

Attachment C – Officer’s Recommended Decisions on Submissions

Note:

- The submitter position identifies whether each submission point supports (S), supports in part or with amendments (SA), opposes (O) or their position is unknown or not stated (U).
- For Table 2, recommended decisions that have changed since the S42A Report recommendations are shown in **bold text**.

Table 1 List of Submitters

Submission No	Submitter Name	Overall position
1	Tu Clarke	SA
2	Rachel and Norm Salisbury	O
3	Te Rauna Cawker	SA
4	Ngāti Hauā Iwi Trust	SA
5	Te Puawaitanga o Ngāti Hinerangi	SA
6	Te Tumu Paeroa – Office of the Māori Trustee	SA
7	Samuel and Leah O’Connor	U
8	Charlie and June Paki Whanau Trust	SA/O
9	Shannon Clarke	SA
10	Tony Ashworth	SA
11	Robyn Roa	SA
12	Georgina Tini Dicken	S
13	Lea Thompson	SA
14	Hariata Jaime Anderson	S
15	Tokaanu Thompson	S
16	Frances Herawana Tupaea	S
17	Grant and Annette Cranfield	O
18	Te Ao Marama Maaka	S

Submission No	Submitter Name	Overall position
19	McRae	O
20	Tahauariki Tauwhiti Thompson	SA
21	Desmond Ewing	S
22	Leigh Webber	S
23	Pamela A Webber	S
24	Richard and Ariana Pirrit	O
25	John and Irene Harris	SA
26	Waikato Regional Council	SA/O
27	Bette Blance	S
28	Thomas Bougher	SA
29	Margaret Osbourne	O
30	Te Mangeo Tamehana Tarapipipi	SA
31	Virginia McMillan	SA
32	Kali Matauwhati	SA
33	Brandon Dromgool and Lyndsay Oldham	O
34	Matamata Aeroclub	SA
35	Tuatahi Nightingale-Pene	S
36	Irene Tai-Rakena	S
37	Te Hanga South Trust	S
38	Raymond Kett	U
39	Jeff Hirawani	S
40	This has been included in submission 17	O
41	Brad Hutton	O
42	Sacha Capeling and Dayne Hazelden	O
43	David King	S
44	Rev Henare Waaka	SA
45	Mananui Te Uira	S

Submission No	Submitter Name	Overall position
46	This submission has been included in submission 11	S
47	Carolyn Nimmo	S
48	Muna Wharawhara	S
49	Ian Robert Young, Dana Sheree Lewis and Ian Young Family Trust	SA
50	Leo George Whaiapu	S
51	Michael Carey	S
52	Karen Chandler	SA
53	Mapuna Turner	U
54	Kāinga Ora	SA
55 LATE SUBMISSION	Matamata Soaring Centre	SA

Table 2 Summary of Submissions (by Submitter) and Officer’s Recommended Decision on Submissions.

Submission No	Submitter	Submitter’s Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought	Officer’s Recommendation
1	Tu Clarke	SA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1 Include Marae and whenua connected with the marae to be included as MPZ-PREC2 (instead of MPZ-PREC1). 	Accept with amendments	Reject
2	Rachel and Norm Salisbury	O	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2.1 Proposed rules should be applied to all parties in the Rural Zone 	Decline	Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2.2 Potential impacts on property values 		Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2.3 Concerns around safety and traffic on Douglas Road 		Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2.4 Limited Council services and increased strain on the services that do exist 		Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2.5 Lower parts of Douglas Road are located within a flood zone and not suitable for development 		Accept in part
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2.6 Concerns around existing housing standards and crime due to increased population 		Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2.7 Dog control and stock safety 		Reject
FS1	Charlotte Cross	FS on S2 Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decision sought from Council is “allowed in whole” Raises concerns about a range of issues including relating to amenity, traffic and parking, rubbish, maintenance, fencing, rural aspect and lifestyle 	Accept	Reject
3	Te Rauna Cawker	SA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3.1 Supports Papakāinga Tahī, Papakāinga Rua and District Wide provisions 	Accept	Accept in part
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3.2 Supports Urupā on ancestral land 		Accept in part
4	Ngāti Hauā Iwi Trust	SA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4.1 Request that Precinct 1 and 2 are adopted as proposed 	Accept with amendments	Accept in part
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4.2 Support the proposed housing density and enabling of community facilities, education facilities, urupā, relocatable buildings and accessory buildings 		Accept in part

Submission No	Submitter	Submitter's Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought	Officer's Recommendation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4.3 Larger land blocks are not fairly represented with a limitation of 10 homes. Request that the wording is changed to make it clear that developments above ten homes may be possible, but will require resource consent 		Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4.4 Extend the MPZ provisions to the District Wide provisions where there are ancestral connections and legal mechanisms for perpetuity of Māori ownership (Key Issue 1) 		Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4.5 Supportive of RM reforms to allow headroom for iwi to access water in a way that supports commercial water uses for Māori adjacent to their papakāinga. 		Reject
5	Te Puawaitanga o Ngāti Hinerangi	SA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5.1 Density limits for MPZ PREC 1 to allow for one kāinga per 2500m² 5.2 Site coverage to be 35% where sites are under 1ha and 10% where sites are over 1ha 5.3 Extend MPZ to cover more Māori Freehold Land 5.4 10m side yards 5.5 Te Ohaki Marae Planning Map to include urupā block 5.6 Policy Papakāinga – P2 b) to include hapu and/or iwi ownership in perpetuity. 5.7 Remove requirement 1.4.30 Providing information on management structures for the papakāinga. 5.8 Amend Provision 6.1.1 1 to enable Kāinga per 2,500m². 5.9 Amend the activity status for Discretionary activity for communal living arrangement to be a restricted discretionary activity. 	Accept with amendments	Reject
					Reject
					Reject
					Reject
					Accept in part
					Accept in part
					Reject
					Reject

Submission No	Submitter	Submitter's Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought	Officer's Recommendation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5.10 Amend the yard provisions for side yards as they relate to papakāinga and a standard over and above what is anticipated in the rural zone. 		Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5.11 Amend 4.4.1 2) building coverage rules to be site coverage where sites are under 1ha, 10% where sites are over 1ha. 		Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5.12 Amend 5.9.1 2 wording to include or where available wireless provisions can be utilized. 		Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5.13 Amend Subdivision rules for Papakāinga from Discretionary to Restricted Discretionary 		Reject
FS2	Clarke McKinney	Support Submission 5 in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support Te Puawaitanga o Ngati Hinerangi requested amendments to the MPZs including side yard provisions 	Accept with amendments	Reject
6	Te Tumu Paeroa – Office of the Māori Trustee	SA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6.1 Supports District Wide Provision 6.1.1 	Accept with amendments	Accept in part
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6.2 Supportive of Māori Purpose Zone's objectives (O1 – O3), policies (P1 - P8) and rules (PREC1(1) –(5); PREC2(1) – (4)) 		Accept in part
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6.3 Supportive of papakāinga objectives (O1 – O3) and policies (P1 – P8) 		Accept in part
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6.4 Amendment of 'Papakāinga' definition to provide for 'māori landowners'. See submission for proposed Papakāinga definition 		Accept in part
7	Samuel and Leah O'Connor	U	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7.1 Concerns around potential negative consequences as a result of re-zoning, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sharp increase in development in a rural area may negatively impact neighbouring properties particularly if the development includes additional facilities (e.g. Schools, short-term accommodation) 	U	Reject

Submission No	Submitter	Submitter's Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought	Officer's Recommendation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Property value changes and appeal to potential buyers 		
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7.2 Concerns over a possibility of funding to aid in rapid development 		Reject
8	Charlie and June Paki Whanau Trust	O SA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8.1 Concerns regarding the proposal process as the beneficiary were not contacted or advised of the proposal, therefore not given an opportunity to ask questions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Concerns that the decision-makers do not whakapapa to the land 	Accept with amendments	Reject
9	Shannon Clarke	SA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 9.1 Supportive of the plan change as it provides a chance to return to ancestral land for current and future generations 	Accept with amendments	Accept in part
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 9.2 Request that General Land owned by Māori be treated the same as Papakāinga Tahī 		Reject
10	Tony Ashworth	SA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10.1 To keep houses and vegetation away from the runway edge to avoid the airport boundary 	Accept with amendments	Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10.2 Limiting who is able to make a noise complaint caused by recreational aerodrome traffic 		Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10.3 Allow for building hangars and a boundary fence along the runway 		Reject
11	Robyn Roa	SA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 11.1 Supportive of the plan change as it provides a chance to return to ancestral land for current and future generations 	Accept	Accept in part
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 11.2 Request that General Land owned by Māori be treated the same as Papakāinga Tahī (Key Issue 1) 		Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 11.3 Supports both precincts as it will enable kaumātua and kuia the opportunity to live near our Marae where they are often needed to support marae 		Accept in part

Submission No	Submitter	Submitter's Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought	Officer's Recommendation
			<p>kaupapa, or give younger families an opportunity to put a home on the whenua</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 11.4 Expresses the following viewpoint: 'we do not own the whenua, we belong to the whenua' 11.5 Supports the opportunities to return home 		Accept in part
12	Georgina Tini Dicken	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 12.1 Supportive of the plan change as it provides opportunity to live on whanau Māori land 12.2 Mokopuna to be supported by her whanau 	Accept	Accept in part
13	Lea Thompson	SA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 13.1 Requested the Māori Purpose Zone provisions be applied to district wide provisions 13.2 Supports papakāinga lifestyle – opportunities to revitalise te reo and Maaoritanga 13.3 Supportive of allowing Urupā onsite as it strengthens ancestral and generational connections 13.4 Expresses disappointment at needing to gain permission to establish kāinga on Māori Land <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identifies that homes in urban areas are closer that the provisions allow for rural zones 	Accept	Reject
14	Hariata Jaime Anderson	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 14.1 Supports the proposed provisions of the Māori Purpose Zone 14.2 Identifies this as an opportunity to establish, sustain and preserve historical heritage, culture and cultural assets while realising ancestral aspirations 14.3 Expresses aspirations to establish whare and business opportunities to serve Whanau 	Accept	Accept in part
15	Tokaanu Thompson	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 15.1 Supports the plan change 	Accept	Accept in part

Submission No	Submitter	Submitter's Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought	Officer's Recommendation
16	Frances Herawana Tupaea	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 16.1 Supports Papakāinga as a safe environment to raise ngā mokopuna 	Accept	Accept in part
17	Grant and Annette Cranfield	O	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 17.1 Expresses concerns around health and safety regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased road users Constant turning and slowing of vehicles Traffic and congestion Complex intersections which could be hazardous for drivers and pedestrians Railway is hazardous – long trucks with trailers need to be able to turn safely without obstacles preventing them from crossing the railway line Loss of parking spaces at the marae resulting in tendency to park along the road Refuse bins bags left at the gate in high volumes will be an obstruction Bright lights from the marae could be distracting for motorists 	Decline	Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 17.2 Existing issues around: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Keeping surrounding area tidy and rubbish-free Maintenance concerns regarding fencing, lawns and gates 		Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 17.3 Expresses concerns regarding the loss of countryside or rural aspect, particularly regarding high fencing 		Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 17.4 Concerns expressed around who is able to access the sewage lines 		Reject

Submission No	Submitter	Submitter's Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought	Officer's Recommendation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 17.5 Expressed concerns regarding significant noise, sleep disturbance, stress and annoyance 		Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 17.6 Expresses traffic and safety concerns around the right of way for trains, hazardous material trucks, elderly driving along the road in mobility scooters, turning vehicles holding up on-coming traffic 		Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 17.7 Concerns around the potential for increased developments to increase roadside parking 		Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 17.8 Expresses concerns around the loss of rural character 		Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 17.9 Concerns around existing maintenance issues related to fence posts and possible incorrect rubbish disposal 		Reject
18	Te Ao Marama Maaka	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18.1 Supports the plan change 	Accept	Accept in part
19	McRae	O	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 19.1 Concerns that the proposed housing density and buildings might diminish the rural aspect 	Decline	Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 19.2 Concerns around diminishing the quality of rural lifestyle 		Reject
20	Tahauariki Tauwhiti Thompson	SA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 20.1 Would like to see General Land Owned by Māori being treated the same as Papakāinga Tahī 	Accept	Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 20.2 Identifies this plan change as an opportunity to return to ancestral land to build a home for children, grandchildren and future generations in a safe environment that values te reo and traditional/ancestral values 		Accept in part
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 20.3 Papakāinga will allow whanau to live collectively as their ancestors did 		Accept in part

Submission No	Submitter	Submitter's Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought	Officer's Recommendation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 20.4 Supports the opportunity for greater involvement in social, educational and economic aspects of hapū, iwi and marae 		Accept in part
21	Desmond Ewing	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 21.1 Supports Papakāinga Tahī 	Accept	Accept in part
22	Leigh Webber	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 22.1 Supports the plan change 	Accept and Accept with amendments	Accept in part
23	Pamela A Webber	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 23.1 Supports the plan change 	Accept and Accept with amendments	Accept in part
24	Richard and Ariana Pirrit	O	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 24.1 Expresses concerns regarding Papakāinga Tahī due to an increase in housing density in comparison to the rural zone 	Decline	Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 24.2 Expresses concerns regarding Papakāinga Rua – related to Rukumoana Road, in the following ways: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dairy farming business is directly adjoining Rukumoana Marae and Rukumoana Avenue Increased housing density and population increase will cause noise pollution, interfere with the rural characters and increased traffic Existing issues include crime, unemployment, drug abuse, gang affiliation, incorrect disposal of rubbish causing issues with rodents and farming stock being attacked by stray dogs from Rukumoana Ave Existing fears around safety with a need for increased security on properties Currently considered a 'high risk' area by insurance 		Reject

Submission No	Submitter	Submitter's Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought	Officer's Recommendation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Existing cabins on Rukumoana marae do not have toilets, running water and are currently disposing of rubbish incorrectly 		
25	John and Irene Harris	SA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 25.1 Would like to include the use of management plans or Body Corporate in light of not requiring a resource consent to ensure effectiveness, efficiency and safety 	Accept with amendments	Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 25.2 Requests transparency around annual capital and operational and maintenance costs, especially around water services, roading and refuse 		Accept in part
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 25.3 Requests there be direct references to climate change, specifically flooding/ inundation due to sea level rise, taken into account for long term decision-making before applying for resource consents 		Accept in part
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 25.4 Requests that consideration be given to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Using 'Non-Complying' status to avoid inappropriate development ○ The appropriateness of development of Class 1 Soils, specifically the potential negative effects on social, economic and cultural wellbeing ○ The potential to subsidise land or development that has already been subsidised in light of Three Waters reform ○ Whether variations to existing Iwi housing and Marae sites on Rural, Rural-Residential and Residential zones, as well as new Papakāinga development in residential or rural-residential zones should be noncomplying, instead of discretionary 		Reject

Submission No	Submitter	Submitter's Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought	Officer's Recommendation
26	Waikato Regional Council	SA O	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 26.1 Request amendments to MPZ-O1 and Papakāinga-O1 to include "other natural and physical resources" 	Accept with amendments	Accept in part
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 26.2 Suggest the inclusion of additional objectives and policies relating to the use of water, energy and climate resilience 		Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 26.3 WRC identifies two MPZ Precinct areas within WRC drainage schemes and therefore appropriate measures and controls are needed to manage flood risk 		Accept in part
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 26.4 Specific concerns regarding the location of Waiti Marae (within the MPZ Precinct 1) and its vulnerability to flooding 		Accept
27	Bette Blance	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 27.1 Supports the proposed plan change, particularly the purpose, and potential to improve the lives of local iwi, kaumātua and kuia through support from younger iwi members 	Accept	Accept in part
28	Thomas Bougher	SA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 28.1 Supports the plan change, submission amendments points include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased distance between dwellings to reduce sewage and storm water concentration in one area and give families space/ privacy New built homes for purposes of reduced maintenance, insulation standards and construction standards that meet current wind & earthquake bracing requirements Housing tenure that offers occupants security and signed agreements that establish rights and responsibilities 	Accept with amendments	Reject

Submission No	Submitter	Submitter's Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought	Officer's Recommendation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Roading and Access should be well-built and well maintained for safety reasons such as legal services (ambulance, fire etc) ○ Houses need to be numbered properly. ○ Road names established if there are more than 5 houses on a right of way ○ Measures put in place to ensure Council Indemnity ○ Consideration of rates due to increased services 		
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 28.2 Minimum 1 vehicle garage per dwelling for storage/ workshop • Require all homes to be new builds 		Reject
29	Margaret Osbourne	O	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 29.1 Requests the proposed zoning provisions should be made available to all 	Decline	Reject
30	Te Mangeo Tamehana Tarapipipi	SA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 30.1 Suggests an amendment to density provisions as the current density requirements will exclude people with smaller blocks 	Accept with amendments	Reject
31	Virginia McMillan	SA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 31.1 Suggests consulting with iwi on their aspirations to reassess the maximum number of homes • Requests an increase in the total number of homes 	Accept with amendments	Reject
32	Kali Matauwhati	SA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 32.1 Expresses strong whakapapa to Kai-a-te-mata and Rukumoana marae • 32.2 There is willingness from whanau living in other regions of the Motu to return to ancestral land, to look after other whanau, the land, marae and rivers 	Accept with amendments	Accept in part
					Accept in part
33	Brandon Dromgool and	O	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 33.1 Expressed concerns around increased traffic using and also turning off State Highway 26 into the proposed development 	Decline	Reject

Submission No	Submitter	Submitter's Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought	Officer's Recommendation
	Lyndsay Oldham		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 33.2 Expresses an expectation for consultation with Waka Kotahi on this proposal and traffic safety investigations completed which would determine what the impact of this development would be 		Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 33.3 Requests that the proposed developments have a water tank and septic tank, both undergoing regular servicing 		Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 33.4 Expresses concerns around the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of rural character Possible effects on surrounding property values Potential impacts on amenity value Intensification of the site and developmental outcomes 		Reject
34	Matamata Aeroclub	SA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 34.1 Expresses concerns around potential future complaints about aircraft noise by future residents 	Accept with amendments	Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 34.2 Propose that MPDC establish a noise contour plan for the area around the Matamata Aerodrome 		Reject
35	Tuatahi Nightingale-Pene	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 35.1 Expresses complete Support for Precinct 1 - Papakāinga Tahī, Precinct 2 - Papakāinga Rua and the District Wide Provisions 	Accept	Accept in part
36	Irene Tai-Rakena	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 36.1 Supports the proposed provisions 	Accept	Accept in part
37	Te Hanga South Trust	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 37.1 Trustees request that two land blocks that were mentioned in the submission be set aside in the District Plan under the District Wide provisions The Trust can demonstrate that there is an ancestral connection as well as a legal mechanism in place to ensure the land is maintained in whanau ownership in perpetuity 	Accept	Accept in part insofar as the district wide provisions already apply

Submission No	Submitter	Submitter's Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought	Officer's Recommendation
38	Raymond Kett	U	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 38.1 Objects to sending letters that are addresses to people who have passed away 38.2 Proposes a shareholder meeting 38.3 Expresses concerns regarding the name of the Waiti marae map 	U	Reject (insofar as no specific changes to PC54 were requested)
39	Jeff Hirawani	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 39.1 Supports the plan change 	Accept	Accept in part
40	This submission has been included in submission 17				
41	Brad Hutton	O	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 41.1 Opposes the proposed plan changes 	Decline	Reject
42	Sacha Capeling and Dayne Hazelden	O	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 42.1 The loss of rural character, and potential affects on mental health and child's welfare Raises concerns with development in the paddock surrounding the submitters' home, including impact on Kaimai views and rural setting. Increase dust and pollution 42.2 Existing high traffic volumes on State Highway - increasing road users around a blind corner would increase the danger at entrance ways Concerns raised about vehicle access onto Tauranga Road 42.3 The proposed zoning provisions should be made available to all groups on freehold land 	Decline	Reject Reject Reject
43	David King	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 43.1 Supports the plan change 	Accept	Accept in part
44	Rev Henare Waaka	SA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 44.1 Supports the plan change but would like General Land owned by Māori to be treated exactly the same as Papakāinga Tahī to enable: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opportunity for whanau to return home to ancestral land 	Accept with amendments	Reject

Submission No	Submitter	Submitter's Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought	Officer's Recommendation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Live collectively and raise mokopuna in a secure and safe environment that values te reo and tikanga Māori ○ Be involved in the social, spiritual, educational and economic heritage of my hapū and iwi ○ Participate in key roles and responsibilities of the marae and support to make Papakāinga a reality 		
45	Mananui Te Uira	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 45.1 Supports the plan change as it allows whanau to build on their whenua 	Accept	Accept in part
46	This submission has been included in submission 11				
47	Carolyn Nimmo	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 47.1 Supports Papakāinga Tahī as it allows for gardening activities on highly productive soils 	Accept	Accept in part
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 47.2 Supports Papakāinga Rua as it enables affordable housing and housing suitable for kaumātua and people with disabilities 			Accept in part		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 47.3 Supports papakāinga development on other Māori-owned land as it increased housing and housing diversity while keeping highly productive soils available for agriculture and building homes in a sustainable and affordable way 			Accept in part		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 47.4 Requests further plan changes and enabling Planning rules to allow close-proximity/ communal housing in urban and rural-residential zones, such as new models of co-housing that supports elderly, disabled, and different cultures (Key Issue 1) 			Reject		
48	Muna Wharawhara	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 48.1 Support in principle Papakāinga Tahī and Rua as an enabling policy that empowers whanau the opportunity to develop and deliver sustainable housing 	Accept	Reject

Submission No	Submitter	Submitter's Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought	Officer's Recommendation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter points out that the information omits councils contribution to infrastructure 		
49	Ian Robert Young, Dana Sheree Lewis and Ian Young Family Trust	SA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 49.1 The Te Ohaki Marae zoning map includes a Right of Way that belongs to the submitter Suitable arrangements are to be considered by Council when allowing the development to go ahead regarding the maintenance and upkeep of the Right of Way Safety issues arising from increased driveway use and interference of farming operations 	Accept with amendments	Reject
50	Leo George Whaiapu	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 50.1 Supports the plan change Request for specific blocks (Okauia 2e.3b-2b.1b, Wāhiti Kuranui 6a.1b.3b.2b) to get through 	Accept	Reject
51	Michael Carey	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 51.1 Supports the plan change 	Accept	Accept in part
52	Karen Chandler	SA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 52.1 Supports the plan change but would like allowances created for other land owners to add dwellings to their land for family. E.g. dependent living space Would like other people to be able to add dwellings up to 80sqm under the condition these dwellings are on the Title and that the property will not be subdivided 	Accept with amendments	Reject
53	Mapuna Turner	U	<p>53.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expresses the definition of Papakāinga Expresses that planning instruments should reflect that Māori landowners have the right to determine how and what their lands shall be use for Identifies that consent has not been given to the planning authority to usurp Māori and landowner rights 	U	Reject (insofar as no specific changes to PC54 were requested)

Submission No	Submitter	Submitter's Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought	Officer's Recommendation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stipulates that communal living should be decided by the traditional application of accommodating whanau numbers Identifies that colonisation has influences Māori practices – traditional lores of tapu are circular Identifies land use restrictions regarding water resources 		
54	Kāinga Ora	SA, O	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54.1 Amend MPZ-O1 to refer to papakāinga, marae and associated commercial activities 	Accept with amendments	Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54.2 Retain objective MPZ-O2 		Accept
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54.3 Amend MPZ-O3 to refer to the planned environment and delete reference to reverse sensitivity effects 		Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54.4 Amend MPZ-P2 to support provision of papakāinga on all land, not just land in Māori title or where land is held in whānau ownership in perpetuity. 		Accept in part
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54.5 Amend MPZ-P3 to refer to the planned environment rather than the character of the particular zone 		Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54.6 Amend MPZ-P4 to delete reference to the functioning of legitimate land uses on adjacent sites 		Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54.7 Delete MPZ-P7 as the submission of a Papakāinga Development Plan is not necessary. 		Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54.8 Amend MPZ-P8 to delete reference to demonstrating the papakāinga will remain in whānau ownership in perpetuity 		Accept in part (insofar as the policy is recommended to be amended to refer to iwi, hapū or whānau ownership in perpetuity – see Key Theme 4).
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54.9 Delete MPZ-PREC1-R(1)(b) relocatable buildings 		Reject

Submission No	Submitter	Submitter's Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought	Officer's Recommendation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54.10 Delete requirement for Papakāinga Development Plan 		Reject
FS3	Clarke McKinney	Support Submission 54 in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support Kāinga Ora's requested amendments to the MPZs, including density 	Accept with amendments	Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54.11 Amend MPZ-PREC1-R(1)(g) relating to home business to allow commercial activity more generally 		Reject
FS3	Clarke McKinney	Support Submission 54 in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support Kāinga Ora's requested amendments to the MPZs, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Home / commercial business standards 	Accept with amendments	Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54.12 Delete MPZ-PREC1-R(1)(h) and manage community facilities, education facilities, and healthcare facilities with development and performance standards 		Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54.13 Amend MPZ-PREC1-R(2)(a) matters of discretion 		Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54.14 Delete MPZ-PREC1-R(3)(a)-(e) Discretionary activities 		Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54.15 Amend MPZ-PREC1-R(5)(b) height in relation to boundary 		Reject
FS3	Clarke McKinney	Support Submission 54 in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support Kāinga Ora's requested amendments to the MPZs, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Height to boundary 	Accept with amendments	Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54.16 Amend MPZ-PREC1-R(5)(c) to reduce front, side and rear yards to 5m 		Accept in part
FS3	Clarke McKinney	Support Submission 54 in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support Kāinga Ora's requested amendments to the MPZs, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yards 	Accept with amendments	Reject

Submission No	Submitter	Submitter's Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought	Officer's Recommendation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54.17 Amend MPZ-PREC1-R(5)(e) to increase maximum building coverage to 40% 		Reject
FS3	Clarke McKinney	Support Submission 54 in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support Kāinga Ora's requested amendments to the MPZs, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Building coverage 		Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54.18 Delete MPZ-PREC1-R(5)(f) Solid waste 		Accept in part
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54.19 Amend MPZ-PREC2-R(1)(a) to remove density requirement 		Reject
FS3	Clarke McKinney	Support Submission 54 in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support Kāinga Ora's requested amendments to the MPZs, including density 	Accept with amendments	Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54.20 Delete MPZ-PREC2-R(1)(b) one kāinga per 500m² site area in its entirety (and rely on MPZ-PREC2-R(1)(a) as requested to be amended by another submission point) 		Accept in part
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54.21 Delete MPZ-PREC2-R(1)(c) relocatable buildings 		Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54.22 Amend MPZ-PREC2-R(1)(e) earthworks 		Accept
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54.23 Amend MPZ-PREC2-R(2)(a) matters of discretion 		Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54.24 Delete MPZ-PREC2-R(3) Discretionary activities 		Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54.25 Amend MPZ-PREC2-R(5)(b) height in relation to boundary 		Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54.26 Amend MPZ-PREC2-R(5)(e) to increase maximum building coverage to 40% 		Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54.27 Delete MPZ-PREC2-R(5)(f) Solid waste 		Accept in part
FS3	Clarke McKinney	Support Submission 54 in part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support Kāinga Ora's requested amendments to the MPZs, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Solid waste and screening 	Accept with amendments	Accept in part
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54.28 Delete MPZ-PR2 		Reject

Submission No	Submitter	Submitter's Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought	Officer's Recommendation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delete MPZ-PR3 		
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54.29 Amend Papakāinga-O1 to refer to papakāinga, marae and associated commercial activities 		Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54.30 Retain Papakāinga-O2 		Accept
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54.31 Amend Papakāinga-O3 to refer to the planned environment and delete reference to reverse sensitivity effects 		Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54.32 Amend MPZ-PREC1-R(1)(f) to delete the density of one kāinga per 5000m² 		Accept in part
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54.33 Delete Policy Papakāinga-P2 		Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54.34 Amend Papakāinga-P3 to refer to the planned environment rather than the character of the particular zone 		Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54.35 Amend Papakāinga-P4 to delete reference to the functioning of legitimate land uses on adjacent sites 		Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54.36 Delete Papakāinga-P7 as the submission of a Papakāinga Development Plan is not necessary 		Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54.37 Amend Papakāinga-P8 to delete reference to demonstrating the papakāinga will remain in whānau ownership in perpetuity 		Accept in part
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54.38 Delete 1.1.2 Plans in its entirety as a Papakāinga Development Plan is not necessary 		Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54.39 Remove requirement 1.4.30(ii) providing information on management structures for papakāinga. 		Accept in part
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54.39 Amend 1.4.30 Papakāinga (assessment matters) to delete (i), (ii), (v), and (viii) and reword (vi) and (vii) 		Accept in part

Submission No	Submitter	Submitter's Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought	Officer's Recommendation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54.40 Amend Section 6 to provide for Papakāinga on general title land as well as Māori Freehold Land and Treaty Settlement Land. 		Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54.41 Amend 6.1.1 to make kāinga a Restricted Discretionary in the Business Zone and a permitted activity in the Residential Zone Amend Activity Table line 6.1.1 to remove density restriction of five kāinga per site and delete 6.1.2 		Accept in part
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54.42 Amend Activity Table line 6.1.1 to remove density restriction of five kāinga per site and delete 6.1.2 		Accept in part
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54.43 Amend 6.1.3 to make marae a permitted activity in the residential zones and Restricted Discretionary in the Business Zone. 		Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54.44 Amend 6.1.4 to delete home businesses and replace with commercial activity less than or equal to 60m², make Restricted Discretionary in Business and Industrial zones, and provide for Restricted Discretionary activity for commercial activities greater than 60m² in the rural, rural residential and residential zones. 		Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54.45 Amend 6.1.5 to add communal buildings and make permitted in Residential, Rural and Rural Residential Zones and Restricted Discretionary in the Business Zone 		Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54.46 Add a new activity for educational facilities and healthcare facilities, permitted across all zones 		Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54.47 Delete Section 6.2 		Reject

Submission No	Submitter	Submitter's Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought	Officer's Recommendation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54.48 Reduce the side and rear yard standard from 20m to 5m and amend the Note applying to papakāinga spanning multiple records of title 		Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54.49 Delete 4.4.1.1 requiring submission of a Papakāinga Development Plan 		Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54.50 Delete 4.4.1.2 maximum building coverage 		Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54.51 Amend 4.4.1.4 to delete 10m setback for service area 		Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54.52 Amend 4.4.1.5 for home businesses so that only heavy vehicle controls and compliance with Permitted activity performance standards and to provide for commercial activities at a kāinga-wide level 		Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54.53 Delete Performance Standards 4.4.2 		Accept in part
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54.54 Amend the matters of discretion in 4.4.3 		Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54.55 Amend the activity status for subdivision in the Rural, Rural Residential, Business, and Māori Purpose zones to Restricted Discretionary 		Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54.56 Delete 6.3.13(i) in its entirety 		Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54.57 Amend Assessment Criteria 6.3.13(ii) 		Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54.57 Amend Assessment Criteria 6.3.13(ii) 		Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54.58 Amend 9.1.2 Access (v)(iii) to increase threshold for number of kāinga to trigger compliance with the Development Manual 		Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54.59 Amend to remove reference to Papakāinga Development Plan 		Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54.60 Replace the definition of Papakāinga with a definition that allows for papakāinga on general title 		Reject

Submission No	Submitter	Submitter's Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought	Officer's Recommendation
			land and where there is no requirement to prove whakapapa to that land.		
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54.61 Amend definition so it is not restricted to the use of a building for one household only 		Reject
55 LATE SUBMISSION	Matamata Soaring Centre	SA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 55.1 Support the intentions to enable quality Papakāinga development and opportunities for landowners 	Support with amendments	Accept in part
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 55.2 Plan change should include explicit reference to the existing Matamata airport protection zones 		Reject
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 55.3 Council should include noise mitigation measures to avoid reverse sensitivity issues from the Matamata/Waharoa aerodrome (for example a setback from the airfield) 		Reject