the Applicant in regard to the required works and triggers, following the outcome of the Safety Assessment. Note that Clause 9.4.2(c) is recommended to remain as shown in Appendix F. Note that the change to Clause 9.4.10.3 provides for monetary payment for the upgrade of</p>	
Matamata-Piako District Council	30.46	<p><u>Appendix 9: 9.4.3 Transport Connections Figure 1 Morrinsville-Tahuna Cross-Section</u> There is some uncertainty regarding the Morrinsville-Tahuna Road cross-section. Council wants to ensure that there is sufficient carriageway width to allow for a compliant flush median, lanes and</p>	<p>Insert into Figure 1 Morrinsville-Tahuna Cross-section dimensions.</p>	<p>Accept the request and recommend changes as requested (see Appendix F) to reflect the agreement reached by Council and the Applicant in regard to the required works and triggers, following the outcome of the Safety Assessment. Note that Clause 9.4.2(c) is recommended to remain as shown in Appendix F. Note that the change to Clause 9.4.10.3 provides for monetary payment for the upgrade of</p>	

			shoulders/cycle lane. As a starting point, Council requests that dimensions are provided on the Morrinsville -Tahuna Road cross-section. These dimensions and details could be refined with Council input in the future.		the George Street/ Coronation Road intersection as agreed between the Council and the Applicant.
Matamata-Piako District Council	30.47	<u>Appendix 9: 9.4.9 Triggers for Works – Table 1 - Water</u> The trigger for the Lockerbie bore and water treatment plant needs to clearly identify ‘when’ the bore and treatment plant needs to be operational.	Reword as follows or similar: <i>“To be agreed with Council. Some development may be able to be accommodated without this based on modelling results. To be operational before any demand is required from development within the area.”</i>		Accept the request and recommend the change as requested (see Appendix F), for purposes of clarification.
Matamata-Piako District Council	30.48	<u>Appendix 9: 9.4.10 Development Agreement</u> Reword the preamble to make it clear a Development Agreement is required and that it needs to be signed and agreed to prior to the decision on this plan change and be legally binding on future landowners. Reasons are to ensure that the community are not left with costs that are directly as a result of the development.	Reword as follows or similar: <i>“The Council and Developer may need to enter into an agreement to be signed and agreed prior to a decision on this plan change and shall be legally binding on future landowners. for The agreement is for the provision of servicing ----”</i>		Accept the request and recommend changes to the wording as agreed between the Council and the Applicant as shown in Appendix F, in order to ensure equitable funding of the required works in accordance with the methodology explained in the evidence of Susanne Kampshof.

	Matamata-Piako District Council	30.49	<p><u>Definitions</u> The definition of 'Building Footprint' is not the same definition as provided for under the National Planning Standard. This standard definition must be used and cannot be changed.</p>	<p>Reword as follows: <i>“For the Medium Density Residential Zone, means, in relation to building coverage, the total area of buildings at ground floor level together with the area of any section of any of those buildings that extends out beyond the ground floor level limits of the building and overhangs the ground.”</i></p>	<p>Accept the relief sought and recommend changes to the definition as requested, to ensure that the definition aligns with the Planning Standards.</p>
36	Sunridge Park Ltd	36.2	<p><u>MRZ-R(1) Outdoor Living Space</u> There is no direct provision for smaller outdoor living spaces above ground floor residential units where this is a separate unit and has no option of ground floor space. To provide for this, an option is to adopt the Medium Density Residential Standard equivalent which requires a minimum 8m² with a minimum dimension of 1.8m. This standard is also present in other areas for commensurate zonings such as Auckland and Waikato. The word “directly” is less flexible than “readily” which still sets a sufficient threshold regarding the space’s accessibility.</p>	<p>Accept the plan change with the following amendment: <u>MRZ-R(1) Outdoor Living Space</u> <i>“Every residential unit shall have an area of outdoor living space which shall: (i) Have a minimum area of 50m² and contains no dimension less than 4m. Except that this space may</i></p>	<p>Reject the relief sought on the grounds that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10m² is considered an appropriate minimum to ensure the usability of the space for outdoor living purposes; • The term “directly” is consistent with the terminology used in the Operative Residential Infill provisions (Rule

				<p><i>be reduced by the same amount where balconies, decks and conservatories are provided with a minimum area of 810m², with no dimension less than 1.8m;</i></p> <p><i>(iv) Be directly readily accessible from the main living area.”</i></p>	4.3.14)
		36.3	<p><u>MRZ-R(11)</u> Correct a grammatical error.</p>	<p>Accept the plan change with the following amendment: <u>MRZ-R(11)</u> <i>“A Duplex Dwelling shall comply with the following performance standards: (iii) Each unit shall have an exclusive outdoor living space of 36m² and contains no dimension less than 4m.....”</i></p>	<p>Accept the relief sought and recommended the following alternative wording to correct the grammatical error:</p> <p><i>Each unit shall have an exclusive outdoor living space of 36m² and which contains no dimension less than 4m.....”</i></p>
		36.4	<p><u>MRZ-R(19)</u> It is not clear why Terrace Housing in the MRZ is a Non-Complying Activity given the zones purpose clearly states:</p>	<p>Accept the plan change with the following amendment:</p>	<p>Reject the relief sought on the grounds that PPC 56 has been holistically</p>

			<p>“The purpose of the Medium Density Residential Zone is to provide areas for medium residential development with a mixture of detached, semidetached housing and terracing housing options.” To this end, it is considered that Non-Complying is too restrictive an activity status and sends the wrong messages as to the intention of the zone. A Discretionary Activity status provides sufficient discretion for the activity.</p>	<p><u>MRZ-R(19)</u> <i>“Non-complying Discretionary Activities Terrace Housing”</i></p>	<p>designed and master planned with higher density terrace housing internalised within the plan change area and planned to be contained within PREC1 with easy access and proximity to public open space, as opposed to the areas of the MRZ outside of PREC1 which is further away from the open space network.</p>
		36.5	<p><u>MRZ R2(1) General Assessment Criteria</u> Regarding (c), “avoid” is a strong directive and essentially means that no monotony is to be allowed. The other amendments are to resolve simple grammatical errors.</p>	<p>Accept the plan change with the following amendment: <u>MRZ R2(1) General Assessment Criteria</u> <i>“The following assessment criteria shall apply to all Restricted Discretionary activities: (c) The degree to which the built form achieves coherency and consistency whilst avoiding</i></p>	<p>Accept the relief sought and recommended the following alternative wording to correct</p>

				<p><i>minimising monotony.</i></p> <p><i>(g) The extent to which landscaping and screening is useds to mitigate adverse visual effects; and...</i></p>	<p>the grammatical error: <i>The degree to which the built form achieves coherence and consistency...</i></p> <p>Reject the relief sought in regard to the requested change in the word “avoiding” to “minimising”. The reason is that “avoiding” in the context of a matter for discretion, is the appropriate term, acknowledging that the assessment will ultimately need to take into account the scale and degree of monotony.</p> <p>Accept the relief sought and make the change as requested, to correct the grammatical error.</p>
		36.6	<p><u>PART 10 –Appendix 9: Schedule of Works</u> <u>9.4.9 Triggers for Works</u> No amendments to this trigger point are</p>	Supports the proposed wording below, without amendment:	Accept the relief sought in part, and recommend the alternative wording

			<p>sought as the provision is generally supported. The submitter recognises that water allocation in the District is a known constraint. However, the submitter supports the concept of allowing staged development to occur (where it can be appropriately serviced) without the need for infrastructure upgrades that provide for subsequent future development within the LDAP, as long as there is capacity available for other future development outside the LDAP.</p>	<p><u>9.4.9 Triggers for Works</u> <i>“Requirement Lockerbie bore and water treatment plant. When To be agreed with Council. Some development may be able to be accommodated without this based on modelling results.”</i></p>	<p>below that has a similar intent:</p> <p>Water Requirement <i>Lockerbie bore and water treatment plant When To be operational before any demand is required from development within the area.</i></p>
--	--	--	--	---	---