

Part C

Submissions Summary Table

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		(Original Submission) Accept/ Reject/ Accept in part	Summary recommendations. Refer to hearings report for full discussion on submissions and further submissions
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				Accept in part	A traffic assessment of the local roading network has confirmed that the existing roading network can sustain the new zoning without any significant effects in terms of traffic safety or efficacy. It is considered a third road linkage may provide some benefits but is not justified.
2	Colin Saunders	MM3	Support in Part	The submitter supports the proposed changes to the landscape provisions with amendments.	Accept the plan change with the following amendments: 1. Allow expansion up to 100m ² without requiring landscaping				Accept in part	The changes to Broadway and Smith Streets are considered appropriate and no changes are proposed. With respect to the land scape provisions, the District Plan already makes provision for restaurants as a 'Place of Assembly' which is 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 infill areas in Te Aroha, but would like the infill area extended to include their property at 21 Gilchrist Street. The submitter describes 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 wishes that the infill area be extended to include Gilchrist Street that are of an acceptable size				Reject	It is considered that Gilcrest Street is too far from the town centre, and that should any specific sites be suitable for infill housing, then the new provisions for infill development across the general Residential zone could apply
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 ² . Existing lots are too large for most people to maintain as a residential property.	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	Oppose	Waikato Regional Council (FS-4) Method 6.1.5 of the RPS relates to District Plan provisions for rural-residential development, and that rural residential development should be directed to areas identified in the District Plan and that the District Plan should ensure development is directed away from particular locations and activities. New development should be aligned with the development principles in section 6A of the RPS.	Without analysis against these provisions, it cannot be determined whether the submission point gives effect to the RPS. Do not allow submission point.	Reject	There is no obvious data available to indicate that there is a housing shortage in Matamata-Piako District and the Plan Change will achieve an oversupply of zoning. It is considered that the new subdivision objectives are appropriate and that they will serve the objectives for achieving appropriate subdivision around the urban areas.
						Oppose	New Zealand Transport Agency (FS-9) The submitter is seeking clarification on the changes proposed by this submission as a change to lot sizes which allows for more development will require further assessment to ensure the effects on the traffic	Clarification as to the exact changes sought by submission 4.		

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		(Original Submission) Accept/ Reject/ Accept in part	Summary recommendations. Refer to hearings report for full discussion on submissions and further submissions
							network are properly identified and addressed.			
						Oppose in part	<p>Fonterra (FS-10)</p> <p>The submitter is concerned with the potential for reverse sensitivity being generated by allowing residential and rural-residential lots. The submitter believes that this submission seeks to make amendments to the subdivision provision in the Rural Zone, which is outside of the scope of this plan change.</p>	Reject this submission. Alternatively, accept the relief sought by this submitter provided that rural subdivision provisions are restricted so they do not apply within 500 metres of the outer property boundaries of the Morrinsville milk processing site.		
5	Karen Semmens	PC47 – 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, which supplies the Tatua Dairy Company. 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>Further to the submission, the submitter proposes that if the Horrell Road NOR is adopted, then a spine road should be installed that is tree lined, and provides safe passage for cyclists and pedestrians should be included in the proposal.</p>	Decline the plan change in part with the following amendments: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> If the NOR is adopted, then the submitter's land on Horrell Road is included into the plan change area, and be considered to be rezoned rural-residential Establish a green belt around the Morrinsville to protect the productive land being used as residential land. Consider rezoning the Western side of Morrinsville as Commercial or Business Zones 	Support	<p>Karen Semmens (FS-1)</p> <p>Rezone Scott and Kuranui Roads residential. The soil is less productive, closer to urban infrastructure, west of industrial zone, and has elevated views. The submitter doesn't believe that Kuranui Road will be a bypass route,</p>	Rezone Scott and Kuranui Roads as residential, do not rezone Horrell Road.	Submission 5 – Reject	<p>In the new infill areas, considerable effort has been made to refine the performance standards for any infill development to ensure good urban design outcomes are achieved to minimise the effects on the local community.</p> <p>Infill standards provide a comparable lot size to many other town centres which set a 325m² -350m² standard for suburban residential development, with lot sizes down to 200m² for higher density development. Given the new performance standards, it is considered that positive outcomes will be achieved by retaining the provisions as notified.</p> <p>The Plan Change has not made any change to the existing industrial areas within the urban boundary. It is considered that many of the businesses have established in the industrial area given the nature of existing activities in that zone. All activities have to comply with the relevant permitted activity standards and/or scale and intensity of existing use rights. There are no ongoing issues or conflicts within this zone. It is therefore considered the existing Industrial zone should remain.</p>
									Submission point 5.3 - Reject	

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		(Original Submission) Accept/ Reject/ Accept in part	Summary recommendations. Refer to hearings report for full discussion on submissions and further submissions
						Oppose	<p>New Zealand Transport Agency (FS-9)</p> <p>The submitter has concerns with the rezoning requested by this submission. 'Area 2' did not form part of the proposed area of the Horrell Road Structure Plan, and the submitter's requests have therefore not been assessed by the Transport Agency.</p> <p>The submitter has not provided details on which areas of Roache Road should be rezoned industrial.</p>	Any rezoning of land which enables further development must be carefully planned and assessed to ensure that adverse effects are identified and addressed.		
6	John Lee	MM3	Oppose	The submitter opposes the rezoning of Meura Street to Business/Commercial zone on the basis there is flooding issues down this street.	Oppose the plan change, unless the following amendments are made: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide stormwater facilities for the street 2. Provide better street lighting 3. Trim the trees on Meura Street to increase the streets exposure to sunlight 4. Allow Residential Infill instead of Business 				Submission points 6.1-3 – Reject	<p>The Business/Residential interface provisions which apply to these areas place significant restrictions on the type and scale of any business establishing in these areas. The Residential Interface provisions only encourage business use that operates from existing residences and retailing activities are not permitted. Any business activity that does not comply with the specified criteria will require land use consent as a Discretionary Activity.</p> <p>With regard to Meura Street, given the existing mixed use character, it is considered that the Business zone with Business/Residential interface is appropriate for Meura Street.</p>
7	Lewis Hall	PC47	Oppose	The submitter is concerned with the increased density that the plan change is trying to achieve and the proposed Business Zone on Waharoa Road East.	Decline the plan change				Accept in part	
8	Tarnia Richardson	MV3	Oppose in part	The submitter is concerned with the increase in density (proposed Infill provisions) at the block between	Accept the plan change with the following amendments:				Accept in part	Further Residential infill development adjacent to Industrial zones could

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	(Original Submission) Accept/ Reject/ Accept in part	Summary recommendations. Refer to hearings report for full discussion on submissions and further submissions		
				McPherson Drive and Page Street bordering the Industrial Zone.	1. Establish a buffer between the two zones			potentially expose more residents to off-site effects. On balance it is considered appropriate to remove the infill area from the end of McPherson Drive and west towards the end of Page Street. The proposed Residential infill area extends along Coronation Road; it is considered that this is an appropriate area and distance from the town centre		
9	Kevin & Dianne Mary Te Wharau	MV3	Does not say	The submitter wishes to see the existing Industrial zoned land changed back to a Residential Zone.	Accept the plan change with the following amendments: 1. Rezone Lot 9 DP 16287 as residential.		Reject	It is considered that the submission raises some valid points in relation to zoning and access; on balance it is considered that the site should retain its Industrial zone. Potential issues may arise if new residential activities were developed on the site given that the site is surrounded by the Industrial zone on three boundaries.		
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 unusable sites	Accept the plan change with the following amendments: 1. For Rule 4.13.2(i), require site density to be calculated on a 325m2 gross site area rather than a 325m2 net site area.		Accept	Council supports the submitter's view that the rule mechanism should calculate site density from the gross section area.		
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 impact the safety in the area by having more cars on the road.	Decline the plan change, unless the road network around Stirling and Kennedy Streets is extended to connect with the surrounding streets		Reject			
12	Inghams Enterprises Ltd	Proposed Equine Area in Matamata, at the corner of Banks and Burwood Roads	Oppose in part	<p>The submitter is concerned about the reverse sensitivity of intensifying the Rural-Residential area, and introducing an Equine Overlay in Matamata.</p> <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</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 has been earmarked for future expansion is rezoned Industrial to protect the operation of their business, and to allow for potential future expansion. 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>Accept the plan change with the following amendments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rezone the Ingham Enterprises site as industrial 2. Delete rule 6.3.10(i)(a), restricting equine lots to equine areas 3. Amend proposed rule 6.3.10(i)(b) as follows: <p>A qualifying titles 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>	Support in part	Calcutta Farms (FS-7) The submitter identifies it is logical for businesses to seek security for their existing operations. The submitter therefore supports measures to avoid reverse sensitivity on existing activities.	<p>The submitter opposes expansion through this process, the resource consent process, or through the permitted rezoning of the land as expansion of industrial/intensive activities have off-site environmental effects.</p> <p>The submitter seeks that if PC47 makes provision for further</p>	<p>Submission points 12,2-7 – Accept in part</p> <p>Submission point 12.1 – Reject & further submissions FS-07 & FS-09</p>	<p>It appears that there is a lack of real community, landowner, or industry sector support, and given the objections raised to the proposed overlay and the potential administration issues, serious doubts exist over the merits of the equine provisions. Council has promoted the equine overlay in good faith; however, without any tangible support and a clearly identifiable community or environmental benefit, there is little merit in retaining the proposal. It is therefore considered that the equine provisions should no longer be pursued.</p> <p>The issues around reverse sensitivity and the equine overlay will be resolved if Council decides to discard 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		(Original Submission) Accept/ Reject/ Accept in part	Summary recommendations. Refer to hearings report for full discussion on submissions and further submissions
					<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 Inghams Hatchery on Part Loty 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 6.6.1 as follows:</p> <p>In addition to the Controlled and Restricted Discretionary Assessment criteria, may be used as a framework for assessing Discretionary and Non-Complying subdivision. 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>			development of the Inghams or similar sites, that responsible controls are imposed on the future expansion to ensure the activity is compatible with the zoning of the neighbouring zone. That the plan change include provisions to address reverse sensitivity effects between activities, and intensive farming or industrial activities established at the time PC47 takes legal effect		Equine provisions. With respect to the Industrial zoning, it is considered that there is insufficient justification or merit in this submission and detailed assessment of environmental and infrastructure issues would be need to be addressed in order for the submission to be supported.
						Oppose	<p>New Zealand Transport Agency (FS- 9)</p> <p>The submitter is concerned with the requested industrial zoning of the identified for future expansion (Lot 1 DPS 16966). The site has direct access onto SH27, which is a limited access road at this location. The rezoning of this site has not been properly assessed.</p>	Any rezoning of land which enables further development must be carefully planned for and assessed to ensure that adverse effects are identified and addressed.		

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		(Original Submission) Accept/ Reject/ Accept in part	Summary recommendations. Refer to hearings report for full discussion on submissions and further submissions
13	A.L., N., & E Loveridge	PC47	Support in part	The submitter would like the residential zone extended to include 56 and 60 Snell Street	Accept the plan change with the following amendments: 1. Rezone 56 and 60 Snell Street to Residential zone.	Neutral	Waikato Regional Council (FS-4) Method 6.1.8 of the RPS sets out the information requirements to support urban development and new subdivision. Further analysis is required to support any amendments to proposed rezoning in PC47. New development should be aligned with the development principles in section 6A of the RPS.	Do not allow without further analysis to ensure the amendment gives effect to the RPS.	Submission 13 – Reject & further submissions: FS-04 Accept; FS-09 Accept.	There is little technical material to support the rezoning request, and Council has identified a future Residential Policy area for future urbanisation along Taukoro Road. In addition, new provision for infill development is proposed and it is considered that the Plan Change will enable appropriate rural-residential and residential development opportunities.
						Oppose in part	New Zealand Transport Agency (FS-9) The submitter identifies that the sites identified in this submission do not have direct access onto the State Highway, rather they gain access from Snell Street. Snell Street become Avenue Road and intersects with SH26. Any rezoning of land which enables further development must be carefully planned for and assessed to ensure that adverse effects are identified and addressed. The Transport Agency is not necessarily opposed to the requested rezoning provided that the potential adverse effects are addressed.			
14	Colin and Sharyn Fabish	PC 47 size of rural	Support in part	The submitter believes that Council should not restrict the size of subdivided blocks at Horrell Road to 1 hectare, and that sections of 1,000m ² would be more appropriate.	Accept the plan change with the following amendments: 1. That further consideration is given to the block sizes.	Oppose	New Zealand Transport Agency (FS-9) The submitter identifies that any change to lot sizes which enables more development will require further assessment.	Any rezoning of land which enables further development must be carefully planned for and assessed to ensure that adverse effects are identified and addressed.		
15	Brett and Sharon Yeandle	PC47	Support in part	The submitter is concerned with the safety of changing the zones around the business area and introducing residential	Accept the plan change with the following amendments:	Support	Navdeep Singh and Baljit Kaur (FS-5)	Extend the business zone as identified in	Submission 15 – Reject & further submissions:	It is considered that there is not sufficient merit in the submission to consider that

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		(Original Submission) Accept/ Reject/ Accept in part	Summary recommendations. Refer to hearings report for full discussion on submissions and further submissions
				development into an already busy area along SH26 in Morrinsville.	1. The submitter wishes to see the existing Business Zone boundary shifted to the western edge of section 2582 on SH26, Morrinsville.		The submitter agrees with shifting the business zone to the western edge of section 2582 on SH 26, Morrinsville.	submission 15, and in this further submission.	FS-05 Reject; FS-06 Reject; FS-09 Accept.	the Business zone request would be superior to the proposed Rural-Residential zone.
						Support	Brett and Sharon Yeandle (FS-6) The submitter would like Council to not restrict the size of the subdivided blocks under the new zoning proposals.	No restrictions on the size of the subdivided blocks under the new zoning proposals.		
						Oppose	New Zealand Transport Agency (FS-9) The submitter identifies that sites identified in this submission have direct access onto SH26, which is a limited access road at these locations. The potential adverse effects of rezoning this site have not been assessed.	Any rezoning of land which enables further development must be carefully planned for and assessed to ensure that adverse effects are identified and addressed.		
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 overlay is excessive, 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" whatsoever, and the two options were not weighed up together and that more assessment into the demographic projections is necessary.</p> <p>The submitter identifies that the Banks Road area is able to provide the necessary infrastructure to facilitate development, and that it is more closely aligned with the Matamata Town Strategy.</p>	Oppose the plan change in part, unless: 1. "Option 2" which includes the Weatherley and Johnson owned blocks of land are included for Residential not Equine to allow for future development in Matamata.	Support in part	Inghams Enterprises (NZ) Ltd. (FS-3) The submitter is concerned about the lack of justification for the Equine Area to allow further rural residential development around the racecourse.	The submitter requests that no Equine Area overlay be introduced into the District Plan, and that if different standards for subdivision are required for equine activities that they be dealt with by a change to the general subdivision rules and a buffer area to ensure existing activities are not comprised by reverse sensitivity effects.	Submission 16 Accept in part & Further Submission 03 – Accept in part	It appears that there is a lack of real community, landowner, or industry sector support, and given the objections raised to the proposed overlay and the potential administration issues, serious doubts exist over the merits of the equine provisions. Council has promoted the equine overlay in good faith; however, without any tangible support and a clearly identifiable community or environmental benefit, there is little merit in retaining the proposal. It is therefore considered that the equine provisions should no longer be pursued.
						Oppose	Inghams Enterprises (NZ) Ltd. (FS-3) The submitter is concerned about the impact and potential for reverse sensitivity effects on the operation of their business which would result from enabling residential subdivision.	Extension of the industrial zone to include present and future Inghams sites to protect the operation and potential for expansion.	Submission 16 – Accept in part & further submissions: FS-03 Accept in part; FS-04 Accept; FS-07 Accept in part; FS-09 Accept	<p>It has been recommended that a small extension of the Residential zone is adopted as part of this process, and a further Future Policy area is also introduced to identify this area including the submitter properties as suitable.</p> <p>A further plan change will be necessary, including a full</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		(Original Submission) Accept/ Reject/ Accept in part	Summary recommendations. Refer to hearings report for full discussion on submissions and further submissions
										assessment of environmental, roading and servicing effects to consider the type of residential development that would be suitable in this area including any structure plan requirements.
						Neutral	<p>Waikato Regional Council (FS-4) Method 6.1.8 of the RPS sets out the information requirements to support new development and urban development. Further analysis is required to support any amendments to proposed rezoning in PC47. New development should be aligned with the development principles in section 6A of the RPS</p>	Do not allow without further analysis to ensure the amendment gives effect the RPS.		
						Support in part	<p>Calcutta Farm (FS-7) The submitter does not support the changes to the extent of the Equine Overlay over Lots 22 & 23 DP13321, unless the change is too residential or future residential. The submitter does, however, support the extension of the residential zoning around the Banks Road area for the reasons below: - Section 32 report is not clear in the option analysis; - Population projections relied upon are not representative of today's migration patterns; - Banks Road provides a viable location for future expansion; - Most of the costs to develop this area will be borne by the developer.</p>	<p>Retain the extent of the Equine overlay over Lots 22 & 23 DP13321, unless the change is too residential or a future residential policy area.</p> <p>That the land within the Banks Road/ Burwood Road area be rezoned to residential or future residential as shown in the Calcutta Farms submission.</p>		
						Oppose in part	<p>New Zealand Transport Agency (FS-9) The submitter identifies the sites identified in this submission do not have direct access to the State Highway, and</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	(Original Submission) Accept/ Reject/ Accept in part	Summary recommendations. Refer to hearings report for full discussion on submissions and further submissions
						<p>will access the network via the Banks Road intersection.</p> <p>Any rezoning of land which enables further development must be carefully planned for and assessed to ensure that adverse effects are identified and addressed.</p> <p>The Transport Agency is not necessarily opposed to the requested rezoning provided that the potential adverse effects are addressed.</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"> 1. Amend planning map MM3 by removing the shop frontage lines from both sides of Arawa Street, north of Rewa Street 2. Amend MV3 planning map by removing shop frontage lines from Studholme Street, north of Thames Street 3. Amend TA5 planning map by removing shop frontage lines from Whitaker Street, east of Boundary Road 		<p>Submission 17.1 - Accept map change</p> <p>Submission 17.2 - Accept map change</p> <p>Submission 17.3 - Reject</p>	<p>There is unlikely to be much pedestrian movement north of Rewa Street. The existing building and presence of car parks along Arawa Street is also considered to make any verandah requirements impractical to implement.</p> <p>The recent redevelopment of the Westpac Bank on the corner of Studholme and Thames Streets has been undertaken without a verandah, and the presence of private and public car parking along Studholme Street reduces the opportunity to achieve a continuous verandah link.</p> <p>The buildings along Whitaker Street have verandahs with the exception being the carpark for the Countdown supermarket. It is considered that the SFA should remain along this section.</p>
18	Nikita Laboyrie	Taukoro Road residential development area	Support	<p>The submitter has indicated that council should increase the density of this proposed residential area as it is in close proximity to the Morrinsville township, and that 129 Taukoro Road is included in the plan change area.</p> <p>The submitter would like to subdivide their land to provide 8 dwellings per hectare of land.</p> <p>Additional information supplied by the submitter on 16 February 2017 now requests that rezoning on their property be Rural-Residential 2, for a total of eight lots with an average lot size of 5,000m², rather than Residential rezoning.</p>	Accept		Reject	<p>The Plan Change has proposed to remove the existing Rural-Residential zone off Taukoro Road and replace this with Future Residential Policy Area. There is not sufficient evidence or merit in the submission to justify a change of zoning further along Taukoro Road.</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		(Original Submission) Accept/ Reject/ Accept in part	Summary recommendations. Refer to hearings report for full discussion on submissions and further submissions
19	Shane Tunnicliffe	Taukoro Road residential development area	Support	<p>The submitter has indicated that council should increase the density of this proposed residential area as it is in close proximity to the Morrinsville township, and that 129 Taukoro Road is included in the plan change area.</p> <p>The submitter would like to subdivide their land to provide 8 dwellings per hectare of land.</p> <p>Additional information supplied by the submitter on 16 February 2017 now requests that rezoning on their property be Rural-Residential 2, for a total of eight lots with an average lot size of 5,000m², rather than Residential rezoning.</p>	Accept				Reject	The Plan Change has proposed to remove the existing Rural-Residential zone off Taukoro Road and replace this with Future Residential Policy Area. There is not sufficient evidence or merit in the submission to justify a change of zoning further along Taukoro Road.
20	Nelson Schick	PC47 Eldonwood South Zoning Rural-Residential 1 & 2 zones	Support in part	The submitter does not see the need to have two classifications of Rural-Residential zoning within the Eldonwood South area.	Accept the plan change with the following amendments: 1. All Rural-Residential 2 zones be classified as rural-residential 1 in Eldonwood South.				Accept in part	Split zoning has been introduced to provide some variation and mix in the nature and type of Rural-Residential lots that may be subdivided. It is considered that a mix of Rural-Residential 1 and 2 zoning in the revised Elwood Structure Plan area is appropriate.
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 residential in the future.	Accept the plan change with the following amendments: 1. That the submitters property at 60 Banks Road be designated residential for future development	Oppose	<p>Inghams Enterprises (NZ) Ltd. (FS-3)</p> <p>The submitter is concerned about the impact for reverse sensitivity on the operation of the business. The hatchery has plant, equipment, and heavy vehicles that have the potential to create adverse effects for nearby rural-residential residents.</p> <p>An increase in development leads to a potential increase in parties potentially affected by the Inghams operation.</p>	Extension of the industrial zone to include current and future Inghams sites to protect the operation and potential for expansion.	Reject	<p>Submission 20 – Reject & further submissions: FS-03 Accept; FS-07 Accept in part; FS-09 Accept</p> <p>The report has recommended that changes are made to the extent of the Residential Zone and that a Future Policy Area also be established. These recommendations do not propose residential zoning to the south of Banks Road.</p>
						Support	<p>Calcutta Farm (FS-7)</p> <p>The submitter supports the notion of extending the residential or future residential policy areas to Banks Road as it aligns with their submission.</p>	That land within the Banks and Burwood Road area be rezoned residential or future residential, including land identified in 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		(Original Submission) Accept/ Reject/ Accept in part	Summary recommendations. Refer to hearings report for full discussion on submissions and further submissions
								"Development Concept Plan" attached to the Calcutta Farms original submission		
						Oppose	<p>New Zealand Transport Agency (FS-9)</p> <p>The submitter identifies the sites identified in this submission do not have direct access to the State Highway, and will access the network via the Banks Road intersection.</p> <p>Any rezoning of land which enables further development must be carefully planned for and assessed to ensure that adverse effects are identified and addressed.</p> <p>The Transport Agency is not necessarily opposed to the requested rezoning provided that the potential adverse effects are addressed.</p>			
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 Residential in the future.	Accept the plan change with the following amendments: 1. That the submitters property at 46 Banks Road be designated residential for future development	Oppose	<p>Inghams Enterprises (NZ) Ltd. (FS-3)</p> <p>The submitter is concerned about the impact for reverse sensitivity on the operation of the business. The hatchery has plant, equipment, and heavy vehicles that have the potential to create adverse effects for nearby rural-residential residents.</p> <p>An increase in development leads to a potential increase in parties potentially affected by the Inghams operation.</p>	Extension of the industrial zone to include current and future around the Inghams sites to protect the operation and potential for expansion.	Reject	It appears that there is a lack of real community, landowner, or industry sector support, and given the objections raised to the proposed overlay and the potential administration issues, serious doubts exist over the merits of the equine provisions. Council has promoted the equine overlay in good faith; however, without any tangible support and a clearly identifiable community or environmental benefit, there is little merit in retaining the proposal. It is therefore considered that the equine provisions should no longer be pursued.
						Support	<p>Calcutta Farm (FS-7)</p> <p>The submitter supports the notion of extending the residential or future residential policy areas to Banks Road as it aligns with their submission.</p>	That land within the Banks and Burwood Road area be rezoned residential or future residential. Including land identified in the "Development Concept Plan"	Submission 21 – Reject & further submissions: FS-03 Accept; FS-07 Accept in part; FS-09 Accept	The report has recommended that changes are made to the extent of the Residential zone and that a Future Policy Area also be established. These recommendations do not propose residential zoning to the south of Banks Road.

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		(Original Submission) Accept/ Reject/ Accept in part	Summary recommendations. Refer to hearings report for full discussion on submissions and further submissions
								attached to the Calcutta Farms original submission.		
						Oppose	<p>New Zealand Transport Agency (FS-9)</p> <p>The submitter identifies the sites identified in this submission do not have direct access to the State Highway, and will access the network via the Banks Road intersection.</p> <p>Any rezoning of land which enables further development must be carefully planned for and assessed to ensure that adverse effects are identified and addressed.</p>	Do not allow.		
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, and the area is suitable for a higher density of development and that providing by smaller residential lots is appropriate.</p> <p>The submitter believes there is sufficient open space at Pohlen Park to not require recreational space to be provided.</p> <p>Further to this, the submitter would like to increase the density in the area</p>	<p>Accept the plan change with the following amendments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Change rule 4.13.1 to a Controlled activity, not an RDA 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 				Submission point 23.1-4 – Accept in part	<p>Any infill development in the area may take advantage of the Pohlen Park outdoor area and open space; it is not considered appropriate to introduce specific rule provisions specifically for this area. It is considered that any local conditions are more appropriately considered through an individual resource consent process.</p> <p>With respect to car parking, it is unlikely that residents will not be car dependent and therefore no change to the car parking requirements are proposed.</p> <p>It is proposed to amend the notified rule mechanism such that density is calculated on 325m² gross site area and 325m² net site area.</p>
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, and has problems with drainage.</p> <p>Concerns have also been raised in relation to the likelihood of the proposed residential zoned land being developed.</p> <p>The submitter's further note that an increase in residential development will increase the pressure on the roading</p>	Decline the plan change in relation to the concerns listed in the previous column				Reject	<p>Existing roading network is able to accommodate additional traffic generation.</p> <p>Geotechnical issues have been further investigated, and the technical assessment indicates that there are parts of the site which are suitable for urbanisation.</p> <p>Overall, it is considered that there is merit in proceeding with rezoning.</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		(Original Submission) Accept/ Reject/ Accept in part	Summary recommendations. Refer to hearings report for full discussion on submissions and further submissions
				<p>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, safety and maintenance issues.</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, and that development in this area would impact the areas natural drainage.</p> <p>Further to this the submitters are concerned about the increased traffic volume generated by increased development, and that upgrades to the road network would be required.</p>	Decline the plan change				Reject	<p>Existing roading network is able to accommodate additional traffic generation.</p> <p>Geotechnical issues have been further investigated, and the technical assessment indicates that there are parts of the site which are suitable for urbanisation.</p> <p>Overall, it is considered that there is merit in proceeding with rezoning.</p>
26	Kathleen Taylor	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, and that development in this area would impact the areas natural drainage. Concerns have also been raised in relation to the likelihood of the proposed residential zoned land being developed.</p> <p>Further to this the submitter is concerned about the increased traffic volume generated by increased development, and that upgrades to the road network 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, safety and maintenance issues.</p>	Decline the plan change				Reject	<p>Existing roading network is able to accommodate additional traffic generation.</p> <p>Geotechnical issues have been further investigated, and the technical assessment indicates that there are parts of the site which are suitable for urbanisation.</p> <p>Overall, it is considered that there is merit in proceeding with rezoning.</p>
27	P.J & D.H Morris	PC47 – Rezoning of Stirling Street	Oppose	<p>The submitters are concerned that the rezoning of the land will lead to a rates increase for land that is unusable. The submitter identifies that there has been ongoing problems with stormwater discharges and the land becoming more sodden.</p> <p>The submitter further identifies that upgrading access to the bridal track, and has security, health and safety concerns if the track entrances cross their land.</p>	Decline the plan change				Reject	<p>Existing roading network is able to accommodate additional traffic generation.</p> <p>Geotechnical issues have been further investigated, and the technical assessment indicates that there are parts of the site which are suitable for urbanisation.</p> <p>Overall, it is considered that there is merit in proceeding with rezoning.</p>
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>	Decline the plan change				Reject	<p>Existing roading network is able to accommodate additional traffic generation.</p> <p>Geotechnical issues have been further investigated, and</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		(Original Submission) Accept/ Reject/ Accept in part	Summary recommendations. Refer to hearings report for full discussion on submissions and further submissions
				<p>The submitters further identify the health and safety concerns of the bridal track crossing the private and wet 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 access to the rail trail in terms of health, safety and maintenance.</p>						<p>the technical assessment indicates that there are parts of the site which are suitable for urbanisation.</p> <p>Overall, it is considered that there is merit in proceeding with rezoning.</p>
29	N.A & P.D Barton	PC47 – change in zoning along Waharoa Road East, Matamata.	Oppose	The submitter is concerned that the change in zoning along Waharoa Road East to business will affect the character and residential amenity in Matamata.	Decline the plan change				Accept in part	
30	Vanessa Kowalski	PC47 – Rezoning of Stirling Street	Oppose	<p>The submitter is concerned with the loss of the rural character of the neighbourhood if the plan change is approved and the land is subdivided.</p> <p>The submitters are 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				Reject	<p>Existing roading network is able to accommodate additional traffic generation.</p> <p>Geotechnical issues have been further investigated, and the technical assessment indicates that there are parts of the site which are suitable for urbanisation.</p> <p>Overall, it is considered that there is merit in proceeding with rezoning.</p>
31	Gayleen Ross & Grant Broomhall	Proposed Business Zones along Waharoa Road East, Matamata.	Oppose	The submitter is concerned that the change in zoning along Waharoa Road to business will affect the character and residential amenity in Matamata.	Decline the plan change				Accept in part	
32	Sheree Broomhall	Proposed Business Zones along Waharoa Road East, Matamata.	Oppose	The submitter is concerned that the change in zoning along Waharoa Road to business will affect the character and residential amenity in Matamata.	Decline the plan change				Accept in part	
33	Gordon and Joanne Barton	Proposed Business Zones along Waharoa Road East, Matamata.	Oppose	The submitter is concerned that the change in zoning along Waharoa Road East to business will affect the character and residential amenity in Matamata.	Decline the plan change				Accept in part	
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 has raised concerns in relation to the provision of public walkways in this area.	Accept the plan change with the following amendments: 1. The submitter would like to see the planned walkways removed from the plan change.				Accept in part	It is considered that the walkways will provide for better connectivity and are appropriate for an urbanisation of the area.
35	Rita Geraghty	Proposed business zones along Waharoa Road East, Matamata.	Oppose	The submitter is concerned that the change in zoning along Waharoa Road to business will affect the character and residential amenity in Matamata.	Decline the plan change				Accept in part	
36	Silver Fern Farms – Darryn Jemmett	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: 1. That the Equine areas on the TA1 planning maps and associated changes are rejected	Supports	Inghams Enterprises (NZ) Ltd. (FS-3) The submitter shares Silver Fern Farms' concerns about the potential for reverse		Submission 36 - Accept	It appears that there is a lack of real community, landowner, or industry sector support, and given the objections raised to the proposed overlay and the potential administration issues, serious doubts exist over 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		(Original Submission) Accept/ Reject/ Accept in part	Summary recommendations. Refer to hearings report for full discussion on submissions and further submissions
					<p>2. That rule 6.3.10 Equine Lots and the associated changes are rejected</p> <p>3. That a definition of Equine activity is included in the plan change</p>		sensitivity in relation to processing operations.			merits of the equine provisions. Council has promoted the equine overlay in good faith; however, without any tangible support and a clearly identifiable community or environmental benefit, there is little merit in retaining the proposal. It is therefore considered that the equine provisions should no longer be pursued.
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>Morrinsville 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>Horrell Road rezoning The submitter does not support the rezoning of the Horrell Road structure plan, and wishes to see this deleted from the plan change.</p> <p>Matamata 1. The submitter wishes to see the Equine Overlay deleted until comprehensive access arrangements have been identified, and that direct access to the State Highway is avoided. 2. Amendment to the subdivision and land use rules which will ensure that the Industrial Zone gains access from the local road network and not the State Highway.</p> <p>Te Aroha 1. The submitter seeks that an additional performance standard is inserted into 6.3.10 Equine Lots, discretionary activity, requiring no access is gained from the state highway network.</p> <p>Raises issues with consistency and alignment with Waikato Regional Policy Statement.</p>	Accept with the amendments provided in previous column.	Support	<p>Inghams Enterprises (NZ) Ltd. (FS-3)</p> <p>The submitter agrees that a more comprehensive assessment needs to be undertaken for the increase in residential dwellings in the Equine area.</p> <p>The submitter cites table 8 of the s.32 report, and that the Matamata equine overlay could result in additional 120 people in this area.</p>	Remove the Matamata overlay until a more comprehensive access arrangement has been identified.	Submission point 37.1 – Accept in part & Further submission 03 – Accept in part	<p>It appears that there is a lack of real community, landowner, or industry sector support, and given the objections raised to the proposed overlay and the potential administration issues, serious doubts exist over the merits of the equine provisions. Council has promoted the equine overlay in good faith; however, without any tangible support and a clearly identifiable community or environmental benefit, there is little merit in retaining the proposal. It is therefore considered that the equine provisions should no longer be pursued.</p> <p>While it is typically not good practice to have specific District Plan rule mechanisms that are site based. To provide certainty to the NZTA it is proposed to insert a new rule at 5.9.1(iv)(c).</p>
						Support in part	<p>Fonterra (FS-10)</p> <p>The submitter generally supports this submission.</p>	<p>Accept, subject to the amendments sought in Fonterra's submission.</p> <p>Remove the residential infill area from map MV3</p> <p>Include the 45db L_{Aeq} Noise Emission Contour for the Morrinsville site on Map MV3</p> <p>Amend the residential infill area boundary on MV3 so that no residential properties are located within the Noise</p>	Submission 37 – Accept	

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		(Original Submission) Accept/ Reject/ Accept in part	Summary recommendations. Refer to hearings report for full discussion on submissions and further submissions
								Emission Contour		
38	Fonterra	PC47	Support in part	<p>The submitter is concerned with the change in zoning of the land surrounding the Morrinsville processing plant. Planning map MV3 identifies that site on the north-eastern corner is to be zoned residential. Fonterra has identified that the increased density arising from the infill areas will result in reverse sensitivity effects and constrain the plant's operations.</p> <p>Of 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.</p>	<p>Accept the plan change with the following amendments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Remove the residential infill area from map MV3 2. Include the 45db L_{Aeq} 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 Noise Emission Contour 				<p>Submission points 38.1 & .3 – Accept</p> <p>Submission point 38.2 – Accept in part</p>	<p>The proposed infill area is located over an existing Residential Zone and therefore any reverse sensitivity issues would be assessed against the existing residential land use and zoning along Allen Street. The infill area is an enabling provision and it is not necessary to 'fix' it to any particular area.</p> <p>Therefore, it is considered that there is no reason why the infill area should not be amended in accordance with the Fonterra submission.</p> <p>It is considered that establishing a noise contour rule within the District Plan may not accurately reflect the full terms and conditions which have been assessed and endorsed as an existing use.</p>
39	Andrew Holroyd	Banks Road Structure Plan, Rule 6.3.2 Rule 4.13 – residential infill development	Support in part	<p>The submitter seeks an extension of the Residential Zone over sites currently zoned Rural.</p> <p>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</p> <p>The submitter wants more details provided on the development contributions policy</p> <p>The submitter is concerned with the ability of the council owned and operated stormwater system to handle an increased usage</p>	<p>Accept the plan change with the following amendments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 4 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 	Oppose	<p>Inghams Enterprises (NZ) Ltd. (FS-3)</p> <p>The submitter is concerned about the impact for reverse sensitivity on the operation of the business. The hatchery has plant, equipment, and heavy vehicles that have the potential to create adverse effects for future nearby residents.</p>	<p>Extension of the industrial zone around the Inghams site to protect the operation and potential for expansion.</p>	<p>Accept in part</p> <p>Submission point 39.1 & further submissions: FS-03 Accept in part; FS-07 Accept in part; FS-09 Accept</p>	<p>The matters raised in this submission are better addressed in the Council's Long Term Plan process.</p> <p>After review of the land budgets and provision for future urbanisation, it is considered appropriate the remaining portion of Lot 1 DP 486931 which forms part of the Banks Road Structure Plan and is currently zoned Rural, is rezoned Residential.</p> <p>In addition, a Future Residential Policy Area can be established to enable a planning framework to consider additional residential areas connecting the Banks Road area through to Mangawhero Road.</p>
						Oppose in part	<p>Calcutta Farms (FS-7)</p> <p>The submitter opposes this submission and the establishment of an overland flow path over their land at Lot 3 DP 486931. However, Calcutta Farms would consider the provision of a stormwater solution whereby the re-zoning of Lot 3 DP 486913 to residential is provided to the extent identified in their original submission,</p>	<p>That land within the Banks and Burwood Road area be rezoned residential or future residential, including land identified in the "Development Concept Plan" attached in the Calcutta Farms original submission</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		(Original Submission) Accept/ Reject/ Accept in part	Summary recommendations. Refer to hearings report for full discussion on submissions and further submissions
					town indicating council ownership and maintenance requirements		with the inclusion of land identified as a future residential policy area.			
						Oppose	<p>New Zealand Transport Agency (FS-9)</p> <p>The submitter is concerned with the rezoning requested by this submission. One of the sites (Lot 1 DPS 69505) has direct frontage with SH24, which is a limited access road. The potential adverse effects of this have not been assessed.</p>	Any rezoning of land which enables further development must be carefully planned for and assessed to ensure that adverse effects are identified and addressed.		
40	Kiwi Rail	PC47	Support	The submitter supports both the plan change and the notice of requirement and indicate the plan change should proceed as notified.	Accept the plan change with the following amendments	Support in part	<p>Fonterra (FS-10)</p> <p>The submitter generally supports this submission.</p>	<p>Accept, subject to the amendments sought in Fonterra's submission:</p> <p>Remove the residential infill area from map MV3;</p> <p>Include the 45db L_{Aeq} Noise Emission Contour for the Morrinsville site on Map MV3;</p> <p>Amend the residential infill area boundary on MV3 so that no residential properties are located within the Noise Emission Contour.</p>	<p>Accept in part</p> <p>Accept</p>	<p>The submission is supported with minor changes to the net site rules for infill subdivision.</p> <p>Kiwi Rail is accepting of the new infill provisions based on the performance standards and mitigation measures included within the District Plan regarding noise, vibration and setbacks.</p>
41	K.R Simpson and K.R Simpson Family trust	PC47 Banks Road zoning	Support in part	<p>The submitter seeks to have the residential zone extended over Lots 1 and 2 DP 489613 identified in the structure plan.</p> <p>The submitter supports the structure plan for the alternate access links and stormwater management areas</p>	<p>Accept the plan change with the following amendments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Amend the residential zoning in the Matamata plan change area to cover Lot 2 DP 486913 	Neutral	<p>Waikato Regional Council (FS-8)</p> <p>Method 6.1.8 of the RPS sets out the information requirements to support new urban development and new subdivision. Further analysis is required to</p>	Do not allow without further analysis to ensure the amendment gives effect to the RPS.	Submission 41- Accept in part & further submissions: FS-04 Accept; FS-07 Accept in part; FS-09 Accept	<p>After review of the land budgets and provision for future urbanisation, it is considered appropriate the remaining portion of Lot 1 DP 486931 which forms part of the Banks Road Structure Plan and is currently zoned Rural, is rezoned Residential.</p> <p>In addition, a Future</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		(Original Submission) Accept/ Reject/ Accept in part	Summary recommendations. Refer to hearings report for full discussion on submissions and further submissions
							<p>support any amendments to proposed rezoning in PC47.</p> <p>New development should be aligned with the development principles in section 6A of the RPS</p>			Residential Policy Area can be established to enable a planning framework to consider additional residential areas connecting the Banks Road area through to Mangawhero Road.
						Oppose in part	<p>Calcutta Farm (FS-7)</p> <p>The submitter opposes this submission and the establishment of an overland flow path over their land at Lot 3 DP 486931. However, Calcutta Farms would consider the provision of a stormwater solution whereby the re-zoning of Lot 3 DP 486913 to residential is provided to the extent identified in their original submission, with the inclusion of land identified as a future residential policy area.</p>	That land within the Banks and Burwood Road area be rezoned residential or future residential. Including land identified in the "Development Concept Plan" attached to the Calcutta Farms original submission.		
						Oppose	<p>New Zealand Transport Agency (FS-9)</p> <p>The submitter identifies that the site in this submission does not have direct access to the State Highway, and that the site is subject to the Banks Road Structure Plan. This structure plan shows an indicative road to Banks Road, and connecting onto SH27 via an intersection.</p> <p>Any rezoning of land which enables further development must be carefully planned for and assessed to ensure that adverse effects are identified and addressed.</p>	Any rezoning of land which enables further development must be carefully planned for and assessed to ensure that adverse effects are identified and addressed.		
42	LJ.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 the rural-residential zones changed to residential to increase the density of housing in the Morrinsville plan change area.	Accept the plan change with the following amendments: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Increase the density in the Morrinsville plan change area Amend the residential zone to include the 	Neutral	<p>Waikato Regional Council (FS-8)</p> <p>Method 6.1.8 of the RPS sets out the information requirements to support new subdivision and</p>	Do not allow without further analysis to ensure the amendment gives effect to the RPS.	Submission 42 – Reject & further submissions: FS-04 Accept; FS-09 Accept.	There is little technical material to support the rezoning request, and Council has identified a future Residential Policy area for future urbanisation along Taukoro Road.

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		(Original Submission) Accept/ Reject/ Accept in part	Summary recommendations. Refer to hearings report for full discussion on submissions and further submissions
					submitters property		<p>development. Further analysis is required to support any amendments to proposed rezoning in PC47.</p> <p>New development should be aligned with the development principles in section 6A of the RPS.</p>			
						Oppose	<p>New Zealand Transport Agency (FS-9)</p> <p>The submitter identifies that the site identified in this submission does not have direct access to the State Highway, but Eynon Street connects with Studholme Street which accesses SH26 via a roundabout.</p> <p>Any rezoning of land which enables further development must be carefully planned for and assessed to ensure that adverse effects are identified and addressed.</p> <p>The Transport Agency is not necessarily opposed to the requested rezoning provided that the potential adverse effects are addressed.</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		(Original Submission) Accept/ Reject/ Accept in part	Summary recommendations. Refer to hearings report for full discussion on submissions and further submissions
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.	<p>Accept the plan change with the following amendments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Activity table 2.2 of part B Item 3.13 Accommodation facilities – should consider accommodation facilities in the business as a controlled activity Rule 3.1.1(iii) – seeks waivers for dwelling yards (in addition to accessory buildings) where internal to subdivision, or affected party consents provided. Rule 4.13.4(i) identify an assessment criteria that encourages innovative design on 325m² sites Rule 4.13.4(g) seeks clarification on 'internal boundaries' Rule 6.1.2(d) – seeks flexibility in the minimum lot size in the business zone. 500m² is too large. 6.2.3(ii) clarify that stormwater is not necessary on site in the rural and rural-residential zone, or delete. 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. 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 	Oppose in part	<p>Calcutta Farms (FS-7)</p> <p>The submitter opposes this submission and the establishment of an overland flow path over their land at Lot 3 DP 486931. However, Calcutta Farms would consider the provision of a stormwater solution whereby the re-zoning of Lot 3 DP 486913 to residential is provided to the extent identified in their original submission, with the inclusion of land identified as future residential policy area.</p> <p>Support the rezoning of additional neighbouring land to residential to reflect other submissions received.</p>	That land within the Banks and Burwood Road area be rezoned residential or future residential, including land identified in the "Development Concept Plan" attached to the Calcutta Farms original submission.	<p>Submission points 43.3, .5, .6, .7, .11, .12 Accept in part</p> <p>Submission point 43.2 Accept in part</p>	<p>Rule 4.13.4(i) – this amendment is supported; the plan rules were drafted with the intention that the density or yield potential would be based on the whole site area.</p> <p>Rule 6.1.2(d) – the District Plan does not specify a minimum lot size for subdivision in the Business Zone where the property is located within the shop frontage area. The minimum lot size of 500m² is considered appropriate for subdivision outside of the shop frontage area as these sites will have to provide onsite car parking.</p> <p>Rule 6.2.1 – submission supported and notified changes are to be retained.</p> <p>Clarification on rules 6.2.3 & 6.5.6 – Most subdivision in the rural areas relies on onsite soakage; it is considered that the wording of this rule is appropriate. If more appropriate wording can be suggested, this will be considered.</p> <p>Rule 6.2.4 – Boundary adjustment rules were considered as an earlier plan change. In terms of Residential standards, subdivision down to the minimum of (new proposed standard) of 450m² nett site area can be undertaken as a controlled activity. As such, there is little need for the boundary adjustment rule in the Residential Zone.</p> <p>Rule 6.5.3 - submission supported and notified changes are to be retained.</p> <p>Support the proposed amendments to the yard setbacks which seek to provide greater flexibility and more appropriate setback standards. Removing the need for resource consent for side and rear boundaries when the neighbour has provided written approval is appropriate and will avoid unnecessary legal costs. These changes will be consistent with the Resource Legislation Amendment Act</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		(Original Submission) Accept/ Reject/ Accept in part	Summary recommendations. Refer to hearings report for full discussion on submissions and further submissions
					<p>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 (RDA) – 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 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 – Require assessments for onsite stormwater is</p>				<p>Submission point 43 Accept in part</p> <p>Submission 43.4 Accept</p>	<p>2107 (RLAA). Whilst it would be possible to adopt some changes to the District Plan to give effect to the submission, these will be superseded once the RLAA comes into effect on 18 October 2017. As such, while the submission is supported no changes are proposed to the District Plan as it is acknowledged these changes will come into effect with the RLAA.</p> <p>It is considered appropriate to retain the rule with a minor amendment to explicitly apply the rule to retirement/lifestyle village proposals rather than infill development which is subject to new rule provisions. Amendments to the rule are as follows: <i><u>"For accommodation facilities, each independent residential unit shall. Alternatively each multi-household unit may provide a living court or balcony with a minimum area of 15m² for each unit which can accommodate a 6m diameter circle to the north, east or west of the unit and which is assessed directly from the main living areas. In addition, a communal area shall be provided which shall."</u></i></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		(Original Submission) Accept/ Reject/ Accept in part	Summary recommendations. Refer to hearings report for full discussion on submissions and further submissions
					<p>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 the criteria on Broadway without further clarification of application and existing use rights</p>	Oppose	<p>New Zealand Transport Agency (FS-9)</p> <p>The submitter identifies that the site in this submission does not have direct access to the State Highway, and that the site is subject to the Banks Road Structure Plan. This structure plan shows an indicative road to Banks Road, and connecting onto SH27 via an intersection.</p> <p>Any rezoning of land which enables further development must be carefully planned for and assessed to ensure that adverse effects are identified and addressed.</p>		<p>Submission point 43.10 - Reject</p> <p>Submission point 43.13 -Reject</p> <p>Submission point 43.1 - Reject</p>	<p>It is considered that this rule should be clarified as follows: <i>No yard or height relative to boundaries rules shall apply to new internal boundaries established as part of any concurrent subdivision application</i></p> <p>A variety of lifestyle and rural-residential areas should be provided and that having a dedicated set of standards for the Rural-Residential 1 and 2 areas will enable current and future owners to choose the type of area they would like to purchase and live.</p> <p>The required landscaping and the site landscaping standards have been reduced. It is considered the new provisions are appropriate and will reduce any unnecessary compliance costs.</p> <p>The assessment of accommodation facilities would be dependent on scale and location of a particular proposal, and therefore a broader assessment of effects may be required in some cases.</p> <p>In addition, the Plan Change has not specifically assessed the make-up of activities in the Business Zone and therefore there may be some issues with this submission not being within the scope of this Pan Change.</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		(Original Submission) Accept/ Reject/ Accept in part	Summary recommendations. Refer to hearings report for full discussion on submissions and further submissions
						Oppose in part	<p>Fonterra (FS-10)</p> <p>The submitter identifies that allowing accommodation facilities in the vicinity of the Morrinsville milk processing site has the potential to generate reverse sensitivity effects and constrain operations. Presently, accommodation facilities are provided for as discretionary activities, which allows Fonterra to submit as potentially affected parties on resource consent applications. Changing to a controlled activity would remove Fonterra's ability to be considered affected, and to submit on consent applications.</p> <p>If the relief sought in submission 43 is granted by Council, Fonterra ask that the discretionary activity status for accommodation facilities in the Noise Emission contour is retained.</p>	Accept the relief sought by Fonterra, and retain the discretionary activity status for 'accommodation facilities' located within the noise emission contour for the Morrinsville milk processing site.		
						Oppose in part	<p>Fonterra (FS-10)</p> <p>The submitter identifies that this submission has not provided any details on possible locations for the rezoning of land to rural-residential 2. The submission is not specific enough for Fonterra to properly assess</p>	Reject Alternatively, accept the relief sought subject to no new rural-residential zone being within 500 metres of the outer property boundaries of the Morrinsville and Waitoa milk processing sites, including Fonterra's Waitoa farm.		
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	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: 1. Create rural-residential 2 zoning over Lots 1 and 2 DP 380546, and Lot 2 DPS 66165.	Oppose	<p>New Zealand Transport Agency (FS-9)</p> <p>The submitter has concerns about the rezoning requested in this submission from Rural-Residential 1 to Rural-Residential 2. Some of the sites that form part of this</p>	Any rezoning of land which enables further development must be carefully planned for and assessed to ensure that adverse effects are identified and addressed.	Reject	The Plan Change has sought to provide variation in the type and nature of Rural-Residential areas by promoting different lot sizes in each zone. It is considered that maintaining this variation of Rural-Residential areas is appropriate and provides future choice on the type and nature of Rural-Residential living that the community may

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		(Original Submission) Accept/ Reject/ Accept in part	Summary recommendations. Refer to hearings report for full discussion on submissions and further submissions
		and Peria Road					submission have access to SH27 which is a limited access road. The adverse effects of this rezoning have not been fully assessed			desire.
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 is practical stormwater management options for a variety of allotment sizes	Accept the plan change with the following amendments: 1. Create rural-residential zoning over lot 8 DP 415514				Reject	The existing provisions for Rural-Residential subdivision which requires a 1ha average. Smaller lots have been created off Cameo Place, with a larger balance lot being retained. While it may be considered that the area is characterised by smaller Rural-Residential lot, there should be no expectation that this will lead to more subdivision.
46	Blue Wallace surveyors, Ollie & Julie Carruthers, Bill & Karen Sweeny	PC47 – Rezoning of Rural land to Rural-Residential	Support in part	The submitter considers their land on Stockmans Road (Lots 1 & 2 DP 434664) is a viable option for Rural-Residential development, and should be rezoned as Rural-Residential as part of this plan change.	Accept the plan change with the following amendments: 1. The submitter wishes to have their land at Lots 1 & 2 DP 434664 integrated into the PC47, and for the land to be zoned as Rural-Residential.	Neutral	Waikato Regional Council (FS-4) Method 6.1.5 of the RPS relates to District Plan provisions for rural-residential development, and that RR development should be directed to areas identified in the District Plan and that the District Plan should ensure development is directed away from particular locations and activities, including high class soils. New development should be aligned with the development principles in section 6A of the RPS, including principles specific to rural residential development.	Do not allow unless justification and analysis is provided to ensure the proposal gives effect to the RPS.	Submission 46 – Reject & further submissions: FS-04 Accept; FS-09 Accept.	The Plan change did not assess these areas for Rural-Residential zoning and therefore it has not consulted or undertaken any specific analysis of the merits of the rezoning submissions. Based on land budgets, the additional Rural-Residential areas would not be required. Without further justification and evidence of consultation and compliance with the regional policy statement and plans, it is considered that there is insufficient merit in the rezoning proposal and therefore the original submission is rejected.
						Oppose	New Zealand Transport Agency (FS-9) The submitter identifies that the sites in this submission have no direct access to the State Highway. Stockman's Road connects with Kereone Road, which accesses SH26 via a roundabout. Any rezoning of land which enables further development must be carefully planned for and assessed to ensure that adverse effects are identified			

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		(Original Submission) Accept/ Reject/ Accept in part	Summary recommendations. Refer to hearings report for full discussion on submissions and further submissions
							and addressed.			
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: 1. That the properties mentioned in the submission are included in the rural-residential boundary	Neutral	Waikato Regional Council (FS-4) Method 6.1.5 of the RPS relates to District Plan provisions for rural-residential development, and that RR development should be directed to areas identified in the District Plan and that the District Plan should ensure development is directed away from particular locations and activities, including high class soils. New development should be aligned with the development principles in section 6A of the RPS, including principles specific to rural residential development.	Do not allow unless justification and analysis is provided to ensure the proposal gives effect to the RPS.	Submission 47 – Reject & further submissions: FS-04 Accept; FS-08 Reject; FS-09 Accept	The Plan change did not assess these areas for Rural-Residential zoning and therefore it has not consulted or undertaken any specific analysis of the merits of the rezoning submissions. Based on land budgets, the additional Rural-Residential areas would not be required. Without further justification and evidence of consultation and compliance with the regional policy statement and plans, it is considered that there is insufficient merit in the rezoning proposal and therefore the original submission is rejected.
						Support	Ollie & Julie Carruthers and Bill & Karen Sweeney (FS-8) The submitter agrees with submission 47, in that it correctly identifies that the Stockman Road area is appropriate for rural-residential development due to soil productivity limitations, infrastructure and transport connectivity and community and storm water advantages.	That Council accept the submission prepared by Barr and Harris Surveyors Ltd for rural-residential rezoning		
						Support in part	Ollie & Julie Carruthers and Bill & Karen Sweeney (FS-8) The submitter identifies that rural residential land use does not represent a logical transition from industrial to rural land use due to potential amenity effects and elevates potential reverse sensitivity. The submitter is	Retain a rural buffer between proposed Kereone Road Industrial rezoning and proposed Stockmans Road rural-residential rezoning.		

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		(Original Submission) Accept/ Reject/ Accept in part	Summary recommendations. Refer to hearings report for full discussion on submissions and further submissions
							concerned with the reverse sensitivity effects from allowing rural-residential zoning next to industrial. The submitter provides support on the wider area being appropriate for rural-residential land use. However, the support is limited to the need for a suitable buffer between the proposed Kereone industrial zone and proposed Stockman Road rural-residential zone.			
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 the data used in the section 32 analysis is based is out of date, and that the land budget-is incapable of meeting the expected population growth whilst 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 s.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>	Decline the plan change with the following amendments: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter seeks that the land proposed to be zoned 'Equine Area' is zoned Residential, or future Residential. 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 should demand outweigh supply. 	Oppose	<p>Inghams Enterprises (NZ) Ltd. (FS-3)</p> <p>The submitter is concerned about the impact for reverse sensitivity on the operation of the business. The hatchery has plant, equipment, and heavy vehicles that have the potential to create adverse effects for nearby residential residents.</p>	Establishment of an industrial zone around the Inghams site to protect the operation and its potential for expansion.	Submission points 48.1 & 2, & further submissions: FS-03 accept in part; FS-04 Accept; FS-09 Accept	<p>After review of the land budgets and provision for future urbanisation, it is considered appropriate the remaining portion of Lot 1 DP 486931 which forms part of the Banks Road Structure Plan and is currently zoned Rural, is rezoned Residential.</p> <p>In addition, a Future Residential Policy Area can be established to enable a planning framework to consider additional residential areas connecting the Banks Road area through to Mangawhero Road.</p>
						Neutral	<p>Waikato Regional Council (FS-4)</p> <p>Method 6.1.8 of the RPS sets out the information requirements to support new urban development and subdivision. Further analysis is required to support any amendments to proposed rezoning in PC47. New development should be aligned with the development principles in section 6A of the RPS.</p>	Do not allow without further analysis to ensure the amendment gives effect the RPS.		
						Oppose	<p>New Zealand Transport Agency (FS-9)</p> <p>The submitter is concerned with the sites identified in this submission. Part of the area requested to be rezoned Future Residential Policy Area has direct access onto</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		(Original Submission) Accept/ Reject/ Accept in part	Summary recommendations. Refer to hearings report for full discussion on submissions and further submissions
							SH24, which is a limited access road at this location. The map provided in this submission identifies a potential link to SH24. Any rezoning of land which enables further development must be carefully planned for and assessed to ensure that adverse effects are identified and addressed.			
49	Ministry of Education	Infill and subdivision areas of PC47	Does not say	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. The submitter is also concerned with the future residential policy areas and the impact on a schools capacity, the road network and road safety	Accept the plan change with the following amendments: 1. That council considers measures to calm and control increased traffic impacts that can result from infill residential growth around schools 2. That walking and cycle connections are considered between the new growth areas and existing schools 3. That Council considers how reverse sensitivity will be managed around schools 4. That the Council consult and work with the Ministry when planning for new education facilities and schools				Submission points 49.1-4 – Accept in part	Any road specific concerns would need to be assessed on a case by case basis and would be assessed and agreed with Council as the controlling authority, not through the District Plan. Council will consult with the Ministry if the population projections significantly increase, and new schools are required. The overall intent of the Ministry's submission is supported, however no specific relief or changes to the Plan Change are proposed.
50	Anthony and Janet Gray	PC47	The submission does not say if they are support or oppose the plan change	The submitter would like to see fewer restrictions on the subdivision of rural land to allow for smaller lots to be created. Additionally, the submitter does not support the provision of infill development	Does not say.	Oppose	Sharron and Max Dalrymple (FS-2) The submitter is opposed to an increase in residential density. It is more appropriate to concentrate development close to services within towns. The submitters' original submission (23) is generally supportive of PC47, although they seek greater flexibility and density provision on Smith Street.	That submission 50 be disallowed.	Submission 50 – Reject Further submission 02 – Accept in part Further submission 04 – Accept	The provision for smaller lots in the rural area is not part of the scope of this Plan Change; however, this matter was addressed in an earlier Plan Change and provisions do exist for small rural lots to be created.

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		(Original Submission) Accept/ Reject/ Accept in part	Summary recommendations. Refer to hearings report for full discussion on submissions and further submissions
						Oppose	Waikato Regional Council (FS-4) Method 6.1.5 of the RPS relates to District Plan provisions for rural-residential development, and that RR development should be directed to areas identified in the District Plan and that the District Plan should ensure development is directed away from particular locations and activities. New development should be aligned with the development principles in section 6A of the RPS Without analysis against these provisions, it cannot be determined whether the submission point gives effect to the RPS.	Do not allow submission point.	Further submission 09 – Accept Further submission 10 – Accept	
						Oppose	New Zealand Transport Agency (FS-9) The submitter identifies that any changes to minimum lot sizes and/or subdivision controls which enables more development than currently provided for must be carefully assessed to ensure that adverse effects are identified and addressed.	Any rezoning of land which enables further development must be carefully planned for and assessed to ensure that adverse effects are identified and addressed.		
						Oppose in part	Fonterra (FS-10) The submitter identifies that the creation of residential or rural-residential lots in the rural zone around the Morrinsville and Waitoa Milk Processing sites have the potential to generate reverse sensitivity and constrain operations. Rural-residential subdivision should be restricted to the areas zoned rural-residential. The submitter further identifies that the unplanned subdivision of rural land has a number of negative impacts on the co-operative and farmers.	Reject the submission		

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		(Original Submission) Accept/ Reject/ Accept in part	Summary recommendations. Refer to hearings report for full discussion on submissions and further submissions
							These include a reduction in supply due to land fragmentation and increased risk of reverse sensitivity. The submitter believes that the relief sought in submission 50 is outside the scope of PC47.			
51	Greg Morton, Team Leader Policy Implementation Waikato Regional Council	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>Matamata: That the changes are retained as notified.</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 Rule 6.1.2(b) – The submitter supports the rule, but asks that the impacts of intensified development in respect of stormwater is addressed.</p>	Accept the plan change with the following amendments	Support in part	<p>Fonterra (FS-10)</p> <p>The submitter generally supports this submission.</p>	Accept, subject to the amendments sought in Fonterra's submission.	<p>Submission point 51.3 - Accept in part</p> <p>Submission 51.4 Accept & Further submission FS-10 - Accept in part</p> <p>Submission point 51.3 – Accept in part & Further submission FS-10 – Accept in part</p>	<p>Rule 6.1.2(b) – The Plan Change proposed to amend the existing lot size of 500m² to a minimum net lot size of 450m². This provides some flexibility of lot size, and will not materially affect how many existing residential sites can be subdivided or increase the potential yield within the residential areas. All subdivision will need to comply within the performance standards for stormwater reticulation and servicing. It was considered that the Plan Change provisions are appropriate, and do not require further amendment.</p> <p>Submission FS-10 is in support of the Waikato Regional Council's submission, subject to the amendments proposed by Fonterra's original submission.</p> <p>The Rule as notified seeks to ensure that new activities proposed on a site which is subject to a Future Residential Policy Area do not compromise the opportunity for future roading links. There is some minor editing of the rule which would be beneficial and this is shown as follows:</p> <p><i>Rule 5.9 Future Residential Policy Areas-</i> <i>Any activity shall not be located within a Future Residential Policy Area, shall not be established or located in such a manner that in a location which may interfere with or compromise the alignment of any and roading linkage to adjacent Residential Zoned land and/ or an identified road corridor.</i></p> <p>It appears that there is a lack of real community, landowner, or industry sector support, and given the objections raised to the proposed overlay and the potential administration issues,</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		(Original Submission) Accept/ Reject/ Accept in part	Summary recommendations. Refer to hearings report for full discussion on submissions and further submissions
									Submission point 51.1 – Accept & Further submission FS-10 – Accept in part Submission 51.1 – Accept & further submission FS-10 Accept in part	serious doubts exist over the merits of the equine provisions. Council has promoted the equine overlay in good faith however without any tangible support and a clearly identifiable community or environmental benefit, there is little merit in retaining the proposal. It is therefore considered that the equine provisions should no longer be pursued. The submitter supports the new infill provisions to enable more compact forms of residential settlement. Fonterra made a further submission in general support, subject to amendments in their original submission.
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"> Status of subdivision for works and network utilities Advice notes relating to New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safe Distance and Electricity (Hazards from Trees) Regulations 2003 Section 6.2.3 Infrastructure service standards <p>Section 9 – Tower Road Structure Plan Section 10 – Status of Network Utilities in Heritage Areas</p>	Accept the plan change with the following amendments: 1. The relief sought under schedule 1 section 6 – subdivision is as follows 1.1 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: 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 operator for advice 1.2 Amend the subdivision assessment criteria to ensure all types of subdivision are required to consider reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully	Oppose	Heritage New Zealand (FS-11) Specifically, the submitter opposes to the inclusion of a permitted activity in table 10.1, being the "operation, maintenance, replacement and minor upgrading of existing network utilities". The submitter identifies that there is not enough information provided as to the exact nature of the proposed permitted activity. Historic heritage is a matter of national significance under section 6(f) of the RMA.	That the submitter (Powerco) provides information regarding the nature of the proposed permitted activity for the review of Heritage New Zealand and the Matamata Piako District Council to be able to ascertain the possible impacts and suitability of the proposed permitted activity on historic heritage.	Accept in part Submission point - 52.4 Reject & Submission FS-11 Accept	<p>The District Plan already refers to the standards requested to be included in the land use sections.</p> <p>The additional reference to the standard in Section 6 is supported, with a refined advice note to be adopted.</p> <p>As a general performance standard for all subdivision, the provisions of Section 5.9 (Infrastructure and Servicing) apply and it is considered that this provides appropriate assessment criteria for servicing and no further criteria are considered necessary in Section 6.</p> <p>The changes in Section 10 of as part of the Plan Change relate to the Te Aroha Character area and the deletion of a generic rule (10.1) which was not implementable. It appears the Powerco submission is seeking a new Permitted Activity status for all network utilities within any scheduled area and this raises the question of scope. Section 8 of the District Plan sets out the provisions for upgrading and maintenance of network utilities and therefore</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		(Original Submission) Accept/ Reject/ Accept in part	Summary recommendations. Refer to hearings report for full discussion on submissions and further submissions
					<p>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><u>Infrastructure</u></p> <p>a) <u>The avoidance of conflicts between activities and potential reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities</u></p> <p>b) <u>Where conflict or reverse sensitivity effects cannot be 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>2. The relief sought under schedule 2 Section 9– Structure</p>				Submission point 52.2 – Accept	<p>it is considered that no additional provisions are required in Section 10.</p> <p>The submission point is accepted as it is considered important that the schedules supporting the Structure Plan areas identify potential network upgrades.</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		(Original Submission) Accept/ Reject/ Accept in part	Summary recommendations. Refer to hearings report for full discussion on submissions and further submissions
					<p>Plans is as follows: 2.1 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: <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 the Structure Plan area is also subject to the engineering and infrastructure provisions contained within the District Plan and Development Manual.</u></p> <p>3. 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</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	(Original Submission) Accept/ Reject/ Accept in part	Summary recommendations. Refer to hearings report for full discussion on submissions and further submissions
					minor upgrading of existing network utilities - permitted			
53	Z Energy Limited	- Principal landscaping areas - Definitions of site coverage - Shop frontage areas	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 with the following amendments: 1. Delete rules 3.3.5(ii) and 3.4.3(ii) as proposed. 2. Retain the new definition of site coverage. 3. Retain operative rule 3.4.6 shop frontage without modification.		Submission point 53.2 -Accept Submission point 53.3 Accept	Support the new definition of 'Site Coverage' which includes clarification that below ground structures are excluded. Support the landscape provisions. Accept the submission that exempts service stations to provide a verandah.
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.	Accept the plan change with the following amendments: 6.4.2 Subdivision in rural and rural-residential zones Add a new matter of control (x) as follows: (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 6.5.5 Rural subdivision Amend 6.5.5(vi) and 6.5.6(vi) as follows: Whether sites can be 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 Fighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008. 3.4.2 Subdivision – objectives and policies Add a new policy as follows: Px- Ensure all new lots provide adequate water and access for firefighting purposes to support onsite development.		Accept in part	The points made in the submission are valid and the following changes to the Rules in Section 5.9 have been recommended: <i>Insert</i> Rule 5.9.1(vi) in relation to firefighting water supply. <i>(vi) Firefighting Water Supply - Where a connection to a reticulated water supply is not possible, adequate provision shall be made for firefighting water supply and access to the supply in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Fighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</i> <i>Insert</i> Rule 5.9.2(vi) in relation to firefighting water supply. <i>(vi) Firefighting Water Supply - Failure to comply with Rule 5.9.1(vi) shall be considered a Restricted Discretionary Activity. Council has restricted its discretion to the matters outlined in Section 5.9.3(vi). If consent is granted Council may impose conditions to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects relating to these matters.</i> <i>Insert</i> Rule 5.9.3(vi) in relation to firefighting water supply. <i>(vi) Firefighting Water Supply - The need to provide adequate supply for firefighting purpose and access to the supply</i> In relation to the policy change request, it is considered that Policy 3.4.3.1 P1 adequately covers infrastructure

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	(Original Submission) Accept/ Reject/ Accept in part	Summary recommendations. Refer to hearings report for full discussion on submissions and further submissions
								requirements and a specific policy on firefighting is unnecessary.
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.	Accept the plan change with the following amendments: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 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) That the "project Te Aroha" document, is placed on the Council website and the advice note is amended to advise of this. 		Submission 51.1-3 - Accept	A number of specific provisions from this submission have been included in section 5.4 of this document.
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>	Accept the plan change with the following amendments: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Delete the provisions relating to the proposed equines area in Te Aroha. Review the actual demand for areas against analysis of any reverse sensitivity effects. 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. 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 <u>100m a minimum of</u> 		<p>Submission 56.5 & 6 Accept in part</p> <p>Submission point 56.1-4 – Accept</p>	<p>The Plan Change reduces the standard for landscaping and new threshold development (50m²) before any landscaping is required. This is a balanced response between not imposing unnecessary constraints on industrial operators, while also maintaining some amenity for the main roads coming into our towns. The submission is supported in part to remove the landscaping requirements from all industrial sites.</p> <p>It appears that there is a lack of real community, landowner, or industry sector support, and given the objections raised to the proposed overlay and the potential administration issues, serious doubts exist over the merits of the equine provisions. Council has promoted the equine overlay in good faith however without any tangible support and a clearly identifiable community or environmental benefit, there is little merit in retaining the proposal. It is therefore considered that the equine provisions should no longer be pursued.</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		(Original Submission) Accept/ Reject/ Accept in part	Summary recommendations. Refer to hearings report for full discussion on submissions and further submissions
					<p>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.</p> <p>4. 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.</p> <p>5. Map TA5 – landscaping areas: Deletion of Piako site from the principal road landscaping areas.</p> <p>6. Landscape provisions – industrial zones Seeks clarification on 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 need to apply Rural area performance standards to sites which are more like residential sections, for example: Tahuna and Waiti. They believe the rezoning should be more reflective of the current situation.	Seek amendments to align planning provisions to size and type of house sites.	Oppose in part	<p>Fonterra (FS-10)</p> <p>The submitter identifies that the relief sought in submission 57 is not specific enough for Fonterra to properly assess. Changing the planning provisions around the Waitoa settlement to allow increased residential density could generate reverse sensitivity effects and constrain operations. The submitter (Fonterra) believes that the relief sought in submission 57 is outside the scope of PC47.</p>	<p>Reject the submission</p> <p>Alternatively, accept the relief sought subject to it not applying to the Waitoa village.</p>	Reject	The submission has merit, and Council intends to review the planning process for all small settlements as a separate plan change process. This may require new zoning mechanisms to recognise the residential nature of some of the smaller settlements; however, in some cases they are not serviced and will not have a fully urbanised character.
58	Tony Upton	PC47	Support in part	The submitter seeks to have the land that has been proposed to have the Equine Overlay in Te Aroha changed to residential.	<p>Accept the plan change with the following amendments:</p> <p>1. That the land at Gordon Ave and Bosson Rd is zoned</p>	Neutral	<p>Waikato Regional Council (FS-4)</p> <p>Method 6.1.8 of the RPS sets out the information requirements to support</p>	Do not allow without further analysis to ensure the amendment gives effect to the RPS.	Reject	Council has reviewed areas around Te Aroha for Residential and Rural-Residential development. It is considered that the Stirling St area is appropriate for a new residential 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		(Original Submission) Accept/ Reject/ Accept in part	Summary recommendations. Refer to hearings report for full discussion on submissions and further submissions
					residential.		new urban development and subdivision. Further analysis is required to support any amendments to proposed rezoning in PC47.			
						Oppose	<p>New Zealand Transport Agency (FS-9)</p> <p>The submitter identifies that this submission has not provided the legal descriptions/addresses for the sites to be rezoned. Some of the sites identified may have direct State Highway access, or access via an intersection.</p> <p>Any rezoning of land which enables further development must be carefully planned for and assessed to ensure that adverse effects are identified and addressed.</p>			
59	Brian & Robyn Hampton	PC47 and Horrell Road NOR	Support	The submitter would like their block of land on Horrell Road to be rezoned Rural-Residential to allow for the subdivision of their land into 2 acre lifestyle blocks.	Accept the plan change with the following amendments: 1. Rezone the land Rural-Residential and allow for 1 acre lifestyle blocks of land.					
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 occurred.</p>	Not stated.				Reject	It will be necessary for the submission to be clarified and specifically what parts of the Plan Change are at issue before further consideration can be given to supporting it.