

Proposed Private Plan Change 56 – Lockerbie Estate, Morrinsville - Summary of Submissions/ Decisions Sought

Submitter	Point #	Topic	Topic Description	Summary of decision requested	Decision sought
1. Dianne McKinnon	1.1	A	Effects on Morrinsville town	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.
4. Paige Tanner	4.1	A	Effects on Morrinsville town	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.
9. Dennis Shine	9.1	A	Effects on Morrinsville town	This will ruin the nice Lockerbie subdivision. There has been no future planning for the township itself.	Decline the plan change.
10. Michael Hagarty	10.1	A	Effects on Morrinsville town	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.
25. Cassandra Mankelow-Hancock	25.2	A	Effects on Morrinsville town	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.
26. Morrinsville Chamber of Commerce	26.1	A	Effects on Morrinsville town	The Morrinsville Chamber of Commerce supports the plan change as proposed	Accept the plan change.
27. Mandy Crockett	27.1	A	Effects on Morrinsville town	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.
29. David & Cheryl Holland	29.8	A	Effects on Morrinsville town	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.
1. Dianne McKinnon	1.2	B	Climate Change	<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 imported items. 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 un-sustainable values at maximum profit. 	If not declined, give careful consideration to the issues raised in the submission and amend the plan change accordingly.
3. Emma Hyde	3.1	C	Water supply capacity	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.
7. Peter Burrell	7.1	C	Water supply capacity	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 round, without restrictions.
11. Deborah May	11.1	C	Water supply capacity	The town is already on water restrictions.	Decline the plan change.
14. Jo Robb	14.1	C	Water supply capacity	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.
15. Diane Simmons	15.4	C	Water supply capacity	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.
17. Hamilton Wright	17.4	C	Water supply capacity	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.
22. Roland and Marjorie Latta	22.4	C	Water supply capacity	The Council have found water but it is not helping with the water supply.	Decline the plan change.
25. Cassandra Mankelow-Hancock	25.1	C	Water supply capacity	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.
29. David & Cheryl Holland	29.3	C	Water supply capacity	<p>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 water treatment plant.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Hence, the submitter proposes that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	Decline the plan change.

30. Matamata-Piako District Council	30.50	C	Water supply capacity	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.	See Submission Point 30.1
33. Val Riches	33.1	C	Water supply capacity	The community often runs short of water.	Accept the plan change subject to requiring all buildings to have roof water storage tanks.
34. Janet Gray	34.2	C	Water supply capacity	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.
37. W.E & G.J Bonnar Ltd	37.1	C	Water supply capacity	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 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.	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.
38 Gord Stewart (Late Submission)	38.1	C	Water supply capacity	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 recharge). At this stage we just don't know by how much. 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. 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. 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 of what the future will bring. 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? 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. 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? 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. 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	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 and businesses.
3. Emma Hyde	3.2	D	Capacity of educational facilities	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.
5. Alicia Crozier	5.1	D	Capacity of educational facilities	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	D	Capacity of educational facilities	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 accommodate, when will it be built and how many teachers are required?	Decline the plan change.
17. Hamilton Wright	17.3	D	Capacity of educational facilities	No capacity in existing schools.	Decline the plan change.
18. Daniel Compton	18.4	D	Capacity of educational facilities	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.
22. Roland and Marjorie Latto	22.3	D	Capacity of educational facilities	The schools do not have space to increase capacity to accommodate new pupils.	Decline the plan change.

23. Ministry of Education	23.1	D	Capacity of educational facilities	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 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. 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.	The Ministry is neutral on the proposed plan change if the relief as outlined below can be incorporated.
3. Emma Hyde	3.3	E	Infrastructure capacity	Infrastructure in town is appalling and 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.
4. Paige Tanner	4.3	E	Infrastructure capacity	There is a need for more parking. There is a need for additional water infrastructure.	Accept the plan change with amendments to address this issue.
8. Wayne North	8.1	E	Infrastructure capacity	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.
9. Dennis Shine	9.2	E	Infrastructure capacity	Infrastructure is already at capacity.	Decline the plan change.
11. Deborah May	11.2	E	Infrastructure capacity	The town does not have the infrastructure to cope. There is lack of parking in town	Decline the plan change.
21. Robert Lowe	21.1	E	Infrastructure capacity	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 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.	Decline the plan change.
22. Roland and Marjorie Latta	22.5	E	Infrastructure capacity	The wastewater needs an improvement.	Decline the plan change.
22. Roland and Marjorie Latta	22.6	E	Infrastructure capacity	The developers want stormwater to discharge into the stream at Taukoro Road which is not designed for this purpose.	Decline the plan change.
29. David & Cheryl Holland	29.4	E	Infrastructure capacity	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. 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.	Decline the plan change.
33. Val Riches	33.2	E	Infrastructure capacity	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 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.	Accept the plan change subject to requiring all buildings to have roof water storage tanks.
34. Janet Gray	34.4	E	Infrastructure capacity	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.
35. Anthony Gray	35.1	E	Infrastructure capacity	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 housing.	Supports the plan change with the following amendments: 1. New resource consents for all existing and additional water plant discharges including sewage; 2. Complete upgrades of treatment plants, and renew and fit new treatment plants for sewage.
36. Sunridge Park	36.7	E	Infrastructure capacity	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.
3. Emma Hyde	3.4	F	Retail capacity	There is a lack of supermarkets.	Until the town is in a better position to support, that many more houses/people, the plan change should be declined.
4. Paige Tanner	4.2	F	Retail capacity	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.
5. Alicia Crozier	5.4	F	Retail capacity	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.
7. Peter Burrell	7.2	F	Retail capacity	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	F	Retail capacity	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.

15. Diane Simmons	15.1	F	Retail capacity	Provide for more shops (a "4-Square"-type convenience store).	Accept the plan change and amend to provide more shops.
29. David & Cheryl Holland	29.7	F	Retail capacity	No consideration has been given to the current poor supermarket facilities in town.	Decline the plan change.
28. Chris Pritchard	28.1	F	Retail capacity	Need supermarkets and more shops to cope with increase in households.	Accept the plan change subject to the amendments as stated.
4. Paige Tanner	4.4	G	Housing affordability	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 price tag for first home buyers.
6. Dayne Horne, Marco Boats	6.1	G	Housing affordability	Make more housing affordable only to first-time home buyers: <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.
12. Karen Chandler	12.2	G	Housing affordability	Unaffordable housing.	Decline the plan change.
4. Paige Tanner	4.5	H	Housing typology/ density	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.
9. Dennis Shine	9.3	H	Housing typology/ density	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.
15. Diane Simmons	15.3	H	Housing typology	The submitter supports a range of types of dwellings to cater to differing financial situations especially for first-home buyers.	Accept and ensure a range of dwellings to cater to differing financial situations especially for first-home buyers.
16. Fran Adamski	16.2	H	Housing typology/ density	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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase the land area for semi-detached and terrace units, such that the land per residence is more than 350 m2. e.g. duplex is > 700 m2.
16. Fran Adamski	16.3	H	Housing typology/ density	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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 beneficial.
20. Michelle Lemay	20.1	H	Housing typology/ density	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: <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 Morrinsville will dramatically change the nature of the town. High density housing is not justified in a small Waikato town. • 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. 	Accept the plan change, but decline the Lockerbie Precinct Overlay.
24. Ron & Robyn Johnston	24.2	H	Housing typology/ density	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.
5. Alicia Crozier	5.2	I	Capacity of medical facilities	Questions whether the existing medical centres, which are already running at capacity and putting strain on doctors, nurses and support staff, can handle the extra influx of patients.	Decline the plan change until there are more medical facilities.
11. Deborah May	11.3	I	Capacity of medical facilities	The doctors are already fully booked with wait times of over a week	Decline the plan change.
12. Karen Chandler	12.3	I	Capacity of medical facilities	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	I	Capacity of medical facilities	No expansion should be allowed because there are no doctors to serve the increase in demand for medical facilities.	Decline the plan change.
18. Daniel Compton	18.3	I	Capacity of medical facilities	The Morrinsville Medical Centre is already stretched with the number of patients it has to service. The submitter fears that adding more households will push it beyond its capacity.	Accept the plan change with the following amendment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Investigate how the Council can support Morrinsville Medical Centre to get more staff and space to serve the community.
34. Janet Gray	34.5	I	Capacity of medical facilities	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.
5. Alicia Crozier	5.3	J	Capacity of emergency services	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.
6. Dayne Horne, Marco Boats	6.2	K	Power supply capacity	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.
11. Deborah May	11.4	L	Lack of demand	The town does not need more sections - there are 68 for sale now, that are not selling.	Decline the plan change.
29. David & Cheryl Holland	29.5	L	Lack of demand	According the developers own report, only 800 new properties are required by 2038. Therefore, all 1,200 homes proposed are not required. Hence, the plan change should be rejected.	Decline the plan change.
12. Karen Chandler	12.1	M	Traffic/ roading/ parking	Increase in traffic.	Decline the plan change.

16. Fran Adamski	16.1	M	Traffic/ roading/ parking	Internal Roads - 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 parking should not be recessed into the road verge.
17. Hamilton Wright	17.2	M	Traffic/ roading/ parking	Parking is already hard now, will be worse with more cars.	Decline the plan change.
18. Daniel Compton	18.1	M	Traffic/ roading/ parking	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.
18. Daniel Compton	18.2	M	Traffic/ roading/ parking	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 to see 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 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	M	Traffic/ roading/ parking	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.
19. Steve Southall	19.2	M	Traffic/ roading/ parking	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.
22. Roland and Marjorie Latta	22.1	M	Traffic/ roading/ parking	The town does not have parking in the town centre to accommodate additional development.	Decline the plan change.
22. Roland and Marjorie Latta	22.2	M	Traffic/ roading/ parking	The roads in Lockerbie are so narrow that parking is not safe outside houses.	Decline the plan change.
24. Ron & Robyn Johnston	24.1	M	Traffic/ roading/ parking	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 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.	Accept the plan change subject to the amendment as stated.
25. Cassandra Mankelov-Hancock	25.3	M	Traffic/ roading/ parking	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.	Accept, but amend to require increased street widths.
29. David & Cheryl Holland	29.1	M	Traffic/ roading/ parking	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 on onto Studholme street which are covered. However, not 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. 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.	Decline the plan change.
29. David & Cheryl Holland	29.6	M	Traffic/ roading/ parking	No consideration has been given to the current lack of parking in the town centre.	Decline the plan change.
31. Ben & Justine Cameron	31.2	M	Traffic/ roading/ parking	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 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.	Decline the plan change in its current form.

32. Bike Waikato	32.1	M	Traffic/ roading/ parking	<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 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 New Zealand meet its climate change objectives.</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 networks to be designed to encourage active modes of transport over private motor vehicle use. 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. Intersections and path crossing points should also be designed to give priority to vulnerable users living in and accessing the development.</p>
34. Janet Gray	34.3	M	Traffic/ roading/ parking	<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. 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>
12. Karen Chandler	12.6	N	Submissions on PC 56 Issues	<p><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 district.</i></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 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>Decline the plan change.</p>
12. Karen Chandler	12.7	O	Submissions on PC 56 Objectives	<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? <p><i>MRZ06 Land-use, subdivision and infrastructure are planned in an integrated manner that does not compromise the supply and capacity of public services.</i></p> <p><i>MRZ-07 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 water tanks? Hence Objective MRZ-06 will not be met as the new 1,200 lots will be dependent on the already overstretch resources i.e. water. 	<p>Decline the plan change.</p>
12. Karen Chandler	12.8	O	Submissions on PC 56 Objectives	<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". 	<p>Decline the plan change.</p>
12. Karen Chandler	12.9	O	Submissions on PC 56 Objectives	<p><i>MRZ06 Land-use, subdivision and infrastructure are planned in an integrated manner that does not compromise the supply and capacity of public services.</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 water tanks? 	<p>Decline the plan change.</p>
12. Karen Chandler	12.10	O	Submissions on PC 56 Objectives	<p><i>MRZ-07 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 water tanks? Hence Objective MRZ-06 will not be met as the new 1,200 lots will be dependent on the already overstretch resources i.e. water. 	<p>Decline the plan change.</p>
12. Karen Chandler	12.11	O	Submissions on PC 56 Objectives	<p>In general – 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?</p>	<p>Decline the plan change.</p>
23. Ministry of Education	23.2	O	Submissions on PC 56 objectives/ policies	<p>Amend as follows: <i>Objective MRZ-06</i> <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></p>	<p>The Ministry is neutral on the proposed plan change if the relief as outlined can be incorporated.</p>

23. Ministry of Education	23.3	O	Submissions on PC 56 objectives/ policies	Add 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.
36. Sunridge Park	36.1	O	Submissions on PC 56 Objectives/ Policies	<u>MRZ-P5</u> Correct typo. This is a clear error where the intention is to refer to "effects".	Accept the plan change with the following amendment: "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."
12. Karen Chandler	12.12	P	Submissions on PC 56 Rules	<u>6.1 Activity Table</u> • Lockerbie should be considered Rural/Residential. If there is to be a new Zone, then it shouldn't be specific to "Lockerbie". <u>6.3.12 Lockerbie Development Area Plan</u> <u>6.3.13 Medium Density Residential Zone and PREC-1 - Lockerbie</u> • The provisions should apply to all Development Area Plans, not just Lockerbie	Decline the plan change.
12. Karen Chandler	12.13	P	Submissions on PC 56 Rules	<u>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)</u> • No exclusions should be allowed – residential is residential and it should be static across the district not "excluding" any development.	Decline the plan change.
12. Karen Chandler	12.14	P	Submissions on PC 56 Rules	<u>6.3.12 Lockerbie Development Area Plan</u> • The provisions should apply to all Development Area Plans, not just Lockerbie	Decline the plan change.
12. Karen Chandler	12.15	P	Submissions on PC 56 Rules	<u>6.3.13 Medium Density Residential Zone and PREC-1 - Lockerbie</u> • The provisions should apply to all of the Medium Density Residential Zone, with no exclusions for Lockerbie	Decline the plan change.
12. Karen Chandler	12.16	P	Submissions on PC 56 Rules	<u>9.4 Lockerbie Development Area Plan</u> <u>Description and Purpose Statement</u> —An integrated public amenity area that provides for a well-functioning neighbourhood and supports increased intensification. This includes: ◦ An open space and reserves network that integrates with the existing wetland and stream network. ◦ 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. ◦ A neighbourhood park located in the medium density precinct core area. ◦ Provision for a storage facility, subject to resource consent approval. • 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 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.	Decline the plan change.
12. Karen Chandler	12.17	P	Submissions on PC 56 Rules	<u>9.4.3 Transport Connections - Subdivision and development within the LDAP shall incorporate the following connections and upgrades:</u> <u>c) Provide for a roundabout to be constructed at the Morrinsville-Tahuna Road/Taukoro Road/Hangawera Road intersection.</u> • 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.
12. Karen Chandler	12.18	P	Submissions on PC 56 Rules	<u>9.4.6 Wastewater - Subdivision and development within the LDAP will require the following wastewater infrastructure and design considerations:</u> <u>e) A further connection will be required to service the lower south-western catchment</u> • When will this be completed? Before or after the building of houses?	Decline the plan change.
12. Karen Chandler	12.19	P	Submissions on PC 56 Rules	<u>9.4.6 Wastewater - Subdivision and development within the LDAP will require the following wastewater infrastructure and design considerations:</u> <u>f) Potential pump station upgrade works at Allen Street pump station.</u> • This should be a condition i.e. "have to do it" rather than "potentially doing it"	Decline the plan change.
12. Karen Chandler	12.20	P	Submissions on PC 56 Rules	<u>9.4.6 Wastewater - Subdivision and development within the LDAP will require the following wastewater infrastructure and design considerations:</u> <u>g) Reticulation upgrade works to the MPDC wastewater network to service the LDAP.</u> <u>h) Increased treatment capacity at the Morrinsville Wastewater Treatment Plant.</u> • What upgrade/increased treatment work? Who will pay for this? Existing ratepayers?	Decline the plan change.
12. Karen Chandler	12.21	P	Submissions on PC 56 Rules	<u>9.4.7 Water - Subdivision and development within the LDAP will require the following water infrastructure and design considerations:</u> • 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.

12. Karen Chandler	12.22	P	Submissions on PC 56 Rules	<p>9.4.8 Stormwater - Subdivision and development within the Lockerbie Development Area Plan will require the following stormwater infrastructure and design considerations:</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.
23. Ministry of Education	23.4	P	Submissions on PC56 rules	<p>17.4 Activity Status Rules Restricted Discretionary Activities</p> <p>Add as follows: <i>MRZ- R(12)</i> <i>Educational Facilities General Performance Standards Refer Rules MRZ-R1(1) to MRZ-R1(5)</i></p>	The Ministry is neutral on the proposed plan change if the relief as outlined can be incorporated.
23. Ministry of Education	23.5	P	Submissions on PC56 rules	<p>Matters of Discretion for Educational Facilities</p> <p>Add the following: <i>Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a) The extent to which it is necessary to locate the activity in the zone;</i> <i>b) Reverse sensitivity effects of adjacent activities;</i> <i>c) The extent to which the activity may adversely impact on the transport network;</i> <i>d) The extent to which the activity may adversely impact on the streetscape and the amenity of the neighbourhood;</i> <i>e) The extent to which the activity may adversely impact on the noise environment.</i> 	The Ministry is neutral on the proposed plan change if the relief as outlined can be incorporated.
23. Ministry of Education	23.6	P	Submissions on PC56 rules	<p>Delete as follows: <i>MRZ-R(17) Educational Facilities</i></p>	The Ministry is neutral on the proposed plan change if the relief as outlined can be incorporated.
29. David & Cheryl Holland	29.2	P	Submissions on PC56 rules	<p>Several changes are requested to the District Plan rules for this development <u>only</u>. Amongst these are:</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>	Decline the plan change.
30. Matamata-Piako District Council	30.1	P	Submissions on PC56 Rules	<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 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>Amend as follows:</p> <p>Add the following standard or similar and renumber for all activities within the Lockerbie Development Plan Area:</p> <p><i>MRZ-R1(5) Water Conservation within the Lockerbie Development Plan Area:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>(a) All new or relocated residential buildings where potable public water supply is available to a residential building must be fitted with one of the following:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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> <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 irrigation. The greywater re-use system shall re-use all water from bathrooms (excluding toilets) and laundry washing machines.</i> <i>(b) The greywater re-use system must be installed to meet the Requirements under the Matamata-Piako District Council Development Manual.</i> <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</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The greywater re-use system must be installed to meet the following requirements</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a) there are safe setback distances from property boundaries;</i> <i>b) the device uses water from a single residential building only;</i> <i>c) the irrigation shall be sub-surface and suited to the soil type and slopes;</i> <i>d) the greywater is not stored in any way, or treated other than primary screening or filtration;</i> <i>e) the diversion device has a switching or selection facility so that greywater can be easily diverted back to sewer;</i> <i>f) some form of non-storage surge attenuation is installed as part of the diversion system;</i> <i>g) a coarse filter for screening out solids and oils/greases;</i> <i>h) no risk of cross contamination between greywater and drinking water supplies; and</i> <i>i) in case of sewage backflow, greywater system will shut off in times of sewage backflow.</i> <i>To be continued.....</i>

30. Matamata-Piako District Council	30.1 Continued	P	Submissions on PC56 Rules		<p>Continued...</p> <p>2. The greywater irrigation system must be installed by an approved installer who must produce an installer's certificate demonstrating that the system meets requirements and will be installed correctly.</p> <p>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 instructions must be added to the Land Information Memorandum for every property installing such a device.</p> <p>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 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.</p> <p>5. Where a development will contain more than one residential 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'.</p> <p>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 2005 (revised 2008), in particular, where connections to a potable water supply exist.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>8. No outdoor taps shall be connected to the potable public water supply.</p> <p>Add the following standard for the subdivision of land in 6.3.12 (i)(b) (b) Every subdivision within the Lockerbie Development Plan Area shall put in place a water meter for each individual residential unit.</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>
30. Matamata-Piako District Council	30.2	P	Submissions on PC56 Rules	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.
30. Matamata-Piako District Council	30.3	P	Submissions on PC56 Rules	For consistency with the NZ Planning Standards, Restricted Discretionary Activities should relate to 'Matters of Discretion' and Discretionary Activities & Non-complying should relate to 'Assessment Criteria' not to performance or activity performance standards. 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.	Amend in relation to all RDIS and DIS and NC rules.
30. Matamata-Piako District Council	30.4	P	Submissions on PC56 Rules	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> .
30. Matamata-Piako District Council	30.5	P	Submissions on PC56 Rules	<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> ".
30. Matamata-Piako District Council	30.6	P	Submissions on PC56 Rules	<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 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> .
30. Matamata-Piako District Council	30.7	P	Submissions on PC56 Rules	<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.	Reword as follows: <i>"A maximum area of 6 10 m2 for the display of goods for sale in addition to (iv)"</i> .
30. Matamata-Piako District Council	30.8	P	Submissions on PC56 Rules	<u>MRZ-R(4)</u> Delete (v) as this is a repeat of the general standards and clarify the wording to new (vi).	Delete (v) Reword as follows: <i>"No yard or height relative to boundary rules shall apply at common (shared) walls; and"...</i>
30. Matamata-Piako District Council	30.9	P	Submissions on PC56 Rules	<u>MRZ-R(6)</u> Performance standards are not required for demolition.	Delete general performance standards for MRZ-R(6)
30. Matamata-Piako District Council	30.10	P	Submissions on PC56 Rules	<u>MRZ-R(9)(vi)</u> Need to ensure this aligns with the NES-FW.	Not stated.
30. Matamata-Piako District Council	30.11	P	Submissions on PC56 Rules	<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>
30. Matamata-Piako District Council	30.12	P	Submissions on PC56 Rules	<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 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>
30. Matamata-Piako District Council	30.13	P	Submissions on PC56 Rules	<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> .
30. Matamata-Piako District Council	30.14	P	Submissions on PC56 Rules	<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> ".
30. Matamata-Piako District Council	30.15	P	Submissions on PC56 Rules	<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)

30. Matamata-Piako District Council	30.16	P	Submissions on PC56 Rules	<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>
30. Matamata-Piako District Council	30.17	P	Submissions on PC56 Rules	<u>MRZ-R(12)</u> Clarify wording.	Reword as follows: <i>"Any permitted activity -----"</i>
30. Matamata-Piako District Council	30.18	P	Submissions on PC56 Rules	<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 (LDPA). It is therefore suggested that an exclusion be provided in activity table 2.2.9.2 to exclude the LDPA.	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>
30. Matamata-Piako District Council	30.19	P	Submissions on PC56 Rules	<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>
30. Matamata-Piako District Council	30.20	P	Submissions on PC56 Rules	<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 to be considered for medium residential density housing.	Reword as follows: <i>"Refer Rules MRZ-R1(1) to MRZ-R1 (3 6) and MRZ-R1(5)."</i>
30. Matamata-Piako District Council	30.21	P	Submissions on PC56 Rules	<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).
30. Matamata-Piako District Council	30.22	P	Submissions on PC56 Rules	<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>
30. Matamata-Piako District Council	30.23	P	Submissions on PC56 Rules	<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(3 5) and MRZ-R1(5)."</i>
30. Matamata-Piako District Council	30.24	P	Submissions on PC56 Rules	<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)
30. Matamata-Piako District Council	30.25	P	Submissions on PC56 Rules	<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)
30. Matamata-Piako District Council	30.26	P	Submissions on PC56 Rules	<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: <i>"(vii) No yard or height relative to boundary rules shall apply at common (shared) walls ; and"....</i>
30. Matamata-Piako District Council	30.27	P	Submissions on PC56 Rules	<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> .
30. Matamata-Piako District Council	30.28	P	Submissions on PC56 Rules	<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> .
30. Matamata-Piako District Council	30.29	P	Submissions on PC56 Rules	<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.
30. Matamata-Piako District Council	30.30	P	Submissions on PC56 Rules	<u>PREC-1(7) Retirement Village</u> Need to ensure earthworks standard is considered as part of any application.	Amend as follows: <i>"Refer Rules MRZ-R1(1) to MRZ-R1(5) and MRZ-R(9)".</i>
30. Matamata-Piako District Council	30.31	P	Submissions on PC56 Rules	<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 LDPA shall be a non-complying activity.	Add the following: <i>"PREC1-(11) Development not in accordance with the Lockerbie Development Plan Area."</i>
30. Matamata-Piako District Council	30.32	P	Submissions on PC56 Rules	<u>MRZ-R1(2) Building Envelope</u> (a) To clarify the intent of rule and to ensure it can be consistently interpreted a diagram needs to be provided to show how the maximum height rule works. (b) (b)(ii) Height to boundary should apply except for the internal (common) boundaries. (c) Yards – consistency of terminology – bulletpoint 2 should relate to accessory buildings. (d) consistency of terminology – bulletpoint 2 (v) should relate to accessory buildings.	Amend as follows: (a) Insert height diagram. (b) <i>"(ii) For common walls of duplex or terrace housing"</i> (c) <i>"It is proposed to site the accessory a building ----"</i> (d) <i>"(v) No more than one accessory building is -----"</i>
30. Matamata-Piako District Council	30.33	P	Submissions on PC56 Rules	<u>MRZ-R1(4) Interface between public and private (d),(e) and (f)(iv)</u> Clarify terminology & correct typo.	Reword as follows: <i>"(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".</i> <i>"(e)Maximum fence heights – Front and side boundary fences or walls located forward of the front building-line wall of the dwelling residential unit"</i> <i>"(f)(iv) ----- expect-except -----"</i>
30. Matamata-Piako District Council	30.34	P	Submissions on PC 56 Rules	<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. 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.	Reword as follows: <i>"MRZ R2(1) General Assessment-Criteria Matters of Discretion"</i> (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> (g) <i>The extent to which landscaping and screening is uses used to mitigate adverse visual effects; and.."</i> Add the following: <i>"The extent to which the subdivision and development principles in 6.3.13 are met."</i>

30. Matamata-Piako District Council	30.35	P	Submissions on PC56 Rules	<u>MRZ-R2(2) Restricted Assessment Criteria – Duplex Dwelling</u> <u>Clarification and terminology</u> Reword heading to relate to matters of Discretion and delete “Note” under heading. Reword to require an additional Matters of discretion to consider all matters (via general performance standards and specific activity standards which need to be headed up in the rules as Matters of Discretion).	Reword as follows: “MRZ R2(2) Restricted <i>Discretionary Matters of Discretion Assessment-Criteria – Duplex Dwelling</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. In addition to -----</i> ”
30. Matamata-Piako District Council	30.36	P	Submissions on PC56 Rules	<u>MRZ-R2(3) Restricted Assessment Criteria – Terrace Housing</u> <u>Clarification and terminology.</u> 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) Restricted <i>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> ”
30. Matamata-Piako District Council	30.37	P	Submissions on PC56 Rules	<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 (LAeq) as measured at any point within the boundary of an adjacent residential or medium density residential zoned site must not exceed the following:---”
30. Matamata-Piako District Council	30.38	P	Submissions on PC56 Rules	<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 113m ² rectangular area of land -----”
30. Matamata-Piako District Council	30.39	P	Submissions on PC56 Rules	<u>6.3.12 Lockerbie Development Plan Area</u> Clarification and Terminology as no controlled activities exist for LDPA – need to relate to Restricted Discretionary Activities. It is unclear as to what rule 6.1.2(j) relates to – needs clarification.	Reword as follows: (i) Additional performance standards for subdivision using Rule 6.1.2(j). <i>UNCLEAR what this reference is to and need to clarify</i> a) The minimum lot size shall be 600m ² . (ii) <i>Controlled-Assessment-Criteria- Matters of Discretion</i> See Section <i>6.4 6.5</i> (iii) Non-compliance Subdivision that fails to comply with the additional <i>controlled-</i> standards in 6.3.12(i) above shall be non-complying activity.
30. Matamata-Piako District Council	30.40	P	Submissions on PC56 Rules	<u>6.1.3 Medium Density Residential Zone and PREC1- Lockerbie</u> Clarification to require appropriate width of lots and making it clear this relates to terrace housing.	Reword as follows: “(i)(b) Minimum lot width <i>of (front and rear boundary)</i> for 25% of front sites shall be 13.5m in the Medium Density Residential Zone (excluding PREC1- Lockerbie). (iii)(b)(ii) A condition of the land use consent will be that the records of title <i>for each adjoining Terrace House</i> is to be legally held together under the same ownership, on a voluntary basis, and shall not be separately disposed of until the framing for each <i>residential-unit- Terrace House</i> is completed.”
30. Matamata-Piako District Council	30.41	P	Submissions on PC56 Rules	<u>6.3 Structure Plan Areas (Restricted Discretionary Activity)</u> Clarification – add in reference to Development Plan Areas.	Reword as follows: (i) Additional Performance Standards Compliance with the relevant Structure Plan or Development Area Plan for subdivision within the following areas:
30. Matamata-Piako District Council	30.42	P	Submissions on PC56 Rules	<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: “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. ----- • Lockerbie Development Area Plan – Refer to Medium Density Residential Zone and 6.3.13, Appendix 9.4 and Lockerbie Development Plan Area.”
30. Matamata-Piako District Council	30.43	P	Submissions on PC56 Rules	<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 ”
30. Matamata-Piako District Council	30.44	P	Submissions on PC56 Rules	<u>Appendix 9: 9.4.2 Additional Standards 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.	Amend: To either 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”
30. Matamata-Piako District Council	30.45	P	Submissions on PC56 Rules	<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.	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.

30. Matamata-Piako District Council	30.46	P	Submissions on PC56 Rules	<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 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.	Insert into Figure 1 Morrinsville-Tahuna Cross- section dimensions.
30. Matamata-Piako District Council	30.47	P	Submissions on PC56 Rules	<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>
30. Matamata-Piako District Council	30.48	P	Submissions on PC56 Rules	<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>
30. Matamata-Piako District Council	30.49	P	Submissions on PC56 Rules	<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.	Reword as follows: <i>"For the Medium Density Residential Zone, means, in relation to building coverage, the total area of building s 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>
36. Sunridge Park	36.2	P	Submissions on PC 56 Rules	<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.	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 be reduced by the same amount where balconies, decks and conservatories are provided with a minimum area of 8.40 m², with no dimension less than 1.8m; (iv) Be directly-readily accessible from the main living area."</i>
36. Sunridge Park	36.3	P	Submissions on PC 56 Rules	<u>MRZ-R(11)</u> Correct a grammatical error.	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 contain s no dimension less than 4m....."</i>
36. Sunridge Park	36.4	P	Submissions on PC 56 Rules	<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: "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.	Accept the plan change with the following amendment: <u>MRZ-R(19)</u> <i>"Non-complying Discretionary Activities Terrace Housing"</i>
36. Sunridge Park	36.5	P	Submissions on PC 56 Rules	<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.	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 minimising monotony. (g) The extent to which landscaping and screening is use ds to mitigate adverse visual effects; and..."</i>
36. Sunridge Park	36.6	P	Submissions on PC 56 Rules	<u>PART 10 –Appendix 9: Schedule of Works</u> <u>9.4.9 Triggers for Works</u> No amendments to this trigger point are 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.	Supports the proposed wording below, without amendment: <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>
12. Karen Chandler	12.23	Q	Submission relating to "Appendix C - Section 32 Assessment"	<u>Preferred option</u> <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 services in the area based on whole-of-site zoning and likely yield.</i> • The submitter does not see how Option 3 will alleviate housing supply and affordability issues.	Decline the plan change.

12. Karen Chandler	12.24	R	Submissions relating to "Appendix E – Integrated Transportation Assessment"	<p>Road Safety</p> <p>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.</p> <p>3.3.2 The search found that six crashes had been reported within the study area, none of which resulted in any injuries.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Public Transport</p> <p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 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? • "It may be appropriate" – 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. 	Decline the plan change.
12. Karen Chandler	12.25	S	Submissions relating to "Appendix L – Morrinsville Residential Growth Assessment"	<p>The assessment summary states that most people will commute to Hamilton for work.</p> <p>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.</p>	Decline the plan change.
13. David King, President, Waikato VHF Group Inc	13.1	T	Amateur Radio Activities	<p>That submission ID 40396 to Plan Change 53 from NZART et. al. be applied to Plan Change 56 to ensure that Amateur Radio Activities are accepted at Lockerbie Estate i.e:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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><i>11.7.1 Permitted activities - Communications facilities</i></p> <p><i>Rule P3 Amateur Radio Activities</i></p> <p><i>a The top of any utility structure is less than 20 metres above ground level.</i></p> <p><i>b Any antenna other than a simple wire 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> 	Accept the plan change with amendments to ensure that Amateur Radio Activities are accepted at Lockerbie Estate.
15. Diane Simmons	15.2	U	Walking and cycling tracks and green spaces	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.
22. Roland and Marjorie Latta	22.7	V	Productive capacity of the soil	The land is good land which could produce food.	Decline the plan change.
24. Ron & Robyn Johnston	24.3	W	Reverse-sensitivity	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.
34. Janet Gray	34.1	W	Reverse-sensitivity	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 dogs, fertiliser and silage spreading, and harvesters and planters working late into the night.	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.

31. Ben & Justine Cameron	31.1	W	Reverse-sensitivity	<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, 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 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 (700m2 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.</p>	Decline the plan change in its current form.
2. VOID - AN EXACT COPY OF SUBMISSION 1					