

No	Submitter	Specific provisions of the plan change that the submission relates to	Support/ Oppose	Details of Submission	Decision that the Submitter wants Council to make	Further Submissions			Assessment and Recommendation	Accept/ Reject/ Accept in part
						Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested		
1	Jannene McDonald	MM2	Support in part	The submitter supports the new Tower Road Residential Zone between Bridie Avenue and Magnolia Drive, Matamata. However, they are concerned about traffic movements in the existing neighbourhood.	Accept the plan change with the following amendments: 1. Provide a third access point into the subdivision area at Findlater Street.					
2	Colin Saunders	MM3	Support in Part	The submitter supports the proposed changes to the landscape provisions with amendments. Increase the number of activities, including food retail, permitted in Business zoning,	Accept the plan change with the following amendments: 1. Allow expansion up to 100m <sup>2</sup> without requiring landscaping. 2. Include food retail as a permitted activity in the Business zone.					
3	Maurice Ritchie	Residential infill zone map TA3	Support in part	The submitter supports the plan change and the proposed Residential Infill areas in Te Aroha, but would like the infill area extended to include their property at 21 Gilchrist Street. The submitter notes that the sections along Gilchrist Street are all large sections, with the house located at the front of the section.	Accept the plan change with the following amendments: 1. The submitter requests that the Residential infill area be extended to include Gilchrist Street properties that are of an acceptable size.					
4	Jonathan Bowen	PC47	Support in part	The submitter is concerned that the District Plan is too restrictive with subdivision of small blocks around the town catchments. Minimum lot size should be reduced to 2,500m <sup>2</sup> . Existing lots are too large for most people to maintain as a residential property, yet are too small to be productive rural holdings.	Accept the plan change with the following amendments: 1. Amend the minimum lot size in the rural residential area to allow smaller lots to be created					
5	Karen Semmens	PC47 – Horrell Road Notice of Requirement; increased housing density; and the Industrial Zoning of Avenue Road, Morrinsville	Oppose	<p>The submitter does not support the Horrell Road rezoning proposal. In their opinion the proposal will compromise the high quality dairy land in the area. Additionally the submitter adds that the rezoning will change the character of the area and destroy the land's productive capability.</p> <p>The submitter does not support the higher density zones in the town centre, and is concerned that the proposed changes will result in overcrowding</p> <p>The submitter does not support the proposed industrial on the Western side of Morrinsville. The submitter identifies that Roach Road and Bolton Road would be better suited. Additionally, they believe there should be a buffer zone between the Industrial and Residential Zones on Avenue Road.</p> <p>Furthermore, the submitter proposes that if the Horrell Road NOR is adopted, then a tree-lined spine road should be</p>	Decline the plan change in part with the following amendments: 1. If the NOR is adopted, then the submitter's land on Horrell Road is included into the plan change area, and be rezoned Rural-Residential 2. Establish a green belt around the Morrinsville to protect the productive land from being used as residential land. 3. Consider rezoning the western side of Morrinsville as Business.					

No	Submitter	Specific provisions of the plan change that the submission relates to	Support/ Oppose	Details of Submission	Decision that the Submitter wants Council to make	Further Submissions			Assessment and Recommendation	Accept/ Reject/ Accept in part
						Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested		
				constructed which provides safe passage for cyclists and pedestrians.						
6	John Lee	MM3	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the rezoning of Meura Street and 10 Tamihana to Business zone on the basis there is flooding issues down this street.</p> <p>The Residential Zone should be retained including the Residential Infill overlay as these properties have a central location in close proximity to facilities which would be ideal for the elderly and the disabled.</p>	<p>Oppose the plan change, unless the following amendments are made:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide stormwater facilities for the street</li> <li>2. Provide better street lighting</li> <li>3. Trim the trees on Meura Street to increase the streets exposure to sunlight.</li> </ol>					
7	Lewis Hall	PC47	Oppose	The submitter is concerned with the increased housing density that the plan change is trying to achieve and the proposed rezoning on Waharoa Road East.	Decline the plan change.					
8	Tarnia Richardson	MV3	Oppose in part	<p>The submitter opposes the proposed increase in housing density (proposed Residential Infill provisions) at the block between McPherson Drive and Page Street bordering the Industrial zone.</p> <p>The submitter suggests that as an alternative, more of Coronation Road should be considered for Residential Infill.</p>	<p>Accept the plan change with the following amendments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Establish a buffer between the Residential Infill and Industrial zoning.</li> <li>2. Consider Infill provisions along Coronation Road</li> </ol>					
9	Kevin & Dianne Mary Te Wharau	MV3	Does not say	<p>The submitter wishes to see the existing Industrial zoned land at the end of Page Street, Lot 9 DP 16287 rezoned to Residential zone.</p> <p>There is plenty of un-utilised Industrial zoned land in western Morrinsville, but a shortage of residential sections in the town.</p>	<p>Accept the plan change with the following amendments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Rezone Lot 9 DP 16287 as residential.</li> </ol>					
10	Jonathan Maitland-Smith	Rule 4.13.2(i)	Support in part	The submitter supports the Infill provisions, however, objects to Rule 4.13.2(i), and believes that using net site area to define the size of sites for infill subdivision will result in nil increase in Infill development or sites being surveyed in a manner to get around the rules, which would have a detrimental effect on Residential areas.	<p>Accept the plan change with the following amendments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. For Rule 4.13.2(i), require site density to be calculated on a 325m<sup>2</sup> gross site area rather than a 325m<sup>2</sup> net site area.</li> </ol>					
11	Sandy Barnes	TA 2	Oppose in part	The submitter opposes the increase in residential density around Stirling Street on the basis that further development will result in up to 1,000 more vehicles per day on the roads in this area, with a detrimental effect on traffic safety	Decline the plan change, unless the road network around Stirling and Kennedy Streets is extended to connect with the surrounding streets.					
12	Inghams Enterprises Ltd	Proposed Equine Area in Matamata, at the corner of Banks and Burwood Roads	Oppose in part	The submitter is concerned about the reverse sensitivity of introducing an Equine Overlay in Matamata which would allow smaller lots in the vicinity of their activities and operation).	<p>Accept the plan change with the following amendments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Rezone the Ingham Enterprises site as industrial.</li> </ol>					

No	Submitter	Specific provisions of the plan change that the submission relates to	Support/ Oppose	Details of Submission	Decision that the Submitter wants Council to make	Further Submissions			Assessment and Recommendation	Accept/ Reject/ Accept in part
						Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested		
				<p>The submitter also describes that changing the zoning to rural-residential could limit their ability to further develop the site in the future should the company wish to expand, and questions the justification for the Equine area as it has not been provided.</p> <p>The submitter seeks to have their present site at Banks and Burwood Road, and the land on the southern side of this site which they have earmarked for future expansion, rezoned Industrial to protect the operation of their business, and to allow for potential future expansion.</p> <p>The submitter also proposes changes to the rules in the Equine Area (listed in next column) to reverse sensitivity protection for the site in respect of operational effects and traffic management.</p>	<p>2. Delete rule 6.3.10(i)(a), restricting equine lots to equine areas.</p> <p>3. Amend proposed rule 6.3.10(i)(b) as follows:</p> <p>A qualifying title shall be defined as a title... which means an area of 4 ha or more and is currently occupied by an existing dwelling at the date of application for subdivision consent.</p> <p>4. Amend proposed 6.3.10(i)(d) as follows:</p> <p>Note: for the purpose of this rule, a direct and permanent association with the equine sector may take the form of a permanent public bridle path network and/or purpose built stables for a commercial equine enterprise...</p> <p>5. Amend proposed rule 6.3.10(i)(e) as follows:</p> <p>Any additional equine lot or balance lot shall not provide for a new house site within 100m of a boundary with a site which is occupied by an intensive farming, industrial other such like activity, including the Inghams Hatchery on Part Lot 1 DPS 16966 and Lot 1 DPS 22046, which may be affected by reverse sensitivity effects.</p> <p>6. Amend proposed rule 6.5.6(ii)(a) as follows:</p> <p>The avoidance of conflicts between activities and potential reverse sensitivity effects, including noise, visual and traffic effects, on lawfully established activities.</p> <p>7. Amend proposed rule</p>					

No	Submitter	Specific provisions of the plan change that the submission relates to	Support/ Oppose	Details of Submission	Decision that the Submitter wants Council to make	Further Submissions			Assessment and Recommendation	Accept/ Reject/ Accept in part
						Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested		
					<p>6.6.1 as follows:</p> <p>In addition to the Controlled and Restricted Discretionary Assessment criteria, <del>may be used as a framework for assessing Discretionary and Non-Complying subdivision.</del> However all actual and potential effects from such Discretionary and non-Complying subdivision shall be assessed and may be used in determining an application and/or imposing conditions.</p>					
13	A.L., N., & E Loveridge	PC47 – Extent of Residential zoning in Morrinsville	Support in part	The submitter would like the Residential zone extended to include 56 and 60 Snell Street (approximately 5.4ha).	Accept the plan change with the following amendments: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Rezone 56 and 60 Snell Street to Residential (approximately 5.4ha).</li> </ol>					
14	Colin and Sharyn Fabish	PC 47 Rural-Residential lot sizes	Support in part	<p>The submitter believes that Council should not restrict the size of subdivided blocks to 1 hectare, and that sections of 1,000m<sup>2</sup> would be more appropriate.</p> <p>Support changes to Horrell Road intersection.</p>	Accept the plan change with the following amendments: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That further consideration is given to reduced Rural-Residential lot sizes.</li> </ol>					
15	Brett and Sharon Yeandle	PC47 – Proposed Rural-Residential rezoning, SH26.	Support in part	<p>The submitter is concerned with the safety of changing the zones around the business area and introducing residential development into an already busy area along SH26 in Morrinsville.</p> <p>The submitter proposes the following properties: 2582, 2586 and 2592 State Highway 26 are rezoned to Business as they neighbour the existing business zone.</p>	Accept the plan change with the following amendments: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The submitter wishes to see the existing Business Zone boundary shifted to the western edge of section 2582 on SH26, Morrinsville.</li> </ol>					
16	Weatherley Bloodstock Limited & R. A. and S. Johnson	Proposed 'Equine Area' Matamata	Oppose	<p>The submitters believe that there has not been enough investigation done into the options put forward for the Equine Overlay areas in Matamata. They believe that the area of the overlay is excessive, that there is insufficient demand for the Equine area, and that the option will limit the ability of the land to be developed for residential purposes in the future.</p> <p>The submitter believes the assessment undertaken by TDG Group is fundamentally flawed in that it does not consider "Option 2", and the two options were not weighed up together.</p> <p>The submitter believes that more assessment of the demographic projections is necessary.</p>	Oppose the plan change in part, unless: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Two sites on Banks Road covering approximately 8.4ha are rezoned Residential, not Equine, to allow for future development in Matamata.</li> </ol>					

No	Submitter	Specific provisions of the plan change that the submission relates to	Support/ Oppose	Details of Submission	Decision that the Submitter wants Council to make	Further Submissions			Assessment and Recommendation	Accept/ Reject/ Accept in part
						Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested		
				<p>The submitter asserts that the Banks Road sites are suitable in terms of the Town Strategies framework and infrastructure capacity. In addition, it neighbours a proposed large-scale Residential subdivision on Burwood Road, and from a servicing perspective it is a better option than the proposed Tower Road Residential/Future Residential Policy Area.</p> <p>The submitter seeks a Residential Zone over two sites with frontage to Banks Road and covering approximately 8.4ha.</p>						
17	Progressive Enterprises Ltd.	- Landscape provisions business and industrial zones, - Shop frontage areas	Support in part	<p>The submitters support the changes to the landscape provisions</p> <p>The submitter believes that the shop frontage rule proposed by the plan change is excessive and should be retracted from identified properties in Matamata, Morrinsville and Te Aroha.</p>	<p>Accept the plan change with the following amendments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Amend planning map MM3 by removing the shop frontage lines from both sides of Arawa Street, north of Rewa Street</li> <li>2. Amend MV3 planning map by removing shop frontage lines from Studholme Street, north of Thames Street</li> <li>3. Amend TA5 planning map by removing shop frontage lines from Whitaker Street, east of Boundary Road</li> </ol>					
18	Nikita Laboyrie	Taukoro Road Proposed Future Residential Policy Area	Support in part	<p>The submitter requests that Council should increase the area of this proposed residential area to include their property, 129 Taukoro Road. Taukoro Road is closer to the Morrinsville township than the existing Residential subdivision at Sunridge Park. The submitter would like to subdivide their land to provide eight dwellings per hectare of land,</p>	<p>Accept the plan change with the following amendments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Rezone 129 Taukoro Road to Residential</li> </ol>					
19	Shane Tunnicliffe	Taukoro Road Proposed Future Residential Policy Area	Support in part	<p>The submitter has requests that Council should increase the area of this proposed residential area to include their property, 129 Taukoro Road. Taukoro Road is in closer proximity to the Morrinsville township than the existing Residential subdivision at Sunridge Park. The submitter would like to subdivide their land to provide eight dwellings per hectare of land.</p>	<p>Accept the plan change with the following amendments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Rezone 129 Taukoro Road to Residential</li> </ol>					
20	Nelson Schick	PC47 Eldonwood South Zoning Rural-Residential 1 &	Support in part	<p>The submitter does not see the need to have two classifications of Rural-Residential zoning within the Eldonwood South area.</p>	<p>Accept the plan change with the following amendments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. All Rural-Residential 2 zones be classified as Rural-Residential</li> </ol>					

No	Submitter	Specific provisions of the plan change that the submission relates to	Support/ Oppose	Details of Submission	Decision that the Submitter wants Council to make	Further Submissions			Assessment and Recommendation	Accept/ Reject/ Accept in part
						Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested		
		2 zones			1.					
21	Wally O'Hearn	Equine Overlay, Matamata	Support in part	The submitter would like a clause added to the rezoning that will enable their property at Banks Road to be rezoned as Future Residential.	Accept the plan change with the following amendments: 1. That the submitters property at 60 Banks Road be rezoned Future Residential for future development.					
22	Valerie O'Hearn	Equine Overlay Matamata	Support in part	The submitter would like a clause added to the rezoning that will enable their property at Banks Road to be rezoned as Future Residential.	Accept the plan change with the following amendments: 1. That the submitters property at 46 Banks Road be zoned Future Residential.					
23	Sharron Wooler and Max Darymple	Planning map MM3 Rules 4.13.1, 4.13.4, and 4.13.5	Support in part	<p>The submitter believes that the planning rules around Pohlen Park need to be more permissive, the area is suitable for a higher density of development and providing smaller residential lots is appropriate.</p> <p>The submitter believes there is sufficient open space at Pohlen Park to not require neighbouring Residential zoned land to provide recreational space, and allow greater building density. Parking and vehicle manoeuvring space is unnecessary because the higher density development will not be reliant on cars.</p>	Accept the plan change with the following amendments: 1. Change rule 4.13.1 to a Controlled activity, not a Restricted Discretionary Activity. 2. Change rule 4.13.4(i)(a) to 300m2 gross site area, or less, and reduce or remove the recreational area. 3. 4.13.4(iii) remove the requirement for driveways and onsite parking and manoeuvring. 4. Insert controlled activity criteria in respect to residential amenity and height.					
24	C.G & G.V Miller	PC47 – Proposed Residential Zoning of Stirling Street	Oppose	<p>The submitters are concerned with the quality of the land that has been identified to be developed for future residential use around Stirling Street. The land is known to be boggy and wet, has problems with drainage and much of it is located in the Flood Hazard zone. The land contains slopes and gullies which would need to remain undeveloped, restricting the area available for development.</p> <p>Concerns have also been raised in relation to the likelihood of the proposed residential zoned land being developed as affected property owners do not wish to sell their land.</p> <p>The submitters further note that an increase in residential development will increase the pressure on the roading network, and that if development was to go ahead serious upgrades to the roads would be required.</p>	Decline the plan change in part: This area should remain Rural-Residential or be rezoned as a Future Residential Policy Area					



No	Submitter	Specific provisions of the plan change that the submission relates to	Support/ Oppose	Details of Submission	Decision that the Submitter wants Council to make	Further Submissions			Assessment and Recommendation	Accept/ Reject/ Accept in part
						Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested		
				<p>The submitter has raised concerns in terms of the proposed pedestrian walk/cycle ways and that they will result in security, safety, amenity and maintenance issues. There would also be a cost to construct bridges to cross a gully and the sewer pipe to access the Rail trail.</p> <p>The submitter wishes the land to remain Rural-Residential, or for it to be rezoned as a Future Residential Policy Area which would allow enough time for servicing and access problems to be addressed.</p>						
25	Warwick Couling	PC47– Rezoning of Stirling Street	Oppose	<p>The submitter is opposed to the residential rezoning at Stirling Street, Te Aroha. They indicate that the land to be zoned Residential is within a flood hazard area, contains natural springs and that development in this area would impact the area's natural drainage.</p> <p>Further to this the submitter is concerned about the increased traffic volume, noise generated by increased development, and that upgrades to the road network would be required. The submitter opposes the proposed pedestrian walkways because of resulting litter and rubbish, security issues and the costs of meeting these, livestock safety and the safety of children who have trespassed on his farm.</p>	Decline the plan change					
26	Kathleen Taylor	PC47– Rezoning of Stirling Street	Oppose	<p>The submitter is concerned with the quality of the land that has been identified to be developed for future residential use around Stirling Street. The land is known to be boggy and wet, and has problems with drainage and much of it is located in the Flood Hazard zone. The land contains slopes and gullies which would need to remain undeveloped, restricting the area available for development</p> <p>Concerns have also been raised in relation to the likelihood of the proposed residential zoned land being developed as affected property owners do not wish to sell their land.</p> <p>The submitter further notes that an increase in residential development will increase the pressure on the roading network, and that if development was to go ahead serious upgrades to the roads would be required.</p> <p>The submitter has raised concerns in terms of the proposed pedestrian walk/cycle ways and that they will result in health, security, safety, amenity and maintenance issues. There would also be a cost to construct bridges to cross a gully and the sewer pipe to access the</p>	Decline the plan change in part: This area should remain Rural-Residential or be rezoned as a Future Residential Policy Area					

No	Submitter	Specific provisions of the plan change that the submission relates to	Support/ Oppose	Details of Submission	Decision that the Submitter wants Council to make	Further Submissions			Assessment and Recommendation	Accept/ Reject/ Accept in part
						Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested		
				<p>Rail trail.</p> <p>The submitter wishes the land to remain Rural-Residential, or for it to be rezoned as a Future Residential Policy Area which would allow enough time for servicing and access problems to be addressed.</p>						
27	P.J & D.H Morris	PC47 – Rezoning of Stirling Street	Oppose	<p>The submitters are concerned that the rezoning of their land will lead to a rates increase for land that is unusable.</p> <p>The submitter identifies that there have been ongoing problems with stormwater discharges from residential areas being channelled through their property. The land ponds and becomes dangerous to walk on following heavy rain.</p> <p>Concerns have also been raised in relation to the likelihood of the proposed residential zoned land being developed as the submitter does not wish to sell their land.</p> <p>The submitter is concerned at the proximity of any walkway to their house. The submitter further identifies that constructing the walkway would lead to security, health and safety concerns if the walkway crosses their land.</p>	Decline the plan change					
28	Rex and Christie Hart	PC47 – Rezoning of Stirling Street	Oppose	<p>The submitters identify that the land proposed to be zoned residential around Stirling Street, Te Aroha, is a natural drain and that the wet ground would limit the ability of the land to be developed.</p> <p>The submitters further identify the health and safety concerns of a walkway crossing their land.</p> <p>Concerns have also been raised in relation to the likelihood of the proposed residential zoned land being developed as affected property owners do not wish to sell their land.</p> <p>Increased traffic volume to an area with one exit and entry point was a further concern for the submitter. They identify that Stirling Street is a no exit street at both ends, and that the additional traffic would cause nuisance to the residents.</p> <p>Concerns regarding the walkway access to the rail trail in terms of health, safety, security, visual amenity and maintenance.</p>	Decline the plan change in part: This area should remain Rural-Residential or be rezoned as a Future Residential Policy Area					
29	N.A & P.D Barton	PC47 – change in zoning along Waharoa Road East, Matamata.	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the proposed Residential/Business overlay rezoning along Waharoa Road East, and requests that the area, up until the Warehouse, is rezoned Residential Infill instead.</p>	Decline the plan change in part: rezone the part of Waharoa Road East, as far as the Warehouse, proposed for Business/Residential overlay,					



No	Submitter	Specific provisions of the plan change that the submission relates to	Support/ Oppose	Details of Submission	Decision that the Submitter wants Council to make	Further Submissions			Assessment and Recommendation	Accept/ Reject/ Accept in part
						Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested		
				This area is an attractive entrance to town, has well established residential amenity and is in close walking distance to shops and services.	to Residential Infill.					
30	Vanessa Kowalski	PC47 – Rezoning of Stirling Street	Oppose	<p>The submitter is concerned with the loss of the rural character of the area if the plan change is approved and the land is subdivided.</p> <p>The submitter is concerned at an increase in traffic resulting from residential development. Furthermore, the submitter states that that the gully systems and undeveloped land help with stormwater disposal and to mitigate flooding.</p> <p>The submitter is also concerned that the existing infrastructure will not cope with an increased density of housing and that they have had problems with water shortages and power outages.</p>	Decline the plan change					
31	Gayleen Ross & Grant Broomhall	Proposed Business Zones along Waharoa Road East, Matamata.	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the proposed Residential/Business overlay rezoning along Waharoa Road East, and requests that the area, up until the Warehouse, is rezoned Residential Infill instead.</p> <p>This area is an attractive entrance to town, has well established residential amenity and is in close walking distance to shops and services.</p>	Decline the plan change in part: rezone the part of Waharoa Road East, as far as the Warehouse, proposed for Business/Residential overlay, to Residential Infill.					
32	Sheree Broomhall	Proposed Business Zones along Waharoa Road East, Matamata.	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the proposed Residential/Business overlay rezoning along Waharoa Road East, and requests that the area, up until the Warehouse, is rezoned Residential Infill instead.</p> <p>This area is an attractive entrance to town, has well established residential amenity and is in close walking distance to shops and services.</p>	Decline the plan change in part: rezone the part of Waharoa Road East, as far as the Warehouse, proposed for Business/Residential overlay, to Residential Infill.					
33	Gordon and Joanne Barton	Proposed Business Zones along Waharoa Road East, Matamata.	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the proposed Residential/Business overlay rezoning along Waharoa Road East, and requests that the area, up until the Warehouse, is rezoned Residential Infill instead.</p> <p>This area is an attractive entrance to town, has well established residential amenity and is in close walking distance to shops and services.</p>	Decline the plan change in part: rezone the part of Waharoa Road East, as far as the Warehouse, proposed for Business/Residential overlay, to Residential Infill.					
34	Roger Lorigan	Residential land rezoning of Stirling Street	Support in part	The submitter supports the planned rezoning if the land to from rural to residential but opposes the provision of public walkways in this area for security	Accept the plan change with the following amendments: 1. The submitter would like to the see the					

No	Submitter	Specific provisions of the plan change that the submission relates to	Support/ Oppose	Details of Submission	Decision that the Submitter wants Council to make	Further Submissions			Assessment and Recommendation	Accept/ Reject/ Accept in part
						Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested		
				reasons.	proposed walkways removed from the plan change.					
35	Rita Geraghty	Proposed business zones along Waharoa Road East, Matamata.	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the proposed Residential/Business overlay rezoning along Waharoa Road East, and requests that the area, as far as the Warehouse, is rezoned Residential Infill instead.</p> <p>This area is an attractive entrance to town, has well established residential amenity and is in close walking distance to shops and services.</p>	Decline the plan change in part: rezone the part of Waharoa Road East, as far as the Warehouse, proposed for Business/Residential overlay to Residential Infill.					
36	Silver Fern Farms	Map TA1 Section 6 – subdivision 6.3.10 Definitions – equine activities	Oppose in part	The submitter is concerned about reverse sensitivity effects, and that the proposed Equine Area could affect their ability to carry out their meat processing operations.	Decline in part: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That the Equine areas on the TA1 planning maps and associated changes are rejected.</li> <li>2. That rule 6.3.10 “Equine Lots” and the associated changes are rejected.</li> <li>3. That a definition of Equine activity is included in the plan change.</li> </ol>					
37	New Zealand Transport Agency	Entire plan change	Support in part	<p>The submitter supports the principles of the plan change, but has listed several concerns:</p> <p><b>Morrinsville</b> The Submitter proposes the deletion of Rural-Residential 1 zoning within MV4 until a traffic assessment is undertaken, which considers the effects on the intersection of Avenue Road and SH26</p> <p><b>Horrell Road rezoning</b> The submitter does not support the rezoning of the Horrell Road structure plan area, and wishes to see this deleted from the plan change.</p> <p><b>Matamata</b> 1. The submitter wishes to see the Equine Area Overlay deleted until comprehensive access arrangements have been identified, and that direct access to the State Highway is avoided.</p> <p>2. Amendment to the subdivision and land use rules which will ensure that the proposed Industrial Zone extension gains access from the local road network and not the State Highway.</p> <p><b>Te Aroha</b> 1. The submitter seeks that an additional performance standard is inserted into</p>	Accept with the amendments provided in previous column.					

No	Submitter	Specific provisions of the plan change that the submission relates to	Support/ Oppose	Details of Submission	Decision that the Submitter wants Council to make	Further Submissions			Assessment and Recommendation	Accept/ Reject/ Accept in part
						Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested		
				6.3.10 Equine Lots, discretionary activity, requiring no access is gained from the state highway network.  Raises issues with consistency and alignment with Waikato Regional Policy Statement.						
38	Fonterra	PC47	Support in part	The submitter is concerned with the change in zoning of the land surrounding the Morrinsville processing plant. Planning map MV3 identifies that an area bounded by Thomas, Allen and Waverly is to be zoned Residential Infill. Fonterra has identified that the increased density arising from the infill areas will result in reverse sensitivity effects and constrain the plant's operations.  A key concern is the reverse sensitivity effects that relate to noise. The plant has an existing use rights through the resource consent process for a 45dB Noise Emission Contour.	Accept the plan change with the following amendments: 1. Remove the residential infill area from the Allen Street side of map MV3 2. Include the 45db L <sub>Aeq</sub> Noise Emission Contour for the Morrinsville site on Map MV3 3. Amend the residential infill areas boundary on MV3 so that no residential infill properties are located within the Fonterra Noise Emission Contour					
39	Andrew Holroyd	Banks Road Structure Plan, Rule 6.3.2 Rule 4.13 – residential infill development	Support in part	The submitter seeks an extension of the Residential Zone over sites currently zoned Rural.  Development in the area between the equine and the proposed residential zone could be serviced by an overland flow path over Lot 3 DP 486931.  The submitter wants more details provided on the development contributions policy.  The submitter is concerned with the ability of the council owned and operated stormwater system to handle an increased usage.	Accept the plan change with the following amendments: 1. Zone Lot 1 DP 486931 residential. 2. Include residential zoning over Lot 3 DP 486931 and Lot 1 DPS 69505 which sit between the residential zone boundary and equine zone boundary. 3. Connect an overland flow path for the four lots with an existing overland flow path. 4. Council to upgrade the sewerage reticulation between Vosper Street and Hohaia Crescent. 5. Provide a schedule of infrastructure items as they relate to Development Contributions. 6. Provide a copy of the infrastructure in each town indicating council ownership and maintenance					

No	Submitter	Specific provisions of the plan change that the submission relates to	Support/ Oppose	Details of Submission	Decision that the Submitter wants Council to make	Further Submissions			Assessment and Recommendation	Accept/ Reject/ Accept in part
						Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested		
					requirements.					
40	Kiwi Rail	PC47	Support	The submitter supports both the plan change and the notice of requirement and that the plan change should proceed as notified.	Accept the plan change.					
41	K.R Simpson and K.R Simpson Family trust	Banks Road Structure Plan zoning	Support in part	The submitter seeks to have the residential zone extended over Lots 1 and 2 DP 489613 identified in the Banks Road structure plan.  The submitter supports amendment to the structure plan to cater for alternate access links and stormwater management areas.	Accept the plan change with the following amendments: 1. Amend the residential zoning in the Matamata plan change area to cover Lot 2 DP 486913.					
42	L.J.M & N.L Loveridge	PC47 – rezoning of 5.384ha of Rural land to Residential, Eynon Road, Morrinsville	Support in part	The submitter seeks to have their rural-zoned property (1 Eynon Road) rezoned to Residential to increase the density of housing in the Morrinsville plan change area.  Sewerage and water utilities are located nearby on the other side of Eynon Road and this rezoning proposal could allow 30 affordable 600m <sup>2</sup> lots.	Accept the plan change with the following amendments: 1. Extend the Residential Zone to include 1 Eynon Road).					
43	Gavin Harris and Andrew Holroyd	PC47 see details in decisions sought column	Support in part	The submitter seeks various amendments to the provisions – see details in decisions sought column.	Accept the plan change with the following amendments: 1. Activity table 2.2 of part B Item 3.13 Accommodation facilities – should consider accommodation facilities in the business as at least a controlled activity. 2. Rule 3.1.1(iii) – seeks waivers for dwelling yards (in addition to accessory buildings) where internal to subdivision, or affected party consents provided. 3. Rule 4.13.4(i) identify an assessment criteria that encourages innovative design on 325m <sup>2</sup> sites. 4. Rule 4.13.4(g) seeks clarification on 'internal boundaries'. 5. Rule 6.1.2(d) – seeks flexibility in the minimum lot size in the business zone: 500m <sup>2</sup> is too large – suggest 250m <sup>2</sup> as a					

No	Submitter	Specific provisions of the plan change that the submission relates to	Support/ Oppose	Details of Submission	Decision that the Submitter wants Council to make	Further Submissions			Assessment and Recommendation	Accept/ Reject/ Accept in part
						Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested		
					<p>discretionary activity.</p> <p>6. 6.2.3(ii) - clarify that stormwater disposal is not necessary onsite in the Rural and Rural-Residential zone, or delete the rule.</p> <p>7. 6.2.4(i) Object to the rule on the basis the rule is to rigid. Relief sought is that the more flexibility should be provided without changing the activity status.</p> <p>8. 6.3.2 Banks Road Structure Plan Area – Make amendments to the stormwater management options, and the potential for staged pipe swale and detention options; Amend road connectivity options; Extend the Residential Zone over the Banks Road Plan area to the eastern boundary of Lot 1 and 4 DP 486913. Public services extended over Lot 1 DP 486913.</p> <p>9. 6.3.5 Rural-Residential Zone (Restricted Discretionary Activity) – request that areas with future potential for development be identified as Rural-Residential 2, except where there are specific development restrictions or land use separation requirements.</p> <p>10. 6.3.5(i) confirm or alter so this applies to subdivision in Rural-Residential 1 and Rural-Residential 2.</p> <p>11. 6.3.6 Boundary adjustment Controlled activity – Amend the</p>					

No	Submitter	Specific provisions of the plan change that the submission relates to	Support/ Oppose	Details of Submission	Decision that the Submitter wants Council to make	Further Submissions			Assessment and Recommendation	Accept/ Reject/ Accept in part
						Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested		
					<p>rule to ensure that the lots continue to comply with the zone area, shape, servicing, and access criteria.</p> <p>12. 6.5.6 (vi)(a) Servicing – Requiring assessments for onsite stormwater is not appropriate in all situations. The rule should be amended to reflect this.</p> <p>13. Proposed principal road landscaping area Plan MM5 - Object to criteria on Broadway without further clarification of application and existing use rights.</p>					
44	Barr and Harris Surveyors, Lesley Stanley, Darren and Toni Roa	PC47 – Rural-Residential Zoning Over Lots 1 & 2 DP 380456, Lot 2 DPS 66165 and other Rural-Residential zoned sites between Residential Zoned boundary and Peria Road	Support in part	The submitter seeks the creation of Rural-Residential 2 zoning over the properties listed in the next column. The submitters believe the land meets the required standards for Rural-Residential 2 zoning.	Accept the plan change with the following amendments: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Extend Rural-Residential 2 zoning over Lots 1 and 2 DP 380546, and Lot 2 DPS 66165.</li> </ol>					
45	Barr and Harris Surveyors, and George Duncan	PC47	Support in part	The submitter seeks that Lot 8 DP 415514 be identified as Rural-Residential 2. The submitter believes the land meets the required standards for Rural-Residential 2 zoning, and that there are practical stormwater management options for a variety of allotment sizes.	Accept the plan change with the following amendments: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Extend Rural-Residential zoning over lot 8 DP 415514</li> </ol>					
46	Blue Wallace surveyors, Ollie & Julie Carruthers, Bill & Karen Sweeny	PC47 – Rezoning of Rural land to Rural-Residential	Support in part	The submitter seeks that their land on Stockmans Road (Lots 1 & 2 DP 434664) be rezoned to Rural-Residential.	Accept the plan change with the following amendments: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter wishes to have their land at Lots 1 &amp; 2 DP 434664 integrated into the PC47, and for the land to be zoned as Rural-Residential.</li> </ol>					
47	Barr and Harris Surveyors, Karen and Bill Sweeney, and Julie and Oliver Carruthers	PC47	Support in part	The submitter would like the proposed rural-residential boundary extended to the properties on the northern side of Kereone Road, being 3B-93. They would also like the adjoining properties on Stockmans Road included.	Accept the plan change with the following amendments: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>That the properties mentioned in the submission are rezoned Rural-</li> </ol>					



No	Submitter	Specific provisions of the plan change that the submission relates to	Support/ Oppose	Details of Submission	Decision that the Submitter wants Council to make	Further Submissions			Assessment and Recommendation	Accept/ Reject/ Accept in part
						Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested		
					Residential.					
48	Calcutta Farms Limited	- Residential zoned land supply and Future Residential Policy Area as shown on proposed maps MM1 to MM6	Oppose in part	<p>The submitter believes that the population data used in the Section 32 analysis is out of date, and that the land budget is incapable of meeting the expected population growth whilst also preserving an overflow supply.</p> <p>To account for the under-supply of land, the submitter seeks the inclusion of additional land into the proposed plan change, in particular in the Banks Road area. The submitter further identifies that the Banks Road area is a viable cost-effective option for residential development.</p> <p>The submitter also challenges the assessment that the Tower Road Policy Area is more viable for future development than alternative sites. The Section.32 analysis does not detail all the alternatives and comparisons made, and that the patterns of migration should be used to influence the plan change.</p>	<p>The plan change be adopted with the following amendments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The submitter seeks that the land between Banks Road and SH24 be rezoned to Residential and Future Residential.</li> <li>2. That the Tower Road area is not excluded from the plan change, but that there is provision for additional land to be included as Residential supply should outweigh demand.</li> </ol>					
49	Ministry of Education	Infill and subdivision areas of PC47	Does not say	<p>The submitter is concerned with the proposed increase in density with infill development around the schools in Matamata and Morrinsville. Increasing the density around schools will lead to increased traffic, security concerns, and potential issues with reverse sensitivity.</p> <p>The submitter is also concerned with the Future Residential Policy Areas and the impact on the school network, the road network, car parking and road safety.</p>	<p>Accept the plan change with the following amendments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That Council considers measures to calm and control increased traffic impacts that can result from infill residential growth around schools.</li> <li>2. That walking and cycle connections are considered between the new growth areas and existing schools.</li> <li>3. That Council considers how reverse sensitivity will be managed around schools.</li> <li>4. That Council consult and work with the Ministry when planning for new education facilities and schools.</li> </ol>					
50	Anthony and Janet Gray	PC47	Does not say	<p>The submitter would like to see fewer restrictions on the subdivision of rural land to allow for an increase in the number of small rural subdivisions and smaller rural lots to be created. Additionally, the submitter sees no benefit in the provision of smaller</p>	Does not say.					

No	Submitter	Specific provisions of the plan change that the submission relates to	Support/ Oppose	Details of Submission	Decision that the Submitter wants Council to make	Further Submissions			Assessment and Recommendation	Accept/ Reject/ Accept in part
						Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested		
				residential lots and infill housing development in urban areas.						
51	Waikato Regional Council - Greg Morton, Team Leader Policy Implementation	PC47	Support in part	<p>The submitter supports the work undertaken by MPDC to ensure that planned and coordinated management of growth is achieved through this plan change. However, the submitter has identified several concerns:</p> <p>Morrinsville: The submitter is concerned about the peat soil in the Horrell Road structure plan area, and seeks further rationale as to why this area was selected for Rural-Residential zoning.</p> <p>Te Aroha: The submitter seeks to ensure that MPDC establishes development controls in the 'Future Residential Policy Area', Proposed Equine Area', and Residential Infill' areas to manage the risk of flood hazards to an appropriate level.</p> <p>Specific Plan Provisions: Rule 5.9 – the submitter wishes that MPDC clarifies the intent of the rule.</p> <p>Rule 6.1.2(b) – The submitter supports the rule, but asks that the impact of intensified development in respect to stormwater is addressed.</p>	<p>Accept the plan change with the following amendments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) MPDC establishes development controls in the 'Future Residential Policy Area', Proposed Equine Area', and Residential Infill' areas to manage the risk of flood hazards to an appropriate level.</li> <li>2) Rule 5.9 – the submitter wishes that MPDC clarifies the intent of the rule.</li> <li>3) Rule 6.1.2(b) – The impact of intensified development in respect to stormwater is addressed.</li> </ol>					
52	Powerco	PC47	Support in part	<p>The submitter wishes to ensure the safe and efficient operation of the electricity transmission across the Matamata-Piako District. The specific concerns relate to: Section 6 – subdivision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Status of subdivision for works and network utilities</li> <li>• Advice notes relating to New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safe Distance and Electricity (Hazards from Trees) Regulations 2003</li> <li>• Section 6.2.3 Infrastructure service standards</li> <li>• Section 9 – Tower Road Structure Plan</li> <li>• Section 10 – Status of Network Utilities in Heritage Areas.</li> </ul>	<p>Accept the plan change with the following amendments: The relief sought under Schedule 1 Section 6 – Subdivision is as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Include advice notes, after the subdivision activity table at 6.1, drawing attention to the need for compliance with NZECP 34:2001 and the Tree Regulations as follows: <u>Advice note: Works in close proximity to all electric lines can be dangerous. Compliance with the NZECP 34 is mandatory for buildings, earthworks and mobile plant within close proximity to all electric lines. Contact the line</u></li> </ol>					

No	Submitter	Specific provisions of the plan change that the submission relates to	Support/ Oppose	Details of Submission	Decision that the Submitter wants Council to make	Further Submissions			Assessment and Recommendation	Accept/ Reject/ Accept in part
						Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested		
					<p><a href="#">operator for advice.</a></p> <p><a href="#">Advice Note: Compliance with the Electricity (Hazards from Trees) Regulations 2003 is also mandatory for tree trimming and planting. To discuss works including tree planting, near electricity lines, especially within 20m of those lines, contact the line operator.</a></p> <p>2) Amend the subdivision assessment criteria to ensure all types of subdivision are required to consider reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and whether subdivision provides appropriate infrastructure in a coordinated manner. This could be achieved by including additional criteria to the following effect in section 6.4, which sets out assessment criteria applying to all subdivisions or in section 6.5.3 subdivision for more than 10 lots, and section 6.5.4 structure plans, as follows:</p> <p><a href="#">Infrastructure</a></p> <p>a) <a href="#">The avoidance of conflicts between activities and potential reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities.</a></p> <p>b) <a href="#">Where conflict or reverse sensitivity effects cannot be</a></p>					

No	Submitter	Specific provisions of the plan change that the submission relates to	Support/ Oppose	Details of Submission	Decision that the Submitter wants Council to make	Further Submissions			Assessment and Recommendation	Accept/ Reject/ Accept in part
						Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested		
					<p><u>avoided, the effectiveness and appropriateness of mitigation measures to protect lawfully established activities.</u></p> <p>c) <u>Whether subdivision provides appropriate infrastructure in a coordinated manner, ensuring that development and the provision of infrastructure keep pace with each other.</u></p> <p>3) The relief sought under Schedule 2 Section 9– Structure Plans is as follows:</p> <p>Amend section 9.3.4 infrastructure and servicing schedule for Tower Road Structure Plan to draw attention to the need to address electricity supply constraints when developing this area. this could be achieved by adding the following clause, or wording to the same effect:</p> <p><u>9.3.4 Infrastructure and servicing schedule</u>  <u>The following schedule identifies the infrastructure and servicing upgrades which will need to be assessed as part of any resource consent process, contribution model or developer agreement. All subdivision and development within</u></p>					

No	Submitter	Specific provisions of the plan change that the submission relates to	Support/ Oppose	Details of Submission	Decision that the Submitter wants Council to make	Further Submissions			Assessment and Recommendation	Accept/ Reject/ Accept in part
						Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested		
					<p><u>the Structure Plan area is also subject to the engineering and infrastructure provisions contained within the District Plan and Development Manual.</u></p> <p>4) The relief sought under Schedule 3 Section 10– Natural Environment and Heritage is as follows: 3.1 Amend Activity Table 10.1 to clearly permit the operation, maintenance, replacement and minor upgrading of network utilities in the heritage areas identified in Schedule 1 and within the Te Aroha Character Area, as follows: <u>Operation, maintenance, replacement and minor upgrading of existing network utilities – permitted.</u></p>					
53	Z Energy Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Principal landscaping areas</li> <li>- Definitions of site coverage</li> <li>- Shop frontage areas</li> </ul>	Support	The submitter is in favour of the proposed changes to the landscaping areas, definitions of site coverage, and changes to requirements of the shop frontages.	Accept the plan change.					
54	New Zealand Fire Service Commission	PC47	Support in part	The submitter wishes to ensure that PC47 provides an adequate supply of water for firefighting activities, and adequate access to properties for fire appliances to ensure the fire service can respond to emergencies.	<p>Accept the plan change with the following amendments:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">6.2.3 Infrastructure and Servicing Standards</p> <p><b>Add a new standard (x) as follows:</b> Where a connection to a reticulated water supply is not possible, adequate provision shall be made for fire-fighting waters supply and access to the supply, in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008</p>					

No	Submitter	Specific provisions of the plan change that the submission relates to	Support/ Oppose	Details of Submission	Decision that the Submitter wants Council to make	Further Submissions			Assessment and Recommendation	Accept/ Reject/ Accept in part
						Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested		
					<p>6.4.2 Subdivision in rural and rural-residential zones, and 6.4.4 Kaitiaki (Conservation Zone)</p> <p><b>Add a new matter of control (x) as follows:</b>  (x) servicing  (a) Whether adequate water supply is provided for firefighting purposes in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Fighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</p> <p>6.5.5 Rural Subdivision Amend 6.5.5(vi) and 6.5.6(vi) as follows:  Whether sites <del>can be</del> are adequately managed for on-site stormwater (while managing cumulative effects on a catchment wide basis), wastewater, water supply in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</p> <p>3.4.2 Subdivision – objectives and policies  <b>Add</b> a new policy (Px) as follows:  Px- <u>Ensure all new lots provide adequate water and access for firefighting purposes to support onsite development.</u></p>					
55	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	PC47 Te Aroha Character Area and Heritage Provisions	Support in part	The submitter supports the retention of heritage listed areas within the Matamata-Piako District	<p>Accept the plan change with the following amendments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That the “Te Aroha Character Area”, is amended to be known as the “Te Aroha <u>Heritage</u> Character Area” within the District Plan text and maps.</li> <li>2. That the proposed rules at 10.1.2 and their activity status is retained subject to the clarification of the wording for rule 10.1.2(d).</li> <li>3. That the “project Te Aroha” document, is placed on the Council website and the advice note is</li> </ol>					



No	Submitter	Specific provisions of the plan change that the submission relates to	Support/ Oppose	Details of Submission	Decision that the Submitter wants Council to make	Further Submissions			Assessment and Recommendation	Accept/ Reject/ Accept in part
						Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested		
					amended to advise of this.					
56	Lowe Corporation Pacific Limited	PC47	Support in part	<p>The submitter has reservations about the extension of the rural-residential zone, and equine overlays surrounding their animal skin processing facilities at Stanley Road, in Te Aroha West.</p> <p>The submitter is concerned with the general lack of Industrially Zoned land in Te Aroha, and the plan change could limit their ability for future expansion of their business</p>	<p>Accept the plan change with the following amendments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Delete the provisions relating to the proposed Equine Area in Te Aroha. Review the actual demand for areas against analysis of any reverse sensitivity effects.</li> <li>Te Aroha map TA1 - Amend Te Aroha map TA1 such that the proposed Equine Area provides for an appropriate transitional zone and/or implement tools such as 'no complaint' covenants and acoustic treatments for any dwellings in this zone.</li> <li>Rule 6.3.10 Amend rules 6.3.10(e) to provide: "Any additional equine lot shall not provide for a new house site within 400m a minimum of 800m of a boundary with a site which is occupied by an intensive farming, industrial or other such like activity which may be affected by reverse sensitivity effects.</li> <li>Te Aroha Map TA3 and 4: Ensure residential intensification is appropriately positioned to avoid reverse sensitivity from existing industrial uses, including but not limited to traffic, noise and odour effects.</li> <li>Map TA5 – landscaping areas:</li> </ol>					

No	Submitter	Specific provisions of the plan change that the submission relates to	Support/ Oppose	Details of Submission	Decision that the Submitter wants Council to make	Further Submissions			Assessment and Recommendation	Accept/ Reject/ Accept in part
						Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested		
					<p>Deletion of all Industrial sites, including submitter's Stanley Road West site from the Principal Road Landscaping Areas.</p> <p>6. Landscape Provisions – industrial zones Seeks clarification of the wording in sub-clause (a).</p>					
57	Ray Kett	PC47	The submission doesn't say if they are support or oppose the plan change	The submitter is concerned about the application of Rural zone performance standards to lots in areas such Tahuna and Waiti which are obviously residential settlements. They believe the zoning and the boundary setbacks should be more reflective of the current, residential situation.	Seek amendments to change planning provisions, boundary setbacks and zoning for residential settlements that are currently zoned Rural.					
58	Tony Upton	PC47	Support in part	<p>The submitter seeks to have land on Gordon Avenue, Te Aroha proposed to be subject to the Equine Overlay rezoned to Residential.</p> <p>Proposed Residential development on the Paeroa side of Te Aroha is not as attractive to developers for economic reasons. Once the land identified by the submitter has been subdivided into lifestyle blocks, future growth will be difficult.</p>	<p>Accept the plan change with the following amendments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>That the land at Gordon Avenue, Grattan Road and Bosson Rd is zoned Residential.</li> </ol>					
59	Brian & Robyn Hampton	PC47 and Horrell Road NOR	Support	<p>The submitters support the proposed rezoning and are in favour of their Horrell Road property being rezoned Rural-Residential to allow for its subdivision into 2 acre lifestyle blocks.</p> <p>The submitters have trialled various agricultural and horticultural ventures on their 3.7ha rural property but, at that size, it is an uneconomic rural block.</p>	Accept the plan change.					
60	Noel Harvey-Webb	None	Not stated	<p>The submitter is concerned that current and future new residential and commercial development in Te Aroha around Terminus, Millar, George and Seddon Streets will lead to more traffic.</p> <p>Increased housing development and reduced pedestrian access on and around the business zoned land immediately to the west of the Rail trail increases the possibility of vehicles causing serious injury or death.</p> <p>The submitter also considers that proposed boundary standards could lead to public land being used by developers, and gives an example of a development where he claims that this has already</p>	Not stated.					

No	Submitter	Specific provisions of the plan change that the submission relates to	Support/ Oppose	Details of Submission	Decision that the Submitter wants Council to make	Further Submissions			Assessment and Recommendation	Accept/ Reject/ Accept in part
						Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested		
				occurred.						